



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Nakasongola District

(Vote Code: 544)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	33%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	62%
Educational Performance Measures	53%
Health Performance Measures	59%
Water Performance Measures	64%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant'</li> <li>o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant'</li> </ul> </li> <li>• From the Uganda budget website: <a href="http://www.budget.go.ug">www.budget.go.ug</a>, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG Submitted performance contract to Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development on 3rd August 2018</p>	No
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG submitted a budget that includes procurement for the forthcoming financial year on 3rd August 2018</p>	No
Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG submitted annual Performance report on 3rd August 2018 for the financial year 2017/2018.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/ inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available).</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG Submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the quarters of the previous FY 2017/2018 on the following dates:</p> <p>.Quarter -4 NO record of submission at the time of LG assessment;</p> <p>.Quarter 3 on 23rd may 2018;</p> <p>. Quarter 2 on 9th march 2018 and</p> <p>. Quarter 1 on 15th December 2017</p> <p>.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant</li> <li>• If there is a response for all –LG is compliant</li> <li>• If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District Local Government submitted the Report on status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the financial year 2017/2018 and was received by Office of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General on 29 March 2018 and Reference Number 251/1</p> <p>The Assessment for this year being April 30 2018 then Nakasongola District Local Government is Compliant .</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>Nakasongola District Local Government had an unqualified audit opinion as per Auditor General's Report for 2017/2018.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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 district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola has a functional Physical Planning committee that considers new investment. Meetings held on following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. On 16th August 2018 at medical boardroom; discussed process of inspection rates being low to do supervision in all the district</li> <li>. On 22nd June 2018 at medical boardroom; discussed and presented Katoogo parents school development plans</li> </ul> <p>However letters of appointment to the Physical planning committee.</p>	1
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG submitted 4 sets of minutes of physical planning committee to the MoLHUD for the FY 2017/2018 on 18th August 2018. It was received and acknowledged in the MoLHUD on same date</p>	1

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG has NO physical development plan for guiding infrastructure investments in the district</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG has NO Action area plan prepared in the FY 2017/2018 in the district</p>	<p>0</p>

<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>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG priorities for the current financial year are based on the outcome of the budget conferences held on 7th November 2017. The following are the priorities that were discussed at the budget ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of Nakasongola District Headquarters;</li> <li>2. Construction of District roads ( Kaswana 11km, Kakonge Kalerwe 23km);</li> <li>3. Construction of Seed School at Wabinyonyi sub-county;</li> <li>4. Construction of various primary school in the 4 sub-counties funded by world bank;</li> <li>5. Construction of 4 -stances VIP toilet in Nakasongola Health Center IV; and</li> <li>6. Urban unpaved road routine maintainance in Kakooge, Migeera and Nakasongola TC</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>
<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>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The capital investment of Nakasongola LG in the approved annual work plan is derived from approved 5- year development plan that was approved in Min/NDC/17/11/2014 dated 18th /11/2014 The following are the projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of Kakooge water supply</li> <li>2. Construction of Nakasongola District Headquarters.</li> <li>3. Construction of District roads ( Kaswana 11km, Kakonge Kalerwe 23km).</li> <li>4. Construction of Seed School at Wabinyonyi sub-county.</li> <li>5. Construction of various primary schools in the 4 sub-counties funded by world bank.</li> <li>6. Construction of 4 -stances VIP toilets in Nakasongola Health Center IV.</li> <li>7. Renovation of Kazwama HC II (Community hall)</li> <li>8. Construction of valley tanks</li> </ol>	<p>1</p>

<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>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG developed and discussed project profiles for all the investments. These projects include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Borehole drilling, Borehole Rehabilitation, and Installation of Power on Third Production Well for Kakooge Town Water Supply, Valley Tank Construction.</li> <li>b) Rehabilitation and Maintenance of District Feeder Roads</li> <li>c) Construction of District Administration Block</li> <li>d) Construction of a Slaughter Slab at Kakooge</li> <li>e) Construction of Kakooge water supply</li> <li>f) Renovation of Kazwama HC II (Community hall)</li> </ul> <p>The discussion was held on 19th February 2018 , Min/DTPC/42/02</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual statistical abstract, with gender- disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG did not compiled gender-disaggregated data therefore they have no statistical abstract.</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The Implemented projects were derived from the annual work plan of the previous financial year 2017/2018. These included the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The urban unpaved road routinely maintained were in Kakooge, Migeera and Nakasongola TC Nakasongola LG budgeted 255,340,000 and spent 299,180,000;</li> <li>2. Construction of seed school at wabinyonyi sub county at Kakindo village in Kiwongore parish budgeted at UGx 700,000,000/= and spent UGx 680,854,000/= ;</li> <li>3. Public toilet Kikaganya fish landing site in Lwampaga sub county budgeted at UGx 50,000,000/= and spent UGx 48,332,000/= ;</li> <li>4. Community access road maintenance budgeted at UGx at 53,624,000/= spent UGx 53,624,000/= ;</li> <li>5. Construction of 4 stance pit latrine at Nakasongola HC IV budgeted at 23,900,000/= spent UGx 23,900,000/=</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY.</li> <li>o 100%: score 4</li> <li>o 80-99%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that all (100%) the sampled investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per the workplan by end of FY. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The urban unpaved road routinely maintained were in Kakooge, Migeera and Nakasongola TC Nakasongola LG budgeted 255,340,000 and spent 299,180,000;</li> <li>2. Construction of seed school at wabinyonyi sub county at Kakindo village in Kiwongore parish budgeted at UGx 700,000,000/= and spent UGx 680,854,000/= ;</li> <li>3. Public toilet Kikaganya fish landing site in Lwampaga sub county budgeted at UGx 50,000,000/= and spent UGx 48,332,000/= ;</li> <li>4. Community access road maintenance budgeted at UGx at 53,624,000/= spent UGx 53,624,000/= ;</li> <li>5. Construction of 4 stance pit latrine at Nakasongola HC IV budgeted at 23,900,000/= spent UGx 23,900,000/= .</li> </ol>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG budgeted for urban unpaved road routinely that is kakooge, Migeera and Nakasongora TC at the cost UGX255,340,000 for the FY 2017/2018 and approved under minute Min/NDC/39/12/16 and the actual expenditure was UGX299,180,000.</p> <p>This represents 117% expenditure for the period exceeding the planned by 17 % from the approved budget.</p> <p>Community road access road was budgeted UGX53,624,000 and the actual expenditure was UGX53,264,000. This was 100% implementation.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There is NO evidence that Nakasongola LG budgeted for O&amp; M for infrastructure for the financial year 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			
<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Four Heads of Departments in Nakasongola were not substantively filled for the current FY 2018/2019 and these include; District Engineer; Natural resource officer, Production and marketing Officer, alongside the District Planner.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG did not appraise 4 HoDs during the previous FY (2017/2018) as per the guide lines. these include;</p> <p>District Education Officer , District Health Officer, Chief Finance Officer and District Community Development Officer.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>All positions submitted by the CAO for consideration as per the letter dated 15th December 2017 were considered by District Service Commission.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The DSC considered all the positions submitted for confirmation during the DSC meeting of 23rd May 2018 under Min/76/2018 for positions in Health and Production departments; Min/36/18 dated 2nd May 2018 for the Education Assistant; and Min 51/2018 for the Head Teacher.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>As per the letter submitted by the CAO dated 20th October 2017 to DSC reference MKN /02/05/ 2017, shows that all the 3 cases submitted for disciplinary action were considered as per the minute extracts 41/17, 43/17 and 44/17.</p> <p>For example ,the CAO was instructed by the IGG to interdict the Accountant for alleged charges of financial loss, the Human resource officer On 28th/ 11/ 2017 was interdicted for charges of alleged neglect of duty and incompetence.</p> <p>On 8th/12/2017 the CAO wrote a letter to DSC for the interdiction of Senior Assistant Secretary for allegation of causing financial loss to the government.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>None of the new staff recruited during the previous FY 2017/2018 under Min DSC 78/2017 accessed the salary pay roll within two month after appointment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District LG had 80 retired staff in the previous financial year 2017/2018 , however none of them accessed pension payroll within two months after retirement.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			

<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District Local Government increased OSR from UGX 377,599,406 as at 30/6/2017 to UGX 553,261,143 as at 30/6/2018 (excluding one/off OSR) as per the Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/18 Dated 31/July/2018 and Received by Auditor General on 15/8/2018 Ref No. Fin 103/4.</p> <p>The Increase in OSR was UGX175,661,406 and the OSR of FY 2016/2017 was UGX 377,599,406 resulting in a 46.85% (UGX175,661,406/UGX 377,599,406) increase in OSR.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The actual Local Revenue collected for FY 2017/2018 was UGX553,261,143 as at 30/6/2018 compared to UGX501,150,000 budgeted as seen on vote 544 Nakasongola District Local Government Detailed estimates of Revenue for FY 2017/18 Resulting in 10.4% More of local revenue collected against planned for FY 2017/18. this was due to unexpected increase in Land Fees.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no sharing statement for mandatory remittances of Local Revenue to LLGs except a sharing statement of LST revenue signed by the CFO and no specific evidence of mandatory remittances.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District Local Government spent a total of UGX54,623,650 as expenditure on council activities excluding General staff salaries of UGX 97,063,000 in relation to OSR of UGX 377,599,737 as at 30/6/2017 for FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>Working :</p> <p>Total expenditure on council activities = UGX 54,623,650.</p> <p>OSR for FY 2016/2017 ( as at 30/6/2017) = UGX 377,599,737.</p> <p>This results in a 14.47% expenditure of OSR on council activities which is less than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY 2016/2017.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG had Senior Procurement Officer dully appointed on 1st /11/2017 and Procurement Officer appointed on 9th /July/2013</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The was evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the contract committee as per the following files sampled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NAKS544/WKS/17-18/00001 for boreholes drilling and it was submitted on 16th –August -2017;</li> <li>2. NAKS544/WKS/17-18/00014 for construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at District Production Unit submitted on 14th December 2017;</li> <li>3. NAKS544/WKS/17-18 Renovation of four classroom block at Kikooge Primary School submitted on 4th December 2017 and</li> <li>4. NAKS544/WKS/17-18/00010 Construction of lined 5 stances pit line latrine at the District Headquarters submitted on 13th –December 2017.</li> </ol>	<p>1</p>
---	--	---	----------

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the contract committee considered the recommendations of the TEC as per the following sampled files:</p> <p>a) Drilling of borehall NAKS544/WKS/17-18/00001. The TEC recommended KLR(U)LTD as the best evaluated bidder to drill 10 handbore hall at the evaluated price of UGX 172,291,800 as at 11th August 2017 and the contract committee sat on 16th August 2017 MIN/114/CC/8/17 and approved KLR(U)LTD as best evaluated and awarded contract at UGX 172,291,800;</p> <p>b) Construction of 5-stances . NAKS544/WKS/17-18/0015. The TEC recommended Phegobu Technologies company Ltd as the best evaluated bidder on 4th December 2017 at UGX 24,858,470 ( VAT inclusive) and the contract committee sat on 13th December 2017 and approved Phegobu Technologies company Ltd as the best evaluated at the evaluated price of UGX 24,858,470 MIN180/CC/12/17;</p> <p>c) Renovation of four classroom blocks NAKS544/WKS/17-18/0015. The TEC sat on 4th December 2017 and recommended TAT and JAD Investment Limited be approved as the best evaluated bidder at the price of UGX 22,892,000 ( VAT inclusive) and on 13th December 2017 MIN184/CC/12/17 the contract committee sat and approved TAT and JAD Investments Ltd at UGX 22,892,000 VAT inclusive</p> <p>d) Construction of the VIP 5-stance latrine. NAKS544/WKS/17-18/00010</p> <p>The TEC recommended KAST Engineering works Ltd on 29th November 2017 to be approved as the best evaluated at the price of UGX 24, 973,373 (VAT inclusive) and the contract committee that sat on 13th December 2017 MIN178/CC/12/17 approved KAST Engineering works as the best evaluated and warded contract at UGX 24,973,373 VAT inclusive</p>	<p>1</p>
---	---	---	----------



The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

• 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

a) There was evidence that the Procurement and Disposal Plan for current FY covered all infrastructural projects. Samples drawn from Local government Work plan and cross-checked in procurement Plan included:

- 1) Construction of OPD at Kakooge;
- 2) Siting and drilling of 12 boreholes at selected sites of the LG;
- 3) Construction of 3 classroom block at Kaleire Primary school and
- 4) Construction of Wabinyonyi seed secondary school.

b) There was evidence that LG made procurements in previous FY by strictly adhering to the procurement plan. Contract agreements sampled from the procurement plan and seen to be implemented were as follows:

- 1) Contract Agreement No: NKS544/WRKS/17-18/00001 seen where contract was signed between Nakasongola LG and KLR(U) LTD for the drilling of 10 hand bore hole in the District This was item No. 12 in the procurement Plan for 2017/2018;
- 2) Contract No: NKS544/WRKS/17-18/00014 for the construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine at the district hall This was item No. 4 in the procurement plan for 2017/2018;
- 3) Contract No: NKS544/WRKS/17-18/00015 for renovation of four classroom blocks at Kikooge primary school This was item No. 7 in the procurement Plan for 2017/2018;
- 4) Contract No: NKS544/WRKS/17-18/00010 for the construction of 5-stances pit latrine at the District headquarters This was item No. 2 in the procurement Plan for 2017/2018.

<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"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Nakasongola LG prepared bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30 during the FY 2018/2019 . Nakasongola had 25 bid to prepare and prepared 22, file numbers starting from NKS544/WKS/1819/00001-00022. This represents 88%.</p>	<p>2</p>
<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"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola updated all the procurement activities and the update is done quarterly and submitted to PPDA as seen from the reports submitted on 15th October 2017, 10th January 2018 and 12th April 2018 and 12th July 2018 . There is also a printed electronic printed contract register that is maintained.</p>	<p>2</p>

<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"> <li>For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Nakasongola adhered to Procurement Thresholds as per the following sampled files ;</p> <p>Open Bidding:</p> <p>a. Construction of Wabinyonyi seed secondary school . it was estimated at UGX 700,000,000 and the advertisement was put in New vision of 28th December 2017;</p> <p>b. Drilling of boreholes NAKS544/WKS/17-18/00001. It was advertised on 18th –May 2017 in the New Vision newspaper;</p> <p>Selective bidding:</p> <p>1) Contract No: NKS/Wrks/17-18/0010 for Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at District Division Headquarters. Contractor: KAST Engineering Amount: UGX 24,973,373;</p> <p>2) Contract No: NAKS544/Wrks/17-18/00015 for renovation of four Classroom Block at Kikooge primary school Primary School. Contractor: TAT and JAD Investment Limited Amount: UGX 22,892,000 and</p> <p>3) Contract No: NAKS5444/WKS/17-18/00014 Construction of the VIP 5-stances line pit latrine at the district Production Hall Contractor: Phegobu Technologies company Ltd Amount : UGX 24,858,470.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that all Nakasongola LG works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified as seen in the following examples:</p> <p>1. Interim Certificate was issued on 22nd February 2018 to Phegobu Technologies company and Completion certificate was issued on 4th April 2018 upon completion of 5-stance pit latrine at the production hall and</p> <p>2. Interim was issued on 7th June 2018 to KLR(U) Ltd , awaiting defect period of 6 months before completion certificate can be issued.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG works project site boards indicate names of project, contractor, source of funding but No sign board indicated contract value.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			
<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was no separate file for Bank Reconciliations and completely no bank reconciliation statements prepared for the Months of July and August 2018 due to migration from IFMS Tier II to Tier I hence no bank reconciliations are up to-date at the time of the assessment ( as at 3/9/2018).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District Local Government makes timely payments in less than two month as evidenced by payment register and more evidence as the following sampled payment requests: 1. payment to Nyange Multi - Tech services Ltd which was Approved 12/9/2017 and Paid on 15/9/2017 and 2. Payment to Lukoma Investments Ltd Approved on 2/10/2017 and was paid on 2/10/2017.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point.</li> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There is a substantive Senior Internal Auditor (Mr Odongo Lebson) as evidenced by details from personal No. CR/D/10315 as per the posting instruction dated 9/7/2013.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District Local Government produced all the four quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 and submitted them as follows; Quarter 1 Submitted on 31/10/2018, Quarter 2 Submitted on 30/1/2018, Quarter 3 Submitted on 30/4/2018 and Quarter 4 Submitted on 31/7/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<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>	<p>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 from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>There was no specific report on information provided to Nakasongola District Local Government Council and Nakasongola District PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for financial year 2017/18 and no trace of follow up on audit queries.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Internal audit reports for FY 2017/18 were submitted for Quarter 1 on 31/10/2017, Quarter 2 on 30/1/2018, Quarter 3 on 31/4/2018, and Quarter 4 on 31/7/2018 to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC BUT LG PAC has not reviewed them with no follow-up.</p> <p>The Nakasongola District PAC held Meetings between 19th and 22nd September 2017 and 25th - 26th June 2018 and during these meetings it is the backlog of Internal audit reports for FY 2016/17 that were discussed.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District Local Government does not maintain an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle and all other assets as per the format in the Local Government accounting manual.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>• Qualified: score 2</li> <li>• Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District Local Government had an unqualified audit opinion as per Auditor General's Report for FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola District council Met as per Min/NDC38/12/2016 where they discussed service delivery issues on the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sector performance report( Works, production, Health, Education and community services , Finance and administration)</li> <li>2. The budget and work plan for the various sectors.</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola has a designated information Officer appointed on ref CR/D/13184 as the person responsible for feedback (grievance/complaints)</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There is no evidence on record of responded feedback and complaints since the staff had just been appointed.</p>	<p>0</p>

<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG payroll and Pensioners schedule were pinned up on Main Noticeboard and accounts Notice board respectively</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The procurement plan and awarded contracts were published on the procurement notice board.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>There is evidence that Nakasongola LG published the LG performance assessment results as seen in the letter dated July 9th 2018 to DEC members, Heads of Departments, Town clerks, RDC Nakasongola, Chairperson LC V and the Sub county secretaries ;reference National assessment results for Nakasongola DLG and highlighted the implications of the results.</p> <p>Nakasongola LG scored 63% and nationally placed at position 36 ref:CR,212</p>	<p>1</p>

<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"> <li>• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola LG discussed and communicated and explained guidelines, circular and policies in Min/02/03/DTPC/2018 in the District Technical Planning Committee on 7th /03/2018.</p> <p>LG displayed Local Government structure chart for LLG on the Main District Administration Block Notice board.</p>	<p>1</p>
<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"> <li>• Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>NTV broadcast debate of People parliament on 28th /Nov/2017 held at Nakasongola Production hall: discussion was on Budget of Nakasongola district and Health status on HIV/AIDS.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			



<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Nakasongola LG gender focal person and CDO provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion as verified below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Annual Work plan for both 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 have got Gender mainstreaming section where issues on gender, vulnerability and inclusion were planned for.</li> <li>2. There was report prepared on 5th October on routine supervision in relation to gender ,vulnerability and inclusion;</li> <li>3. There was a plan on integration of gender into agricultural value chain;</li> <li>4. Radio talk show was held on 30th May, 2017,30th June and 30th July 2017 on gender related issues and</li> <li>5. Radio talk shows were held where issues of gender based violence were discussed as seen from the talkshow report prepared on 21st December 2017.</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the gender focal person and CDO planned for activities to strengthen women,s role and address vulnerability as follows:T</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Integration of gender into agricultural value chain:</li> <li>2. Gender based violence and its effects on farming and</li> <li>3. Talk shows on gender based violence Vulnerability and social inclusions among others.</li> </ol> <p>As per the budget performance report of the previous financial year, amount budgeted was UGX 6,942,000 and only 3,271,000 was implemented , this represents only 47%.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Environmental screening was carried out and mitigation measures planned and budgeted for as verified below,</p> <p>Drilling of boreholes for examples Kiswera bore hole and signed on 16th April 2018.</p> <p>Kalongo borehole signed on 18th April 2018 and the following primary schools, Bamugolede, Bulwansi, Kirolo, Kanyongonga, Kalula , Kimatwe ,Kabaala, Nalubale, Kisenyi primary school all were screened with mitigation measures taken into account.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Nakasongola LG integrated environment and social management and health and safety plans in the bid documents as seen in the construction of line pit latrine at the district production hall.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence to show that Nakasongola LG implemented projects on land where LG has proof of ownership. The land belongs to the Kingdom of Buganda and that of Baruli.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that all completed projects in Nakasongola LG have environmental and social mitigation certification forms signed by environmental officer and CDO as evidenced by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the renovation of Zemgebe primary school certificate number one and</li> <li>2. Construction of 5-stances VIP latrine at Kisaalizi primary school NKS544/WKS/17-18/00005.</li> </ol>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was seen that includes prior environmental and social clearance.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence seen that included checklists ,deviations with pictures and any corrective action taken.</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>From the approved staff list sent by the CAO on 5/10/2017 and received by the ministry of public service on 12/10/2017, there is evidence that each of the 144 primary schools had head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school.</p>	4
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school as reflected on the approved staff list by the deputy CAO Mr Nkugwa Norbert dated 17/05/2018 .This is also supported by the district wage bill for 2018/2019.</p>	4
<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100%: score 6</li> <li>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</li> <li>o If below 80%: score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The district has filled position for 1179 teachers (83%) out of 1420 teachers expected.</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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>All the three Inspectors of Schools in the approved staff structure were substantively appointed as per the following minute numbers:</p> <p>Mbangire Samuel, NO:07/2004/DSC</p> <p>Kamia Difas, NO:23/2005</p> <p>Nabayizzi Mary, NO:48/2013</p>	<p>6</p>
<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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary Teachers: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>A recruitment plan with 148 positions of Primary Teachers was received by HRM on 20/07/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no recruitment plan submitted for the School Inspectors since all had been filled in accordance to the local government staff structure.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Monitoring and Inspection</p>			

<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 has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% school inspectors: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The District Education department appraised 2 out of 3 school inspectors during FY 2017/2018. This represents 66.6%.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3</li> <li>o 70% and 89%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Out of the ten sampled Head teachers In Nakasongola District , there is no evidence that the Head Teachers were appraised in the FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Out of the three circulars issued by the ministry of education, which are stop malaria, school timing and MDD ,the local government only had one which was on MDD which was also disseminated.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The DEO held meetings with head teachers on 11/07/2017,1/12/2017 and sensitized them about school hygiene and conducive learning environment.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59 % score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The district has a total of 156 licenced and registered schools where 144 are government aided while 12 are private schools</p> <p>Term 3:(2017) :Govt 142/144:private 0/12 percentage supervised 91%(142/156)</p> <p>Term 1(2018):Govt 128/144:private 0/12 percentage supervised 82%(128/156)</p> <p>Term 2(2018): Govt 125/144:private 0/12 percentage supervised 80%(125/156)</p> <p>Average performance 84%</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the school inspection reports were discussed nor used to make recommendations for corrective actions</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspec- tions, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and fol- lowed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There is completely no evidence that the education office has submitted reports to Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspec- tions, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and fol- lowed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>From the sampled primary schools including Walukunyu Church of Uganda, Wabigalo RC, Kateebe and Nakasongola Church of Uganda , There was no evidence to show that the inspection recommendations are followed up.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The total number of schools in Nakasongola is 144 which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS.</p>	<p>5</p>



<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Enrollment data recorded in EMIS report obtained from MoES and PBS are not consistent. That is, PBS recorded 35000 pupils in 144 schools compared to EMIS records from MoES with 32,429 pupils there is a variation.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>LG council committee on education met and discussed service delivery issues in Social Service Standing committee where education sector is discussed 15th /march/2018 and subsequently presented to council 29th /March/2018 Min/NDC 38/03/2018;</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The education sector committee presented issues to council as required for approval on 31th /May/2018 in Min/NDC 47/05/2018</p>	<p>2</p>

<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/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% schools: score 5</li> <li>• 80 to 99% schools: score 3</li> <li>• Below 80 % schools: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Most schools in Nakasongola district have established school management committees: The records indicate that 139 (97%) out of 144 are established. From the sampled schools which were Kimaga C/U, Kyanika P/S, St Jude Day and Boarding school Kakooge it was verified that the three mandatory meetings and discussions of budget and resource issues were held.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</li> </ul> <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence of published list of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grant on the public notice board in Nakasongola LG</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence to show that Education department submitted procurement input to the procurement unit on time on 2/01/2018.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.</li> </ul>	<p>All payment requests are approved and recommended/forwarded for payments within time and thus Nakasongola District Local Government Education department Made timely payments when funds are available as evidenced on payment vouchers.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The education submitted departmental performance report and quarterly reports departmental work plan to the Planner for consolidation by the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter - 1 on November 15, 2017</p> <p>Quarter-2 on March 09, 2018</p> <p>Quarter-3 on July 20,2018 and</p> <p>Quarter -4 on August 24, 2018</p> <p>Hence the Department submitted later than 15th July as required</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recom- mendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If sector has no audit query</li> <li>score 4</li> <li>o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of imple- mentation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2</li> <li>o If all queries are not respond- ed to score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola Education department did not respond to all audit queries which included: Schools with classrooms, office blocks and latrines in dire need; and unapproved expenditure of UGX126,229,500 for PTA funds of Kalongo Seed SS.</p>	<p>0</p>

Social and environmental safeguards			
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health and life skills. In the meeting held on 1/12/2017 Min/12/ED//2017 the issue of menstrual hygiene was stressed, similarly schools were encouraged to have a separate toilet facility for both boys and girls clearly marked.</p>	2
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p>	0
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition. As per the sampled schools: Wabigalo RC Primary School(4 female 8 males), Junda Church Uganda (5 female 7 males) ,Kimaga Church of Uganda (5 female 7 males ) and Nakasongola Church of Uganda (5 female 7 males) .</p>	1

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1:</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the district environmental officer together with the education department carried out environmental screening.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence to show that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with.</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 8</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 4</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Out of the 418 positions approved, 345 (82.5%) were filled.</p>	8
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>The health department submitted a recruitment plan with 7 positions, which was received by HRM on 26th May 2018.</p>	6

The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:

- o 100%: score 8
- o 70 – 99%: score 4
- o Below 70%: score 0

All the Health facility In-charges sampled in Nakasongola were appraised during the previous Fy [100%]as shown by the file numbers and their facilities , For example;

Wampiti HCII - CRD/13658 was appraised on 8th February 2018

Walukunyu HCI -CRD/0/15534 was appraised on 8th February 2018

Wabigalo HCIII -CRD 15347 was appraised on 8th February 2018

Nasongola HCIV – CRD / 15698 was appraised on 8th February 2018.

Nabiswera HCIV –CR/D / 15507 was appraised on 8th February 2018.

Bamugolodde HCII –CR/D/13004 was appraised on 8th February 2018

Batuusa HC II ,-CR/D/13014 was appraised on 8th February 2018.

Irima HCII – CR/D/15734 was appraised on 8th February 2018.

Kakoge HCIII –CR/D/13005 was appraised on 8th February 2018

Kakola HCII CR.D/12791 was appraised on 8th February 2018.

The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.

Maximum 4 points for this performance measure

- Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4

Four out of the five sampled health facilities had positions consistent with the budget list. The inconsistency was at Nakasonkola HCIV. Presented below is information about the health facility staff as per the deployment and budget lists:

Kakooge HC III:

The deployment list was consistent with the budget list apart from having more numbers of some positions in the budget due to pending recruitment. Nonetheless, the budget had 4 Nursing Assistants yet the approved structure had 3. A Medical Records Assistant was budgeted for but did not even appear in the approved structure. Overall, 21 out of the 23 staff budgeted for were deployed.

Kiralamba HCII:

The budget and deployment lists were consistent though an Askaris was not yet deployed. 7 out of the 8 staff budgeted for were filled.

Nakasongola HC IV:

The budget catered for 7 Enrolled Nurses yet 8 were deployed. The budget also did not cater for the 2 Health Information Assistants that were deployed. Overall, 69 staff had been deployed, which is similar to what had been budgeted for.

Wabigalo HC III:

The deployed cadres were consistent with the budget list. 17 out of the 18 staff budgeted for were deployed. The unfilled position awaited recruitment.

Walukunyu HC II:

The deployment and budget lists were consistent. All the 5 positions in the budget were deployed.



<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Only 2 of the 3 prioritized policies / guidelines were received by the District Health Officer (DHO). They included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement 2016; and</li> <li>Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021</li> </ol> <p>Apart from Nakasongola HCIV where the Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement 2016 were delivered, the guidelines were not delivered to the other health facility facilities.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>In a joint meeting with the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and In-charges held on 7th December 2017, the DHO explained the following policies / circulars:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Circular Standing Instruction No.5 of 2017 on salary structure for FY 2017/2018.</li> <li>Establishment notice No. 4 of 2009 on “Application of Cases of absenteeism in Public service.</li> </ol>	<p>3</p>
<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/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>The District Health Team (DHT) supervised 100% of HCIVs (Nakasongola and St. Franciscan HCIVs) only in quarter one as per the report dated 13th October 2017.</p> <p>Only St. Franciscan HCIV was supervised in quarter three as reflected in the report dated 28th March 2018 and only Nakasongola HCIV was supervised in the fourth quarter as reflected in the report dated 13th June 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<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/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% supervised: score 3</li> <li>• 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>• Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Out of the 32 health facilities, 28 (87.5%) were supervised by the Health Sub District (HSD) as reflected in the following reports:</p> <p>Quarter 3 report for Buyebwo HSD dated 6th March 2018 covered 10 out of its 14 facilities.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report for Nakasongola HSD dated 25th October 2017 covered 5 out of its 18 facilities.</p> <p>Quarter 2 report for Nakasongola HSD dated 13th December 2017 covered 6 different facilities.</p> <p>Quarter 4 report for Nakasongola HSD dated 8th June 2018 covered 7 other different facilities.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The DHT discussed only reports for quarters 3 and 4 and made recommendations in meetings held on 9th February 2018 and 15 May 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>A DHT disciplinary meeting was held on 9th February 2018 to address recommendations made in earlier meetings.</p> <p>Some of the cases handled included absenteeism by two staff of Nakasongola HCIV that had been referred to the disciplinary committee in the DHT meeting held on 9th February 2018.</p>	6
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>All the 32 facilities that were in PBS were reflected in the HMIS reports.</p>	10
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>LG Council committee members for Health met on 4th /December/2017 at Medical boardroom and discussed performance reports and their annual work plans.</p>	2

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The health sector committee presented issues to council for approval in Min/NDC 26/03/2018 for 2018/2019 FY</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6</li> <li>If 80-99 %: score 4</li> <li>If 70-79: %: score 2</li> <li>If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Out of the 5 sampled health facilities, only 1 (20%) had an active HUMC as reflected in the following meetings:</p> <p>Kiralamba HCII HUMC met 3 times on; 15th December 2017; 19th April 2018; and 25th June 2018.</p> <p>Nakasongola HCIV met 4 times on; 27th June 2018; 19th April 2018; 8th February 2018; and 11th October 2017. The meetings for the first 3 quarters were held outside those quarters.</p> <p>Kakoge HCIII HUMC met 3 times including on 25th May 2018.</p> <p>Wabigalo HCIII HUMC met 2 times on; 6th June 2018 and 20th July 2017.</p> <p>Walukunyu HCII HUMC met 3 times on; 31st January 2018; 28th September 2017; and 24th August 2017. Only 2 meetings were mandatory.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>A list of releases to health facilities with PHC non-wage figures was pinned on the DHO's notice board covering all the quarters and dated 4th May 2018 and the one of quarter 4 dated 8th May 2018.</p> <p>Releases for quarters 1, 2 and 3 dated 7th September 2017; 10th November 2017; and 2nd February 2018 had been filed.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>A procurement plan was submitted to PDU on 27th July 2018 beyond the deadline. It catered for 7 projects.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Form PP1 was submitted and received by the PDU on 12th September 2017, covering the construction of a latrine at Nakasongola HCIV.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>The DHO certified projects including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of a latrine at Nakasongola HCIV on 30th January 2018 as reflected on voucher number 00452.</li> <li>Construction of a latrine at supply of a computer and printer on 10th May 2018 as reflected on voucher number 00670.</li> </ol>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The department did not submit as per the required date of submission for the last quarter 4 Annual performance report for the previous Financial year to the planner after mid-July for consolidation</p> <p>Quater-1: Submitted 22/Nov/2017; Quater-2: submitted on 09th /March/2018; Quater-3: submitted on 22nd /May/2018 and Quater-4: Submitted later than mid-july on 24th/August/2018</p>	<p>0</p>
<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"> <li>If sector has no audit query: Score 4</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Nakasongola Health department did not respond to 1 internal query about none submission of accounts for audit raised in Quarter1 as per Internal Audit Report dated 31/1/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Out of the five sampled health facilities, four (80%) met the 30% gender requirement as shown below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kiralamba HCII HUMC had 40% (2 female out of 5 members).</li> <li>Nakasongola HCIV HUMC had 11% (1 female out of 9 members).</li> <li>Kagoge HCIII HUMC had 57% (4 females out of 7 members).</li> <li>Wabigalo HCIII HUMC had 42% (3 females out of 7 members)</li> <li>Walukunyu HCII HUMC had 57% (4 females out of 7 members).</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There were no sanitation guidelines at the 5 sampled facilities.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There were no checklists used for screening health facility infrastructure projects their approval since screening was not conducted for health facility infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The District Environment Officer and District Community Development Officer did not visit the sites to check for compliance since mitigation plans had not been developed for health facility infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence to show that guidelines on medical waste management were disseminated. They were also not found at any of the 5 sampled health facilities.</p>	<p>0</p>



Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 7</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 4</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Three sub-counties of Lwabiyata, Lwampanga and Wabinyonyi have a safe water coverage below the district average which currently stands at 80% as per the District Atlas Report of the Ministry of Water and Environment, and 76% at the beginning of the financial year 2017/2018.</p> <p>According to the budget allocation to the water projects for this current FY only 25.3% was allocated to these sub-counties. According to the District Water Officer, these sub-counties have no viable safe water options that would fit within the available financial resources.</p>	0
<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Score 15</li> </ul> </li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 10</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 5</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The district water department planned 8 water projects in sub-counties below the average district safe water coverage. The projects include rehabilitation of 1 borehole in Lwabiyata, drilling 1 new borehole and rehabilitating 2 boreholes in Lwampanga, and drilling 2 new boreholes and rehabilitating 2 in Wabinyonyi. The 5 boreholes to be rehabilitated were all rehabilitated, but no new boreholes were drilled in these sub-counties. The 5 executed projects represent 63% of the 8 that were to be implemented.</p> <p>The District Water Officer pointed out that the new boreholes could not be drilled due lack of viable sites for water drilling in the sub-counties whose safe water coverage was below the district average in the previous FY.</p>	5
Monitoring and Supervision			

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15</li> <li>• 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10</li> <li>• 70 - 79%: score 7</li> <li>• 60% - 69% monitored: score 5</li> <li>• 50% - 59%: score 3</li> <li>• Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The District Water Office provided filled Form 1s which were used for monitoring all new water sources in the district. In addition, Form 4s were also provided which confirmed that all the old water sources had been monitored.</p>	<p>15</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5</li> <li>• List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>The data contained in the District Annual Work Plan is similar to the information in the MIS report obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>The water facilities listed in the MIS report provided by the Ministry of Water and Environment reflected;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8 boreholes were drilled.</li> <li>- One piped water system design achieved.</li> <li>- 14 boreholes rehabilitated.</li> </ul> <p>This was consistent with the information in the PBS in the 4th quarter report.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, 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 input for the district procurement plan 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>The procurement plan for all the investment items approved was submitted to the PDU together with the final work plan. However, it was submitted on 20th-July-2018.</p> <p>The District Water Officer indicated that the 30th April 2018 deadline was never met since the Annual Work Plan hadn't been approved then.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district 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"> <li>If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The contract manager, Mr. Mulondo Hussein was duly appointed on 5th-November-2017 by the Chief Administrative Officer under the appointment letter ref 156/1.</p> <p>There are also several reports on contract management file including engagement in the WSCs, meetings, site inspection, training, post- construction support to users, and commissioning of completed projects. This was corroborated by the selected sites that were visited.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district 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"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The following completed facilities were sampled and inspected. They were all found to be functioning and well maintained, and the visible elements were confirmed to have been constructed as per design.</p> <p>Boreholes: DWD 60659 in Kasambya Village, DWD 60661 in Buloolo Village, DWD 60663 in Rwandama Village, DWD 31653 at Nakasongora Prison, and another one in Katitiiza Village which was rehabilitated.</p> <p>Sanitation Facilities (VIP Latrines): one at the District Headquarters and the other at Kikaraganya Landing Site</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district 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"> <li>If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Completed WSS facilities were handed over by Muganwa Contractors Engineering Services Limited for the VIP Latrine and KLR Uganda Ltd for Boreholes. The Commissioning and Handover Report was availed by the District Water Office.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district 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"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Completion reports for the boreholes drilled by KLR Uganda Ltd was availed together with copies of their substantial completion certificates obtained.</p> <p>Completion report for the VIP latrine by Mugwanya Contractors Engineering Services Limited was also seen together with its substantial completion certificate.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<p>The DWO always certified and recommended payments timely for the sampled contracts except payments being made on dates when funds are available as evidenced on payment vouchers.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>The District Water Officer submitted all the 4 quarterly reports as seen below,</p> <p>Quarter-1 was submitted on 22nd/ Nov/2017</p> <p>Quarter-2 was submitted on 9th /March/2018</p> <p>Quarter-3 was submitted on 22/ May/ 2018</p> <p>Quarter-4 was submitted on 24/August/2018( this time of submission is later than the required date of submission)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <li>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</li> </ul> </li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Water Department did not have Audit Queries in all the 4 Quarters.</li> </ul>	<p>5</p>

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>water standing committee responsible for water met on 27th /Feb/ 2018 and presented to council on 9th /March/ 2018 for approval</p> <p>LG PAC reports were not discussed in the LG council</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The Water sector committee presented water issues to council for approval on the 9th /March/2018</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no information on the notice boards regarding the AWP, Budget and Grant Releases. No verifiable information could be provided to indicate that they had been displayed on the notice boards</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Detailed information about the project, date of construction, contractor, and source of funding was seen on only one VIP latrine at the District Headquarters. The VIP latrine at Kikaraganya Landing Site had space reserved for the labelling but was not labelled. All boreholes had reference numbers, with some indicating location and date of construction, but no details of the contract, contractor, and source of funding.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The information on tenders and contract awards was not on the notice board. Information availed was that they had been removed to create space for the latest announcements. However, copies of what had been displayed on the notice board were availed.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Applications and reports on formation of WSCs together with Memorandum of Understanding between sub-counties and the WSCs were available on file.</p> <p>The reports on the training of the WSCs and post-construction support to WSCs were also well prepared and available on file.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&amp;M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they have an M&amp;E plan for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>On file, there were copies of receipts of contributions by the WSCs to the drilling and rehabilitation of boreholes. The facilities visited were functioning and well maintained, with some fenced for protection.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The Environment screening reports for all WSS projects implemented were duly filled and available on file. An EIA report was also seen on file.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Available on file are post-construction inspection reports and reports on post-construction support to water user committees.</p>	<p>1</p>



<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Clause 3 of technical specifications in the borehole drilling contract covers environmental protection (KLR Uganda Ltd, Contract No: NAKS 544/Wrks/17-18/0001).</p> <p>Item 3.6 of BOQs of borehole repair contracts provides for mitigation measures.</p> <p>Element G (H) in the VIP latrine contract has a provision for environmental compliance.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The lists of members of WSCs were provided in the software progress reports of the District Water Office. All committees had women, with majority (61%) having over 50% members being women and with women occupying key positions. This was corroborated on 4 of the facilities visited, with the 5th being under the management of the Prisons Department.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Only two sanitation in form of VIP latrines had been constructed during the previous financial year. One at the District Headquarters was constructed using the District Equalisation Grant while the second one constructed at Kikaraganya Landing Site was constructed using the Rural Water and Sanitation Grant. Both facilities had separate stances for men and women, and provisions for PWDs on both sides, including access ramps and support handles inside the latrines.</p>	<p>3</p>