



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Nansana Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 779)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Accountability Requirements	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	76%
Educational Performance Measures	67%
Health Performance Measures	70%
Water Performance Measures	0%

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>Nansana MC Submitted performance contract on 23rd July 2018 to Ministry of Finance and Economic development.</p>	<b>Yes</b>
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>Nansana MC submitted a budget with a procurement plan report for the forthcoming FY to MFPEd on 23rd July 2018.</p>	<b>Yes</b>
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>Nansana MC submitted Annual Performance report for the forthcoming FY to MoFPED on 23rd July 2018</p>	<p>Yes</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>Nansana MC submitted quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY to MoFPED on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Quarter -4 submitted On 23rd July 2018;</li> <li>. Quarter -3 submitted on 11th May 2018;</li> <li>. Quarter -2 submitted on 2nd march 2018 and</li> <li>. Quarter-1 submitted on 15th January 2018</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</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>Nansana Municipal Local Government submitted the status Report and received by Office of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General on 6 March 2018</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>Nansana Municipal Council had an unqualified audit opinion as per Auditor General's Report for FY 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>Nansana Municipality has an appointed and functional physical Planning Committee in place; the committee Appointed in Ref: CRM 202/2 dated 15th /November/2016</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>Nansana MC Submitted 4 sets of Minutes to MoLHUD on 04th September 2018 in Ref: CRM 202/2</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>Infrastructure Investments in Nansana Municipality are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan 2008-2018</p> <p>For infrastructure investments that are beyond the town plan of 2008-2018 coverage are consistent with the New Nansana Municipal Physical Development Plan 2018-2040, Presented to MoLHUD on 23rd August 2018; Ref: PPD/45/04; Drawing No: NMC/PDP/020</p> <p>Its Approved Under Min. 43/cm/17/18 held on 15th /March/2018 by Municipal Council</p>	<p>1</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>Action plan for Kawanda Veterans Commercial Centre in Nabweru Division; approved by council under Minute:32/WC/2017/17</p>	<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>Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The prioritised investment activities in the AWP for current FY 2018/2019 are based on the Budget conference of 15th/November/2017</p> <p>These include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban road upgrade of little Maheji-Kabulengwa-1km Kawanda- Senge 1.2km Stone pitching Naluuma Road Pothole patching of tarmacked roads Stone pitching of Maganjo -Jinja kaloli</li> <li>Urban Road Resealing; Maganjo-Jinja Kaloli Second seal Maganjo-Jinja kaloli</li> </ol>	2
<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>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>Capital investments in AWP for the current FY were derived from 5 year development plan approved in Min.24/CM/16/17 dated 22nd /Dec/ember/2016</p> <p>Water &amp; sanitation</p> <p>Procurement of land for Water project in Busukuma</p> <p>Procurement of land for gabbage disposal</p> <p>Roads&amp; Engineering</p> <p>Upgrading of Urban roads to Bitumen standard</p> <p>Preparation of Landuse, Structure &amp; Detailed for Nansana Municipality</p> <p>Construction of second seal and speed control humps on Kabumbi road</p> <p>Desilting and Maintainace of Access Municipal roads</p> <p>Production &amp; Marketing</p> <p>Construction of Roadside Market in Busukuma division</p> <p>Establishment of 7 live stock demonstration units in Gombe, Nabweru, Busukuma</p>	1

		<p>Division</p> <p>Education</p> <p>Construction of Kazo C/U Playground and Backfilling</p> <p>Construction of 3-Classroom at Bulesa primary School in Busukuma</p> <p>Renovation of Classrooms at Tikalu UMEA Primary School</p> <p>Construction of a Pit latrine at Kanyange Primary School in Nabweru</p> <p>Construction of 2-staff quarters at Building tomorrow Primary School in Gombe and Kibibi Primary School in Busukuma</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Construction of a 4 unit staff quarters and latrine at Kasozi Health centre III</p> <p>Renovation of OPD at Tikalu Health Centre-II</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>The Minutes of project profiles investments were discussed by TPC and adhered to in the LG planning Guidelines under Min40/CM/16/17. DTPC held on 11 May 2017</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>Nansana Municipality developed and compiled Annual Statistical Abstract with gender disaggregated data to support budget allocation</p> <p>It was submitted to Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBoS) on 23rd /Dec/2017</p> <p>and Presented to TPC under Min.96/TPC/01/2018 on 23rd January 2018</p>	<p>1</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>Nansana MC implemented Infrastructure projects were derived from the Annual work plan of the previous financial year 2017/2018 dated under the Budget approved by LG Council Min.40/CM/16/17; for 2017/2018 held on 11th /May/2017. It includes;</p> <p>Physical Planning</p> <p>Procurement of land for Water project in Busukuma at UGX 60,000,000/=</p> <p>Procurement of land for garbage disposal at UGX 100,000,000/=</p> <p>Production &amp; Marketing</p> <p>Construction of Roadside Market in Busukuma division at UGX 97,000,000/=</p> <p>Education</p> <p>Construction of Kazo C/U Playground and Backfilling</p> <p>Construction of 3-Classroom at Bulesa primary School in Busukuma</p> <p>Renovation of Classrooms at Tikalu UMEA Primary School</p> <p>Construction of a Pit latrine at Kanyange Primary School in Nabweru</p> <p>Construction of 2-staff quarters at Building tomorrow Primary School in Gombe and Kibibi Primary School in Busukuma</p> <p>All education investment projects planned at UGx 319,385,082/=</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Construction of a 4 unit staff quarters and latrine at Kasozi Health centre III</p>	<p>2</p>

		<p>Renovation of OPD at Tikalu Health Centre-II</p> <p>All Health investment project at UGx 106,910,605/=</p> <p>Roads&amp; Engineering</p> <p>Upgrading of Urban roads to Bitumen standard</p> <p>Preparation of Lanuse, Structure &amp; Detailed for Nansana Municipality</p> <p>Construction of second seal and speed control humps on Kabumbi road</p> <p>Desilting and Maintainace of Access Municipal roads</p> <p>All road works projects planned at UGx 1,213,449470/=</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>Nansana Municipal Council implemented the investment projects as per the Annual workplan approved by end for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Procurement of land for Water project in Busukuma, Budgeted at UGX 60,000,000/= actual Spent UGx 60,000,000/=</p> <p>Procurement of land for garbage disposal budgeted at UGX 100,000,000/= actual spent 117,637,000/=</p> <p>Construction of Market at Busukuma budgeted at UGx 97,000,000/= actual spent 97,000,000/=</p> <p>Building of staff quarters at Kisozi Health Centre III and Construction of Toilet at Tikalu Health Centre III Gombe division. Budgeted at UGx 106,910,605/= actual spent 106,910,605/=</p> <p>Construction of Tree nursery at Municipal headquarters budgeted at UGx 20,000,000/= actual Spent UGx 20,000,000/=</p> <p>Hence four out the sampled completed projects were within the workplan that is 80%</p>	<p>2</p>

The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.

• Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2

Nansana MC completed the investment projects in FY 2017/2018 within the Approved budget

Building of staff quarters at Kisozi Health Centre III and Construction of Toilet at Tikalu Health Centre III Gombe division. Budgeted at UGx 106,910,605/= actual spent 106,910,605/=; 100%

Construction of Market at Busukuma budgeted at UGx 97,000,000/= actual spent 97,000,000/=; 100%

Procurement of land for garbage disposal budgeted at UGX 100,000,000/= actual spent 117,637,000/=; 100%

Construction of Tree nursery at Municipal headquarters budgeted at UGx 20,000,000/= actual Spent UGx 20,000,000/=; 100%

Education

Construction of Kazo C/U Playground and Backfilling

Construction of 3-Classroom at Bulesa primary School in Busukuma

Renovation of Classrooms at Tikalu UMEA Primary School

Construction of a Pit latrine at Kanyange Primary School in Nabweru

Construction of 2-staff quarters at Building tomorrow Primary School in Gombe and Kibibi Primary School in Busukuma

All education investment projects; Budgeted at UGx 319,385,082/= actual Spent UGx 297,681,218/=; 93.2%

<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 clear record of O&amp;M; LG record on O&amp;M is hard to distinguish between civil works construction and maintenance costs</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	--	----------

Human Resource Management

<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>Nansana Municipality has 9 heads of departments as per the structure, but only 5 heads of departments are substantively appointed.</p> <p>The 5 heads of department who are substantively appointed include;</p> <p>Principal Assistant Town Clerk, Principal Community Development Officer ,Principal Education Officer, Production and Marketing Officer and Senior Internal Auditor</p> <p>Those in Acting position include;</p> <p>Ag Principal Engineer, Ag Principal Treasurer, Ag Planner and Ag Medical Health Officer.</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>Nansana Municipality appraised 7 Heads of departments in the financial year 2017/2018 as per the required guideline issued by the MoPS,as seen below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Principal Education Officer was appraised on 19th Jan 2018;</li> <li>2. Principal Treasurer was appraised on 25th March 2018;</li> <li>3. Principal Community development Officer was appraised on 11th July 2018;</li> <li>4. Medical Health Officer was appraised on 20th/Feb/2018;</li> <li>5. Principal Assistant Town Clerk was appraised on 18/ 07/2018;</li> <li>6. Municipal Engineer was appraised on 11th July 2018;</li> <li>7. Senior Internal Auditor was appraised on 11th July 2018;</li> </ol> <p>However, there was no evidence of appraisal for Ag Planner and Production and Marketing 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>There was evidence that the DSC considered all the submissions for recruitment as per the Town Clerk's letter dated 15th June 2017 and 21st November 2017 where all the 19 staff were considered by DSC on 27th November 2017 during the FY 2017/2018.</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>According to the Town Clerk submissions dated 16/01/2017, 15/06/2017 and 21/11/2017 to DSC for confirmation, all the 19 positions were considered as per the DSC meeting held on 7/12/ 2017 DSC Minute 144/2017.</p> <p>For example 15 Education Assistants Grade II were submitted on 15/06/2017 and 21/11/2017 and considered by DSC on 7/12/2017 Minute 144/2017.</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>Three cases were submitted to DSC for disciplinary action during the previous year 2017 /2018 as follows;</p> <p>Two Education Assistants submitted on 7th August 2017by Town Clerk to the DSC under Min33/2018 were considered by DSC on 29/08/2017.</p> <p>However, the Town Agent submitted on 20th October 2017 to the DSC under Min33/2018 was not considered.</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 recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Nansana Municipality recruited 19 staff as per the DSC minute extract Ref CRM 214/6 dated 3rd/ May /2018. They all accessed Payroll within the stipulated two months as verified by their IPPS numbers.</p>	<p>3</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</li> </ul> <p>FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</p>	<p>Out of the 15 Officers that retired during the FY 2017/2018 , only 6 teacher pensioners accessed the 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>The Nansana Municipal Council increased its own source revenue as evidenced by increase of 38.85% ( from UGX 2,807,116,440 as at 30/6/2017 to UGX 3,897,771,828 as at 30/6/2018 in OSR as per Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/18 vote 779.</p> <p>From the Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/18 on page11, The total Local Revenue was UGX2,599,096,740 which was 50% of the vote but the 100% Local Revenue was UGX 3,897,771,828 evidenced by the monthly distribution sheets.</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</li> </ul> <p>+/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</p>	<p>With evidence from final accounts, there was actual Local Revenue of UGX UGX 3,897,771,828 as at 30/6/2018 in OSR compared to UGX 4,684,428,000 budgeted as seen on vote 779 Nansana Municipal Local Government Detailed estimates of Revenue Resulting in 16.79% shortfall of local revenue collected against planned for FY 2017/18.</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 District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nansana Municipal Council remitted UGX 523,861,884 of Local Revenue to LLGs as per sharing statements seen compared to Local Revenue of UGX 2,273,044,501 giving a percentage of 23.046% which is less than the mandatory 50% of Local Revenue to be remitted to LLGs.</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>There was evidence of 13.78% expenditure of OSR on council activities as there was a total of UGX 386,762,831 expenditure on council activities excluding General staff salaries of UGX 28,988,553 in relation to OSR of UGX 2,807,116,440 as at 30/6/2017.</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>There was Procurement officer and Assistant Procurement officer dully appointed on 18th July 2018.</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>There was evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the contract committee for the previous FY. The sampled recommendations were as follows;</p> <p>a) NANS779/WRKS/2017-18/00006 : Project: Construction of classroom block at Bulesa primary school in Busukume Division under education . Contractor: Link Investment Ltd. Submitted on 9th August 2017;</p> <p>b) NANS779/WRKS/2017-18/00003. Project: Construction of staff quarters and 5-stances pit latrine at Kasozi Health center III in Busukuma Division –under Health department. Contractor: Bestie- Hostels Ltd. Submitted on 9th August 2017;</p> <p>c) NANS779/SULPS/2017-18/00014. Project: Supply of one unit of double cabine pickup and accessories to the municipal – administration. Contractor : Toyota Uganda Ltd. Submitted on 22nd February 2018;</p> <p>d) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00010. Project. Renovation of classroom blocks at Tikalu Umea Primary Schools in Gombe Division . Contractor: Net Distributors Telecom services Ltd. Submitted on 25th September 2017 and</p> <p>e) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00004. Project: Construction of two teachers houses- building tomorrow in Gombe division and Kibibi C/S primary school in Busukume Division . Contractor: P &amp; D Traders and contrators Ltd. Submitted on 9th –August -2017.</p>	<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 and provided justification for any deviations as follows;</p> <p>I. NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00006. Contract was signed between Nansana Municipal Council and Link Investments Ltd . Where TEC recommended Link investment Ltd as the best evaluated bidder at the sum of UGX 76,739,412 taxes inclusive and Contract committee held a meeting on 3rd - 10-2017 ,MIN062/CC/004/2017-2018 and approved the same bidder at UGX 76,739,412;</p> <p>II. NANS779/WKS/2017-2018/00003. Contract was signed between Nansana Municipal Council and Bestie Hostel Ltd. TEC recommended Bestie Hostel Ltd as the best evaluated bidder at the sum of UGX 90,639,973 and Contract Committee held meeting on 3rd October 2017 under MIN063/CC/04/2017-2018 and approved the same bidder at UGX 90,639,973;</p> <p>III. NANS779/SUPLS/CC/2017-2018/00014. Contract signed between Nansana Municipal council and Toyota Uganda Ltd , TEC recommended the sum of UGX188,480,535 taxes inclusive and the contract committee held a meeting on 23rd February 2018 MIN0098/CC/007/2017-2018 and approved the same bidder at the sum of UGX 188,480,535;</p> <p>IV. NANS779/WRKS/ 2017-2018/00010. Contract was signed between Nansana Municipal Council and Net Distributors Telecom Ltd. TEC recommended UGX46,541,177 and the contract committee held meeting on 3rd October 2017 under MIN065/CC/004/2017-2018 and approved the same bidder at UGX 46,541,177 and</p> <p>V. NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00004. Contract signed between Nansana Municipal council and P &amp; D Traders and contractors Ltd. TEC recommended UGX147,458,700 and the contract committee approved the same bidder at UGX 147,458,700 tax inclusive</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has a comprehensive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that procurement plans for the current financial year 2018/2019</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>covers infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget consolidated in the procurement plan for works, goods and services and non consultancy services submitted on 14th March 2018 to Treasury , PPDA and Publications. Below are the projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Completion of the existing two classroom block and construction of one class room block at Prince Nsuna Primary school in Gombe division under education Item No 1;</li> <li>2) Construction of two classroom block a Nabinene Primary school item no 11;</li> <li>3) Demolition and construction of two class room block with an office in Butesa C/U primary school item no 12</li> <li>4) Construction of two units of pit latrine of 2-stances each with two washrooms and two plastic water tank of 5000 Liters capacity at Kibibi C/S and BT-Building tomorrow .Item 9</li> <li>5) Construction of 3 classroom block at Kanyande UPE primary school in Maganjo Ward .Item 15</li> </ol> <p>B)</p> <p>From the samples, it is evident that the procurement plan was followed during implementation during the previous 2017/2018</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00006. Construction of classroom block at Bulesa primary school in Busukuma division in the procurement plan 2017/2018 Item no 3 in the education department by contractor Link investments Ltd;</li> <li>2) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00003. Construction of staff quarters and 5-stance pit latrine at kasozi Health Centre III in the procurement plan 2017/2018 item no 10 under Health department. Contractor Bestie Hostels Ltd;</li> <li>3) NANS779/SUPLS/2017-2018/00014. For the supply of one unit double cabine pick up and accessories for administration in procurement plan 2017/2018 Item no 16 , contractor Toyota Uganda Ltd;</li> <li>4) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00010. For the renovation of classroom block at Tikalu Umea Primary School in Gombe in the</li> </ol>
---	--	---

		<p>procurement plan 2017/2018 Item no 10 and</p> <p>5) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/0004. For construction of two teachers houses at Building tomorrow primary school at Gombe division and Kibibi C/S primary school in Situkuma division procurement plan 2017/2018 Item no 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 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 Nansana Municipality prepared bid documents for all investments/infrastructure. Nansana municipality had 50 bid documents to prepare, and 40 bid documents were prepared which represents 80%.</p>	2
<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>Nansana Municipality has an updated contract register that runs from page 1 to page 23 and Item 1 to item 79 as as at 29th /June /2018.</p>	2

The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects):  
score 2.

There was evidence that Nansana Municipality strictly adhered to the procurement thresholds as seen from the sampled files:

Opening bidding

- 1) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00006. Construction of classroom block at Bulesa primary school in Busukuma division in the procurement plan 2017/2018. It was estimated at UGX 76,739,412 and advertised on 13th July 2017 in the New Vision News Paper;
- 2) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00003. Construction of staff quarters and 5-stance pit latrine at kasozi Health Center III in the procurement plan 2017/2018 item no 10 under Health department. It was estimated at UGX 90, 639,973. It was advertised in the New Vision News Paper of 13th July 2017;
- 3) NANS779/SUPLS/2017-2018/00014. For the supply of one unit double cabine pick up and accessories for administration in procurement plan 2017/2018. It was estimated at UGX188,480,535. It was advertised in the New Vision News Paper on 18th January 2018;
- 4) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/0004. For construction of two teachers houses at Building tomorrow primary school at Gombe division and Kibibi C/S primary school in Situkuma division procurement plan 2017/2018. It was estimated at UGX 147,458,700. It was advertised on 13th July 2017 and
- 5) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00010. For the renovation of classroom block at Tikalu Umea Primary School in Gombe in the procurement plan 2017/2018. It was estimated at 46,541,177. Request for quotation was on Friday 25th August 2017.

<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</li> </ul> <p>for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that all works project implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified .Sampled projects with certificates of completion are as follows;</p> <p>1) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00006. Construction of classroom block at Bulesa primary school in Busukuma division in the procurement plan 2017/2018 completion certificate was signed on 28th November 2017 and 17th May 2018;</p> <p>2) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00003. Construction of staff quarters and 5-stance pit latrine at kasozi Health Center III in the procurement plan 2017/2018 . Completion certificate signed on 29th November 2017;</p> <p>4) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00010. For the renovation of classroom block at Tikalu Umea Primary School in Gombe in the procurement plan 2017/2018 Completion certificate signed on 15th February 2018 and</p> <p>5) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/0004. For construction of two teachers houses at Building tomorrow primary school at Gombe division and Kibibi C/S primary school in Situkuma division procurement plan 2017/2018.Completion certificate signed on 14th December 2017.</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>There was no evidence that Nansana Municipality projects are clearly labelled indicating the names of the project, the contractor , sources of funding and expected duration and 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>Nansana Municipal Local Government made bank reconciliation statements for all 12 Months of FY 2017/18 and up to date bank reconciliations are at the time of the assessment( as at 14/9/2018) as per the assessment guidelines.</p>	<p>4</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</li> <li>– no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers as evidenced by No overdue Bills for FY 2017/18 with reference to note 24: Payables on page 30 in Final Accounts.</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>Nansana Municipal Local Government has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor evidenced by personal file no: CRM/0025 Ref No: CRM 10025 and posting Instructions dated 3//01/2017 DSC Min No: 245/2016.</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>Nansana Municipal Local Government produced quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/18 and submitted them for:Quarter 1 on 11/10/2017; Quarter 2 on 15/1/2018; Quarter 3 on 30/4/2018; and Quarter 4 on 01/8/2018.</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 report on information provided to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for financial year 2017/18.</p> <p>There is no LG PAC at Wakiso District Local Government and Nansana Municipal Council uses LG PAC at Wakiso District Local Government which expired in may 2017 and no LG PAC has been constituted to date.</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>	<p>• 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.</p>	<p>Internal audit reports for FY 2017/18 were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, but LG PAC has deliberated only audit issues for backlog of 2016/17 internal audit findings and non for financial year 2017/18 and thus LG PAC has not reviewed FY 2017/18 Internal Audit Findings and hence no follow - up.</p> <p>Nansana Municipal Council uses LG PAC at Wakiso District Local Government which expired in may 2017 and no LG PAC has been constituted to date.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>• 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</p>	<p>Nansana Municipal Council maintains 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>4</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>Nansana Municipal Council 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>Nansana Municipal council Meeting held on 11th may 2017 under Minute 39/CM/16/17 where they discussed service delivery issues</p>	<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>There is no person designated for coordination of response to feed backs in Nansana Municipality</p>	<p>0</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 was no evidence on record, for investigating and responding to grievances</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>Payroll august 2018 and pensioner schedule is Publicized on main notice board at the Headquarter</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>Procurement plan and awarded contracts and amount published on main notice at Muniicpal headquater</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>LG perfomance results and implication published on the main notice board at headquater</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>Circulated on 15th November 2017 to all heads of departments and divisions under Ref: CRM 164/1 and Dissemination of Guidelines for Budget preparation.</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>Nansana Municipal Council held a feed back meeting in Wambale ward Gombe division, held on 14th June 2018 at 3:00pm on Municipal Bye laws</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 the Gender focal person and CDO provided guidance and support to the departments to mainstream gender vulnerability and inclusion. This is evidenced as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender awareness training for the local leaders;</li> <li>Training of parents and children on how to end early marriages;</li> <li>Dissemination of gender materials to the community;</li> <li>Guiding heads of departments on mainstreaming gender in their annual plans and budget and</li> <li>There was evidence of contributions of UGX 5,060,515 from the sector department to support the activities of gender.</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 point person and CDO planned a minimum of two activities to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusion for the financial year 2018/2019 as below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>making survey on local leaders on issues of domestic violence, handling and referring cases;</li> <li>Training on gender mainstreaming to local leaders and women council;</li> <li>Collection and compilation of gender aggregated data in schools and</li> <li>Funding the gender committee activities.</li> </ol> <p>In the previous financial year, there was a budget of 7,800,000 and all the activities were implemented that represents 100%</p>	<p>2</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 Nansana municipality carried out environmental screening carried out , mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for. These were seen as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental screening was done as seen in the reports prepared on 10th July 2017 and</li> <li>2. Inspection report for the proposed waste management collection and sorting site Ggabde Nansana Division.</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 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 Nansana Municipality integrates environmental and social management , health and safety plans in the contract bid documents as seen in the sampled documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00006. Construction of classroom block at Bulesa primary school in Busukuma division in the procurement plan 2017/2018;</li> <li>2) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00003. Construction of staff quarters and 5-stance pit latrine at kasozi Health Center III in the procurement plan 2017/2018;</li> <li>3) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00010. For the renovation of classroom block at Tikalu Umea Primary School in Gombe in the procurement plan 2017/2018 and</li> <li>4) NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00004. For construction of two teachers houses at Building tomorrow primary school at Gombe division and Kibibi C/S primary school in Situkuma division procurement plan 2017/2018.</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 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 evidence that Nansana Municipal implement projects on the land where the municipality has proof of ownership as seen below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plot no 5009, block 203 Municipal Headquarters;</li> <li>2. Plot 510 Block 156 Kavule –Water reservoir;</li> <li>3. Plot 1337 Block 156- Kyadondo;</li> <li>4. Plot 209 block 132-Nabutiti Health Center III and</li> <li>5. Plot 82 Block 71-Tiikalu Health center III</li> <li>6. Plot 78 Block 85 Nase Mok primary School.</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 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 Nansana Municipal council completed projects had environmental and social mitigation certification form signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO .Sampled projects are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00006. Construction of classroom block at Bulesa primary school in Busukuma division in the procurement plan 2017/2018;</li> <li>2. NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00003. Construction of staff quarters and 5-stance pit latrine at kasozi Health Center III in the procurement plan 2017/2018;</li> <li>3. NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00010. For the renovation of classroom block at Tikalu Umea Primary School in Gombe in the procurement plan 2017/2018 and</li> <li>4. NANS779/WRKS/2017-2018/00004. For construction of two teachers houses at Building tomorrow primary school at Gombe division and Kibibi C/S primary school in Situkuma division procurement plan 2017/2018.</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>There was no evidence that contract payment certificated included 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 evidence that Nansana municipality environmental officer and CDO monthly reports had completed checklist, deviations observed with pictures and corrective actions as seen from their reports prepared on 10th July 2017, report on 27th /July/2017 and 31st October 2017.</p>	<p>1</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment 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>	<p>• 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</p>	<p>There was evidence from the performance contract,staff lists and list of schools at the Municipal office that Nansana Municipality budgeted for a Head Teacher in all its 49 schools and minimum of 7 teachers per school (485 teachers) . The total budget provision was 3,379,854,264 Uganda Shillings for the current FY.</p>	4
<p>The LG education de- partment 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>	<p>• 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</p>	<p>From the list of schools and staff list , the municipality 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.</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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision</p> <p>o If 100%: score 6</p> <p>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</p> <p>o If below 80%: score 0</p>	<p>As per the sector annual budget for FY 2018/19 approved on 11/05/018 it is evident that the LG has filled 534/ 542 (98%) teachers on the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision of 3,379,854,264 Uganda shillings .</p>	6

<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>As per the Nansana Municipality staff structure approved by the permanent secretary ministry of local government on 30/08/2017 Ref No.ARC 135/306/01.All the two Inspectors of Schools were substantively appointed as per the following minutes: Katongole Katono Fredrick DSC/190/2018 and Nantege Margret DSC/189/2018.</p>	6
<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>Nansana Municipality Education department submitted a recruitment plan on 21/2/2018 to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of 8 primary teachers .</p>	2
<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>All positions for Inspector of Schools were filled at time of assessment, hence there was no need for the LG to include same in the recruitment plan for FY 2018/19</p>	2
<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>All the 2 Inspectors of Schools were appraised as shown on their files below,</p> <p>Inspector of schools (Katogole Katono Fredrick) was appraised on 18th July 2018.</p> <p>Senior Inspector of Schools (Nantenge Margaret) was appraised on 18th July 2018.</p>	<p>3</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>Ten (10) primary school head teachers sampled were all appraised as can be seen below</p> <p>Head teacher of Kazo C/U Primary School CRM20242 DSC39/2012 was appraised on 25th March 2018</p> <p>Head teacher of Busukuma C/U Primary School CRM20530 DSC04/2008 was appraised on 25th /March/2018</p> <p>Head teacher of Nabinene Primary School CRM20205 DSC105/2014 was appraised on 15th /June/2018</p> <p>Head teacher of Ssanga Primary School CRM20061 DSC106/2014 was appraised on 19th /Jan/2018</p> <p>Head teacher of Ttikalu Umea Primary School CRM20328 DSC 2/ 2008 was appraised on 25th/ March/2018</p> <p>Head teacher of Nansana C/U Primary School CRM20477 DSC107/2014 was appraised on 17th /July.2018</p> <p>Head teacher of Nansana SDA Primary School CRM20396 DSC107/2014 was appraised on 16th /Jan/2018 .</p> <p>Head teacher of Nansana Municipality Primary School CRM20315 DSC04/2008 was appraised on 23rd/Marc/2018</p> <p>Head teacher of Kazo Mixed Primary School CRM20590 DSC37/2012 was appraised on 7th/ May /2018.</p> <p>Head teacher of Jinja Karoli Primary School CRM20418 DSC39/2012 was appraised on 8th/May/2018</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>The LG communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools. As per sampled schools :Nansana SDA:Kazo C.O.U P/S ,Nansana church ,Ggimbo P/S, Buso UMEA, Namulonge P/S had received the MDD Circular, Stop Malaria Guidelines, and the school calendar.</p>	<p>1</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>Nansana Municipality educational department LG held meetings for Head teachers on 12/07/2018 among others explained and sensitized teachers on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education De- partment has effectively inspected all registered primary schools2</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:</li> <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>	<p>Nansana municipality has 49 government aided primary schools and 162 licenced/registered primary schools . The above schools were inspected as follows:</p> <p>Term 3 (2017) 33 government schools were inspected which represents 67% while 109 private licenced /registered schools inspected which represents 67%</p> <p>Term 1(2018)35 government schools were inspected which represents 71% while 100 private licenced /registered schools inspected which represents 61%</p> <p>Term 2(2018)46 government schools were inspected which represents 94% while 99 private licenced /registered schools inspected which represents 61%</p> <p>Therefore the average percentage perfomance is 70%</p>	<p>6</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 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 from Minutes from departmental reports to show that the Education department discussed school inspection reports and used the reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY.</p>	<p>0</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 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 evidence from acknowledgements dated 16/7/018 that the LG Education department submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports as required.</p>	<p>2</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 inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence from the minutes of departmental meetings as well as from sampled schools already mentioned above to show that the inspection recommendations were 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>Lists of schools in the EMIS is 49 schools this is consistent with the information in the 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 for all schools is not consistent with EMIS 19,012 compared PBS.19,320 pupils.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible 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>There was evidence that council committee Meeting held on 1st August 2017 under minute.6/EC/17/18, discussed quarter four performance results and 1st quarter work plan; approval of School Management Committees</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible 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>There was evidence that education sector committee held meeting on 4th may 2018; under minute. Min.6/EC/17/18 discussed Education sector budgets for FY 2018/2019 for council approval</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>Nansana has total of 49 Government aided and 401 private primary schools</p> <p>5 schools sampled;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Busukuma CoU Primary school-EMIS-8289; It had expired SMC and not yet Established and approved;</li> <li>2. Kazo CU primary school -EMIS-008185 had an established and approved SMCs under Minute.6/EC/17/18;</li> </ol> <p>however there was evidence of minutes available for SMCs;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Nabinene Primary school -was established and approved on 19th October 2017; but there was no minutes from SMC's available;</li> <li>4. Ssanga primary school-EMIS 7999; established and approved in minute. 6/EC/17/18 on Ref: CRM305/1</li> </ol> <p>minutes available 3 sets-of SMCs. minute.9/Joint SMC&amp;PTA/10/2017; approval of Sanga budget and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Ttikalu UMEA primary school; established and approved on 19th October 2017 under minute 6/EC/17/18; meeting held on 14th November 2017 minute 14/11/2017 construction and renovations.</li> </ol> <p>Therefore 2 primary schools have SMC's established and were functional and had minutes as required; 2 primary Schools had fully appointed SMCs but had not minutes. 1 primary school had not appointed and approved SMC</p> <p>Hence 2 primary school have established and functional SMC to discuss budget and resource issues which is 40% of the sampled schools</p>	<p>0</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>Nansana Municipality education department on 5/09/2018 publicized on its public notice board all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants for month of September 2018 meant for term 3 2018 .</p>	<p>3</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>The education sector submitted in time the procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on 1/3/2018.</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>Nansana Municipal Council Education department maintains a separate file for payments for Education and all payments were timely certified and recommended as per copy of contracts as per the following sampled contracts: Contract No:Nans779/WRKS/17-18/00006 Construction of a 2 classroom block at Bulesa Primary School by Link Investments for payment requested on 17/5/2018 and paid on 21/6/2018, and Contract No Nans779/WRKS/17-18/00006 Construction of playground of Kazo C/U by Ms Associated construction Co requested on 20/3/2018 and paid on 3/4/2018.</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 department submitted annual performance report for 2017/2018 FY to the Planner on the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1- submitted and received on 15th October 2017;</p> <p>Quarter 2- submitted and received on 15th January 2018;</p> <p>Quarter 3- submitted and received on 15th April 2018 and</p> <p>Quarter 4- submitted and received on 4th July 2018.</p> <p>Hence the department submitted all annual performance report for 2017/2018 to planner by mid-July 2018 for consolidation.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</li> <li>o If sector has no audit query</li> <li>score 4</li> <li>o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2</li> <li>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Nansana Municipal Education Officer (MEO) provided information on Audit queries for Quarter 1, Quarter 2 and Quarter 3 evidenced by Municipal Education Officer's responses dated July 20, 2018 and there were no responses for Quarter 4.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<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</li> </ul> <p>on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</p>	<p>The Municipal education officer held a meeting on 13/06/2018 with senior women teachers and sensitized them about the need to enforce menstrual hygiene as well as maintenance of a clean school environment.</p>	<p>2</p>
<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>Despite the fact that the MEO held a meeting with senior women teachers on 13/06/2018 there is no documentary 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>	<p>0</p>
<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>All SMCs of the sampled schools:Nansana SDA(6 females 7 Males):Kazo C.O.U P/S(4 females 9 males) ,Nansana church P/S (5 female 7 males),Ggimbo P/S (4 females,9 males ), Buso UMEA,(4 female, 9 males) Namulonge P/S(5 females,7 males) meet the gender composition as seen above.</p>	<p>1</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 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 that LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department issued guidelines on environmental management by addressing issues of tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education.</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 documentary evidence from the sampled schools that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines .</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 from the sampled schools that the environmental officer and community development officer visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans were 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>The LG filled 77.5% (145 out of 191) positions.</p>	<p>4</p>
<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/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>A recruitment plan was received by HRM but the date of receipt could not be established since it was direct from flash to the HRM's computer. The incorporated version was availed by the HRM department and had 215 approved positions, 171 filled and 41 vacant ones.</p>	<p>6</p>

<p>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</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100%: score 8</li> <li>o 70 – 99%: score 4</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>All the 5 sampled In-charges were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen on file. They include the following</p> <p>In-charge for Buwambo HC IV CRM No,10185 was appraised on 27th May 2018;</p> <p>In-charge for Nabweru HC I11, CRM No, 10132 was appraised on 16th March 2018;</p> <p>In-charge for Kawanda HCIII CRM, No, 10178, was appraised on 27th November 2017;</p> <p>In-charge for Nansana HCII CRM No, 10153 was appraised on 25th May 2018;</p> <p>In-charge for Nansolo Wamala HCII CRM No. 10128 was appraised on 25th May 2018.</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There were differences between the deployment list and staff list in the budget as reflected below:</p> <p>Matugga HC II:</p> <p>The deployment list at the Municipality had 3 Nursing Assistants yet the budget list had 2.</p> <p>Namulonge HC III:</p> <p>The deployment list at the Municipality had 2 Enrolled Nurses yet only 2 were catered for on the budget list.</p> <p>Maganjo HC II:</p> <p>The budget list had an Enrolled Midwife yet a Nursing Assistant was deployed.</p> <p>Nabweru HC III:</p> <p>Apart from the Laboratory Technician, a Clinical Officer, an Enrolled Midwife and 2 Enrolled Nurses that were not yet recruited, the deployment and budget lists were consistent.</p> <p>Wamala HC II:</p> <p>Apart from the Enrolled Midwife and Health Assistant that were not yet recruited, the two lists were consistent.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</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 communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The MHO received only one of the 3 prioritised guidelines and disseminated it to all the sampled health facilities.</p> <p>This was the guideline titled “Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments FY 2018/19”.</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>There was no record of the MHO’s explanation of policies or guidelines to the health facility In-charges.</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 supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>The MHT supervised Buwambo HC IV (the only one in the Municipality), in all the quarters as per reports for supervisions conducted from; 14th to 23rd September 2017; 26th October to 3rd November 2017; 5th to 14th March 2018; and 20th to 29th June 2018.</p>	<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 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>The MHT ensured 100% supervision of the lower level health facilities. This was reflected from the five sampled health facilities including; Nansana HCII; Tikalu HCII; Nansana HCII; Miggade HCII and Kasozi HCIII that were all supervised in all the four quarters as per reports dated; 27th June 2018 (for third and fourth quarters); 15th March 2018; and 30th November 2017.</p>	3
<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>Discussion of issues in reports and recommending actions were made in all the 4 quarters as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1:</p> <p>Absenteeism, late coming, early departure of health workers at various facilities was reported in the MHT's report for supervision conducted from 14th to 23rd September 2017.</p> <p>The MHT discussed this as reflected in 004/MHT/17/18 of the MHT meeting dated 27th September 2017. A recommendation that the MHO intensifies on spot checks at health facilities was made under Min 005/MHT/17/18 section 5 of the same meeting.</p> <p>Quarter 2:</p> <p>Accumulated medical waste at Nansana HCII was reported in the MHT's report for supervision conducted from 26th October to 3rd November 2017.</p> <p>The MHT discussed this as reflected in Min 004/17/18/NMC of the MHT meeting dated 10th January 2018. A recommendation assigning the MHO to collect the waste was made under Min 005/17/18/NMC of the same meeting.</p> <p>Quarter 3:</p> <p>Chronic absenteeism of health workers was reported in the MHT's report for supervision conducted from 5th -14th March 2018.</p> <p>The MHT discussed this as reflected in Min</p>	4



		<p>NMC.003/04/18 of the MHT meeting dated 27th April 2018. A recommendation to that In-charges issue warning letters to whoever absents him/her without clear reason and permission was made under Min NMC.006/04/18 of the same meeting.</p> <p>Quarter 4:</p> <p>Continued absenteeism was reported in the MHT's report for supervision conducted from 20th to 29th June 2018.</p> <p>The MHT discussed this as reflected in Min NMC.003/07/18 of the MHT meeting dated 6th July 2018. A recommendation assigning the In-charges to caution / warn health workers who absent themselves without permission was made under Min NMC.005/07/18(9) of the same meeting.</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</li> <li>– up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>The LG followed up on recommendations from made based on quarterly supervision reports. For example, a recommendation that the MHO coordinates the collection of medical waste at Nansana HCII was followed up as reflected under minute 004/17/18/NMC of the MHT meeting held on 6th July 2018. Accordingly, the MHO presented a letter he wrote to the Town Clerk dated 17th April 2018 titled "Follow up on the medical waste management at Nansana Health Centre" as evidence of action.</p>	<p>6</p>

<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>o 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 14 health facilities that appeared on the PBS list were also on lists in the HMIS reports submitted.</p>	<p>10</p>
<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>Meeting held on 30th April 2018 under minute.33/HC/17/18 discussed sector budget for FY 2018/2019</p> <p>Meeting held on 19th February 2018 under minute 27/HC/17/18 presented and discussed second quarter performance report 2017/2018 and under minute 28/HC/17/18 discussed third quarter workplan for 2017/2018</p>	<p>2</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 health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nansana Council meeting held on 11th May 2018 under minute 39/CM/16/17 Health sector committee presented budget to council for approval. It includes the construction/renovation of OPD at Ttikalu Health Centre III and construction of 4 unit staff quarters at Kasozi Health centre III</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>The Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) were functional. All the HUMCs of the five sampled health facilities held the four mandatory meetings and four of them discussed budget and resource allocation as reflected below:</p> <p>Buwambo HCIV discussed budget issues in 2 out of the four mandatory quarterly meetings held on; 28th June 2018 (Min 170/HMC/06/2018); 24th May 2018 (Min on reactions); 2nd March 2018 (Min 153/HMC/12/2017); 22nd February 2018; 30th November 2017; and 3rd August 2017.</p> <p>Matugga HCII HUMC held all the four mandatory quarterly meetings and discussed budget issues on the following dates; 12th September 2017 (Page 4 paragraph 1,2,3,4 and 5); 12th October 2017 (Page 2; and Page 4 paragraphs 4 and 5); 29th March 2018 (Page 1 paragraph 3; and page 2 paragraph 2); and 21st June 2018 (Page 1 paragraph 3; Page 2 paragraph).</p> <p>Maganjo HCII HUMC discussed budget issues in all the four mandatory quarterly meetings held on; 28th September 2017 (Page 1 paragraph 4 and Page 2 paragraph 1); 29th December 2017 (No discussion of budgets); 15th March 2018 (Page 1 paragraph 3); and 20th June 2018 (Page 1 paragraph 3; Page 2 paragraph); and 12th October 2017 (Page 2; and Page 4 paragraphs 4 and 5).</p> <p>Nabweru HCIII held all the 4 mandatory meetings and discussed budget and resource allocation issues on the following dates; 27th July 2017 (Min VI); 5th December 2017 (Min 9); 14th March 2018 (Min 3 and 4b); and 14th June 2018 (Min VIII).</p> <p>Kasozi HCIII HUMC held all the 4 mandatory quarterly meetings on the following dates; 29th September 2017; 29th January 2017; 17th April 2018; and 26th June 2018. No discussions of budgets were recorded.</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>Nansana Municipal Council publicised all health facilities that received PHC non-wage recurrent grants. A list of 15 health facilities with PHC non-wage figures for quarter one 2018 was pinned on the main notice board of the administration block dated 11th August 2018.</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>The sector procurement plan was received by the Procurement and Disposal Unit (PDU) on 4th March 2018. It catered for the following 3 projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance of an operational theatre at Buwembo HCIV.</li> <li>Completion of staff quarters at Kasozi HCIII.</li> </ol>	<p>2</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>The PDU received Form PP1 from the health department on 7th July 2017. It covered the construction of a staff quarter and a 5 stances pit latrine at Kasozi HCIII.</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>Nansana Municipal Local Government Health department maintains a separate file for payments for Health and all payments were timely certified and recommended as per copy of contracts as per the following sampled contract: Contract No:Nans779/WRKS/17-18/00003 Construction of staff quarters at Kasozi HC payment requested on 27/11/2017 and paid on 08/12/2017.</p>	<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 submitted annual performance report to the planner for consolidation</p> <p>Quarter 1- submitted and received on 11th October 2017</p> <p>Quarter 2- Submitted and received on 13th January 2018</p> <p>Quarter 3- Submitted and received on 8th May 2018 and</p> <p>Quarter 4- Submitted and received on 16th July 2018</p> <p>Hence the last quarter 4 was submitted later than 15th July</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>Nansana Municipal Health Officer (MHO) did not provide information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year 2017/2018 evidenced by only Health sector responses dated March 29, 2018 for Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 but with no responses for Quarter 3 &amp; Quarter 4.</p>	<p>0</p>

Social and environmental safeguards			
<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>All the five sampled health facilities met the 30% gender requirement as shown below:</p> <p>Kasozi HCIII HUMC at 40% (4 females out of 10 members)</p> <p>Buwambo HCIV HUMC at 30% (3 females out of 10 members).</p> <p>Matugga HCII at 50% (3 females out of 6 members).</p> <p>Maganjo HCII HUMC at 57% (4 females out of 7 members).</p> <p>Nabweru HCIII HUMC at 43% (3 females out of 7 members).</p>	<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>Sanitation guideline from the MHO was in Maganjo HCII out of all 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>The Acting Environment Officer did not use the checklist provided in the budget guidelines to screen projects. The following projects were screened as reflected in the report dated September 2017.</p> <p>The report was titled “Environmental Screening Report for Nansana Municipality Development projects for FY 2017/18”. This was signed by the Acting Environment Officer.</p> <p>Inspection was conducted by the Acting Environment Officer and Senior Community Development Officer screened projects as reflected in reports dated 5th July 2018. This was signed by the Acting Environment Officer.</p> <p>Inspection was further highlighted in another report dated 11th July 2018 and titled “Report on Social and Environmental Safe Guards for projects held implemented under the health department for FY 2017/18” This was signed by the Senior Community Development Officer.</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>Inspection was conducted by the Acting Environment Officer and Senior Community Development Officer screened projects as reflected in reports dated 5th July 2018. This was signed by the Acting Environment Officer.</p> <p>Inception was further highlighted in another report dated 11th July 2018 and titled “Report on Social and Environmental Safe Guards for projects held implemented under the health department for FY 2017/18” This was signed by the Senior Community Development Officer.</p>	<p>2</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>Guidelines / charts on medical waste management found at 2 out of the 5 sampled facilities including Buwambo HCIV and Nabweru HCIII.</p> <p>Kasozi HCIII, Maganjo HCII and Matugga HCII did not have the guidelines / charts.</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>	Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC	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: Score 15</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>	Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC	0
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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</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 water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</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 contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</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 DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Nansana Municipal Local Government Water is under National Water and Sewerage Corporation</p>	<p>0</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>Nansana Municipality has no Water department, instead its water needs are handled by National Water and Sewerage Corporation</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> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Water is under National Water and Sewerage Corporation</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</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 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>Nansana Municipality has no Water department, instead its water needs are handled by National Water and Sewerage Cooperation</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>Nansana Municipality has no Water department, instead its water needs are handled by National Water and Sewerage Cooperation</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>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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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 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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</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>Not Applicable, Municipal water is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/ 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>Not Applicable, Municipal water and sanitation under NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>