



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Nakaseke District

(Vote Code: 569)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Accountability Requirements	33%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	59%
Educational Performance Measures	43%
Health Performance Measures	40%
Water Performance Measures	56%

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>Nakaseke LG Submitted performance contract submitted on 9th /August/2018 to Ministry of Finance and Economic development.</p>	No
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke LG submitted a budget that include a procurement plan report for the forthcoming FY later than 30th June 2018 as required by LG PPDA regulations 2006.</p>	No
Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke District Local Government submitted annual Performance report for the coming Financial Year 2018/2019 as follows:</p> <p>.Quarter-4 on 9th August 2018</p> <p>. Quarter-3 on 23rd May 2018;</p> <p>.Quarter 2 on 26th March 2018 and</p> <p>. Quarter 1 on 25th January 2018</p> <p>Late Submission of Quarter 4.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/ inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available).</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>LG submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015) on following date:</p> <p>.Quarter -1 submitted on 25th January 2018;</p> <p>.Quarter -2 submitted on 26th March 2018;</p> <p>Quarter-3 : NO evidence of submission</p> <p>. Quarter-4 submitted on 9th August 2018.</p> <p>Late submission to MoFPED</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General’s findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all find- ings where the Internal Audi- tor 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>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</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>Nakaseke District Local Government had an unqualified audit opinion as per Auditor General's Report for FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></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>Nakaseke LG has a functional physical Planning Committee in place comprised of 11 members; meeting held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. 19th October 2017 at district board room in Minute 05/ DPPC/17-18 FY where they discussed guidelines from MoLHUD; and development applications;</li> <li>. on 6th march 2018 at district headquarters, 21 members presented Kapeeka structure plan and master plan.</li> </ul>	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>Nakaseke Physical Planning Committee did NOT submit the required 4 sets of minutes to MoLHUD.</p>	0

<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>Nakaseke LG has no Approved Physical Development plan</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke LG has no Action plans prepared in the previous FY</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The investment activities in the AWP for current FY 2018/2019 are based on the Budget conference. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling of 11 deep borehole in selected sub counties and parishes in Nakaseke district;</li> <li>2. Construction of Butalangu Health Centre III including Maternity ward, general ward OPD and staff house 5 stance VIP and placenta pit;</li> <li>3. Construction of Kinoni HC III including Maternity ward, general ward OPD and staff house 5 stance VIP and placenta pit;</li> <li>4. Construction of 2 classroom block at Kibose Primary school in Kikamulo sub county with 4 stance VIP latrine;</li> <li>5. Construction of 2 classroom block at Lujjumbi primary school in Ngoma sub county;</li> <li>6. Construction of 2 classroom block at Kyetume Tokiika p/s in Kasamgombe sub county;</li> <li>7. Construction of 4 stance latrine at Kizibba Primary school, Nakaseke sub county, and</li> <li>8. Construction 4 stance at Lumpewwe primary school at Kikamulo sub county</li> </ol>
--	--	--

<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 are based on Approved AWP for current FY Min. 41/NDC/16-17. They were derived from approved 5-year development plan for Nakaseke district 2015/16-2019/20; approved under Min. 37(c)/NDC/2014/2015 on 23rd /April/2015.</p> <p>They were also based on updated District Development Plan 2018/2019-2022/23 under Min.46/NDG/17-18 held on 24th /05/2018.</p>	1
<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>Project profiles for investments were discussed by TPC and adhered to in the LG planning Guidelines. These project discussed include:</p> <p>.Construction of Butalangu Helath Centre III including Maternity ward, general ward OPD and staff house 5 stance VIP and placenta pit; source of funding by Primary Health Care fund at UGx 500,000,000/=;</p> <p>. Construction of Kinoni HC III including Maternity ward, general ward OPD and staff house 5 stance VIP and placenta pit; source of funding is Primary Health Care fund at UGx 500,000,000/=.</p>	2



<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>There was NO annual Statistical Abstract with disaggregated data compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The infrastructure Projects Implemented were derived from the annual work plan of the previous financial year 2017/2018 and approved budget by Nakaseke LG council. They include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of one 2 classroom block at Ngoma C/U P/S in Ngoma TC, budgeted at UGx 58,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 56,645,000/= completed on 28th April 2018;</li> <li>Roofing of Wakayamba P/S in Kikamulo S/C, budgeted at UGx 14,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 13,740,031/= completed on 18th March 2018;</li> <li>Construction of one 2 classroom block at Mpunge P/S in Semuto S/C, budgeted at UGx 58,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 55,681,993/= completed on 9th May 2018;</li> <li>Construction of one 4-stance VIP Pit latrine at Magoma R/C P/S, Budgeted at UGx 16,500,000/= and actual spent at UGx 17,000,000/= completed on 20th April 2018;</li> <li>Construction of S/C Administration block &amp; 2 stance Drainable latrine, Budgeted at UGx 123,908,614/= and actual spent at UGx 91,016,822/= completed on 9th May 2018;</li> <li>Construction of cattle loading site (Phase 1) at Kinyogoga S/C, Budgeted at UGx 25,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 23,923,231/= completed on 12th June 2018;</li> <li>Chain link fencing of Semuto HC IV (Phase 3), Budgeted at UGx 34,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 33,471,650/= completed on 12th June 2018;</li> <li>Renovation of Administration block, Budgeted at UGx 34,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 33,906,681/= completed on 12th June 2018; and</li> <li>Construction of a Slaughter Slab in Kinyogoga Sub-county, Budgeted at UGx 13,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 12,900,000/= completed on 19th May 2018.</li> </ol>	
---	--	--	--

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY.</li> <li>o 100%: score 4</li> <li>o 80-99%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that all investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per the workplan by end of FY. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of one 2 classroom block at Ngoma C/U P/S in Ngoma TC, completed on 28th April 2018;</li> <li>2. Roofing of Wakayamba P/S in Kikamulo S/C, completed on 18th March 2018;</li> <li>3. Construction of one 2 classroom block at Mpunge P/S in Semuto S/C, completed on 9th May 2018;</li> <li>4. Construction of one 4-stance VIP Pit latrine at Magoma R/C P/S, completed on 20th April 2018;</li> <li>5. Construction of S/C Administration block &amp; 2 stance Drainable latrine, completed on 9th May 2018;</li> <li>6. Construction of cattle loading site (Phase 1) at Kinyogoga S/C, completed on 12th June 2018;</li> <li>7. Chain link fencing of Semuto HC IV (Phase 3), completed on 12th June 2018;</li> <li>8. Renovation of Administration block, completed on 12th June 2018; and</li> <li>10. Construction of a Slaughter Slab in Kinyogoga Sub-county, completed on 19th May 2018.</li> </ol>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that all the Investment Projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 were completed within the approved budget-max. 15% plus or minus of the original budget. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of one 2 classroom block at Ngoma C/U P/S in Ngoma TC, budgeted at UGx 58,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 56,645,000/= completed on 28th April 2018, that's 97.7%;</li> <li>2. Roofing of Wakayamba P/S in Kikamulo S/C, budgeted at UGx 14,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 13,740,031/= completed on 18th March 2018, that's 98.14%;</li> <li>3. Construction of one 2 classroom block at Mpunge P/S in Semuto S/C, budgeted at UGx 58,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 55,681,993/= completed on 9th May 2018, that's 96.0%;</li> <li>4. Construction of one 4-stance VIP Pit latrine at</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>

		<p>Magoma R/C P/S, Budgeted at UGx 16,500,000/= and actual spent at UGx 17,000,000/= completed on 20th April 2018, that's 103.0%;</p> <p>5. Construction of cattle loading site (Phase 1) at Kinyogoga S/C, Budgeted at UGx 25,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 23,923,231/= completed on 12th June 2018, that's 99.2%;</p> <p>6. Chain link fencing of Semuto HC IV (Phase 3), Budgeted at UGx 34,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 33,471,650/= completed on 12th June 2018, that's 98.5%;</p> <p>7. Renovation of Administration block, Budgeted at UGx 34,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 33,906,681/= completed on 12th June 2018, that's 99.73%;</p> <p>8. Gravelling of 7 km along Kiwoko-Kasambya road (23 km) , Budgeted at UGx 29,564,600 /= and actual spent at UGx 29,564,600 /= completed on 30th June 2018, that's 100%;</p> <p>9. Gravelling of 11 km Namilali-Katalekamese road (19.8 km) , Budgeted at UGx 33,006,725 /= and actual spent at UGx 33,006,725 /= completed on 12th June 2018, that's 100%; and</p> <p>10. Construction of a Slaughter Slab in Kinyogoga Sub-county, Budgeted at UGx 13,000,000/= and actual spent at UGx 12,900,000/= completed on 19th May 2018, that's 99.23%.</p>	
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Nakaseke LG Budgeted and spent atleast 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in 2017/2018. These infrastructure projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Facelifting of Main Administration Building at UGx 10,000,000/= in FY 2017/2018 and spent UGx 10,000,000/ as of Voucher No: Nake LPO_No 0000774; this represents 100% expenditure of the Budget; and</li> <li>. Renovation of Administration block, Budgeted at UGx 34,000,000/= spent at UGx 33,906,681/= that's 99.73%;</li> </ul> <p>Hence Nakaseke LG spent 99.86% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in FY 2017/2018.</p>	2
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>Out of Twelve [ 12] heads of departments, only 6 were filled substantively for FY 2018/2019 and six are in acting capacity .The substantive include the following ;</p> <p>The District Education Officer CR D 11750 was appointed on 1st September 2015</p> <p>The Natural Resource Officer , on CRD 11226 , DSC, No 24/2008/[c] was appointed on</p> <p>The Community Development Officer CRD12/12197 was appointed on 11th December 2008</p> <p>The District Engineer DSC, No 52/2018 was appointed on 5th May 2007.</p> <p>The Principal Procurement Officer CRD 11494,was appointed on 15th March 2007.</p> <p>The chief finance officer CR/D/10014 was appointed on 1 September2005</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>All heads of departments were appraised as follows ;</p> <p>Production and Marketing officer CR /D/1010081 was appraised on 29th June 2017;</p> <p>The District Planner CR/D/10067 was appraised on 1st February 2018;</p> <p>The District Education officer { DEO} ,CR/D/10036 was appraised on 1st September 2017;</p> <p>The District Engineer C /R/D/10042 was appraised on 10th May 2018;</p> <p>The District Health Officer was appraised 10th January 2018;</p> <p>Chief Finance Officer was appraised on 1st September 2017;</p> <p>The Principal Internal Auditor was appraised on 11th June 2018;</p> <p>The Procurement officer was appraised on 2nd March 2018;</p> <p>How ever , only 5 out 10 were appraised for the FY 2017/2018 .</p> <p>The principle Human resource was appraised on 8th June 2018;</p> <p>The deputy CAO was appraised on 12 June 2018;</p> <p>How ever , only 5 out of 10 were appraised for the FY 2017/2018 .</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>The CAO submitted seventy two staff for recruitment on 2nd October 2017 to the DSC for financial year 2017/ 2018.</p> <p>These were all considered by the District Service Commission on 13th October 2017 under minute DSC/NSK/101/2017 (2)</p> <p>For example Musanje Geoffrey a pharmacist DSC /NSK/ 36/ 2018 , Nakatude Maria scholar Nursing officer DSC/ NSK/36/2018 .</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>DSC held a meeting on 9th February 2018, as per minute DSC Min /NSK /37/2018 and confirmed all the 23 staff submitted by the CAO on 12/ 02/ 2018 to SC /NSK/159 shows that all the 23 staff were confirmed. these include s ;</p> <p>For example</p> <p>The senior clinical officer ,CR/D/ 10992 on DSC/NSK/37/2018 , The psychiatric Nursing officer CR/D/ 10704 on DSC/NSK/37/2018 ,</p>	<p>1</p>
---	---	---	----------

The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.

• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1

Nakaseke District LG section meeting held on 24/01/2018 showed that some cases were referred to the DSC and the DSC considered all the cases(100%) as follows;

Clinical officer under took unauthorized study leave and he was cautioned on 15/5/2018 under DSC Min DSC/NSK/42/2018/[2][1]

Clinical Officer under took unauthorized study leave and he was cautioned on 15/5/2018 and granted for the remaining 1 and 1/12 year study leave on DSC/NSK/43/2018[1] [1].

District Health Officer was terminated under Min DSC/NSK/73/2017[1] on 19/01/2018 for irregular appointment in service.

A senior Education Assistant , mismanaged UPE fund and selling the government property , his interdiction was up lifted on 15/5/2018 under DSC Min ,/NSK/43/2018/[3](1)

A principal Human Resource Officer was accused of irregular attendance to the duty and his interdiction was noted on 15/05/2018 under Min DSC/NSK/43/2018/[1][1] .



<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>Forty four [ 44 ] positions recruited during FY 2017/2018 accessed the payroll within two month as verified against their IPPS numbers as below;</p> <p>IPPS,1018670 for Lugemwa Joel was appointed on 1st February 2018 and accessed payroll on 3rd May 2018</p> <p>IPPS 1018461 for Nanteza stella was appointed on 1st February 2018 and accessed payroll on 3rd May 2018</p> <p>IPPS, 10118412 for Ssendagi Ibra was appointed on 1st February 2018 and accessed payroll on 3rd May 2018</p> <p>IPPS,1018666,for Kanakulya was appointed on 1st February 2018 and accessed payroll on 3rd May 2018</p> <p>10184444 for Serubiri John and these were porters appointed on 1st February and accessed payroll on 3rd May 2018</p> <p>IPPS, 871921 for Dr Ocen Moses was appointed on 1st February 2018 and accessed payroll May 2018</p> <p>IPPS,821470 for Dr Nabette Violet was appointed on 1st February 2018 and accessed payroll on 3rd May 2018</p> <p>IPPS,837384 for Kaweesa Moses was appointed on 1st February 2018 and accessed payroll on 3rd May 2018</p> <p>.IPPS,1018657 .Askers like Namiyingo Jennipher was appointed on 1st February 2018 and accessed payroll 3rd May 2018.</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 FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Out of Eight { 8 }retired officers for the previous FY, only 2 accessed pension pay roll within two months. The reason was that they did not have the national ID , and the work load in the ministry of public service .</p>	<p>0</p>

Revenue Mobilization			
<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>Nakaseke District Local Government Decreased OSR from UGX 825,502,546 as at 30/6/2017 for FY 2016/17 to UGX 768,079,120 as at 30/6/2018 as per Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/18 vote 569.</p> <p>The Decrease in OSR was UGX 51,423,426.</p> <p>OSR for FY 2016/2017 being UGX 825,502,546.</p> <p>Then OSR decreased by 6.96%.</p>	0
<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The Local Revenue Budgeted for FY 2017/2018 was UGX 978,760,099 (As per original budget for FY 2017/2018 Vote 569)</p> <p>The Local Revenue collected during FY 2017/2018 was UGX 768,079,120 as seen from the Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Workings:UGX 768,079,120 / UGX 978,760,099 x 100= 78%.</p> <p>Therefore budget realization/ratio was: 100% - 78%= 22%.</p> <p>The budget realization shortfall was 22% of what had been planned in the original budget for FY 2017/2018.</p>	0
<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>This was no complete evidence of transfer of 65% mandatory remittances of Local Revenue to LLGs except some references to payment vouchers for remittances to LLGs of UGX 46,766,641 for Local Service Tax out of the Total Local service tax of UGX 75,467,625</p>	0

<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>Evidenced by a 14.58% expenditure of OSR on council activities as there was a total of UGX 120,347,000 expenditure on council activities excluding General staff salaries of UGX 9,432,200 in relation to OSR of UGX 825,502,546 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>Nakaseke LG had senior Procurement officer and Procurement officer dully appointed on 1st August 2008.</p>	<p>2</p>

The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

• Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1

There was evidence that Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) produced and submitted the following contracts to the contract committee for the previous FY:

1. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00001, Contractor: KLR(U) Project: Drilling of boreholes in six sub-counties: Submitted on 17th –July-2017 to the contract committee;

2. Contract No: NAKA569/SRVCS/17-18/00001 Project Consultancy, Design and supervision of six boreholes: Contractor: FELS Consultant Ltd.Submitted on 17th July 2017 to the contract committee;

3. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00017.Project: Construction of two classroom blocks under SFG at Ngoma Town council; Contractor: Abazuwa Construction Company Ltd. Submitted on 15th October 2017 to the contract committee;

4. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00018. Project: Construction of Mpunge Primary School in Semuto Sub-county. Contractor: Rio –SR Investment Ltd. Submitted on 15th October 2017 and

5. Contract No: NAKA569/SPLS/17-18/00001. Project: supply of borehole spare parts. Contractor: Paroz company Ltd. Submitted on 17th July 2017 to the contractor committee.

The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

• Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1

There was evidence that the contract committee considered the recommendation of the TEC as seen in the following:

1. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00001. Project: Drilling of boreholes in six sub-counties: Submitted on 17th –July-2017 to the contract committee as the best evaluated bidder at the Contract Sum of UGX125,510,000 to the contract committee and contract committee approved on 8th August 2017 KLR(U) Ltd and awarded contract at UGX125,510,000;

2. Contract No: NAKA569/SRVCS/17-18/00001: Project Consultancy, Design and supervision of six boreholes: The TEC recommended FELS Consultant Ltd as the best evaluated bidder at UGX15, 167,801: Submitted on 17th July 2017 to the contract committee who approved FELS consultant Ltd on 8th –August 2018 as the best evaluated and awarded the contract at UGX15,167,801;

3. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00017. Project: Construction of two classroom blocks under SFG at Ngoma Town council; The TEC recommended Contractor: Abazuwa Construction Company Ltd as the best evaluated bidder at the Contract Sum: UGX 56,654,000 and submitted on 15th October 2017 to the contract committee and the Contract committee approved and award Abazua Construction company ltd as the best evaluated on 13th November 2017 at the contract sum of UGX56,654,000;

4. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00018. Project: Construction of Mpunge Primary School in Semuto Sub-county. The TEC recommended Contractor: Rio –SR Investment Ltd as the best evaluated bidder at the Contract Sum: 55,681,993 and submitted on 15th October 2017 and the contract committee approved Rio -SR Investments ltd as the best evaluated bidder on 13th November 2017 and awarded the contract at the UGX 55,681,993 and

5. Contract No: NAKA569/SPLS/17-18/00001. Project: supply of borehole spare parts. Contract Sum: 19,337,840. The TEC recommended Paroz Company Ltd as the best evaluated Contractor at UGX19,337,840 submitted on 17th July 2017 to the contract Committee , the contract committee approved and awarded to Paroz Company on 8th August 2017 at UGX 19,337,840.

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

• a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for

the previous FY: score 2

There was evidence that the the current procurement and disposal plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects. Examples include:

1. Drilling of 6 boreholes item number 1 on works;
2. Installation of HDPE of 10,000lters rain water harvesting tanks at Nyakatongo Primary School Item 3
3. Drilling of 3 boreholes Item 2 on works;
4. Construction of 4 stance communal VIP latrine at Semuto sub-county and
5. Construction of two classroom blocks at Kyetume Kasangombe;

b) Evidence that the LG has made procurements of the previous year as planned

1. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00001 seen where contract was signed between Nakaseke LG and KLR(U) to drill boreholes six sub-counties. This was Item No 142 in the procurement plan 2017/2018;
2. Contract No: NAKA569/SRVCS/17-18/00001 seen where contract was signed between Nakaseke LG and FELS Consultant Ltd to design and supervision of six boreholes: This was item 12 in the procurement plans for 2017/2018;
3. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00017 seen where Nakaseke LG signed contract with Abazuwa construction company Ltd to construct two classroom blocks under SFG at Ngoma Town council. This was Item No 159 in the Procurement plan 2017/2018;
4. Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00018 seen where contract was signed between Nakaseke LG and Rio -SR for the Construction of Mpunge Primary School in Semuto Sub-county. This was Item No 160 in the procurement plan of 2017/2018 and
5. Contract No: NAKA569/SPLS/17-18/00001 seen where contract was signed between Nakaseke LG and Paroz for the supply of borehole spare parts . This was Item No 1 in the procurement plan of 2017/2018.

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke had 40 bid documents , 18 prepared ranging from NAKA 0001-18 due to delay in budget approval</p> <p>This represents only 45% .</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke LG has an updated contract register and procurement activity files.</p>	<p>2</p>

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 Nakaseke LG strictly adhered to the procurement thresholds as seen from the sampled projects.

Opening bidding

1. NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00001. Drilling of six boreholes in six location in the District by Contractor KLR(U) , it was advertised on 11-May-2017 in the New Vision News Paper;

2. NAKA569/SRVCS/17-18/00001. Consultancy, design and supervision. It was advertised on 11-May-2017 in the New vision Newspaper;

3. NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00017. Construction of two classroom blocks under SFG at Ngoma Primary School by contractor Abazuwa construction Company Ltd. It was advertised on 7th –September 2017 in the New Vision News Paper;

4. NAKA569/SPLS/17-18/00001. Project: Supply of boreholes spare parts. Contractor: Paroz Company Ltd. Contract Sum: UGX 19,337,840, it was advertised on 11th May 2017 in the New Vision News Paper and

5. NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00018. Project: Construction of Mpunge Primary School in Semuto Sub-county, Contractor: Rion-SR Investment Ltd contract sum: UGX 55,681,993 It was advertised in the New Vision News Paper on 7th –September 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 Nakaseke LG works projects for the previous FY were appropriately certified with Completion certificates as seen from the sampled files:</p> <p>Certificates of completion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00001. Drilling of six boreholes by Contractor KLR(U). Certificated issued on 11th –January -2018;</li> <li>Contract No: NAKA569/SRVCS/17-18/00001. Consultancy, Design and Supervision of six boreholes by Contractor FELS Consultant Ltd. Certificate was issued on 11th –Jan-2018;</li> <li>Contract No: NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00017. Construction of two-classroom block under SFG at Ngoma Primary School in Ngoma Town Council by contractor Abazuwa Construction Company ltd. It was advertised in the New Vision News Paper on 16th March 2018;</li> <li>Contract No: NAKA569/SPLS/17-18/00001. Supply of borehole spare parts by Contractor: Paroz Company Ltd. It was advertised on 2nd march 2018 and</li> <li>Contract No NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00018. Construction of Mpunge Primary School in Semuto Sub-county by contractor Rio –SR Investments Ltd. It was advertised on 5th April 2018 in the New Vision News Paper</li> </ol>	<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>The projects were clearly labelled on site boards indicating the names of the project, contractor source of funding but no contract value.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			

<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was completely no bank reconciliation statements prepared for the Months of July and August 2018 hence no bank reconciliations are up to-date at the time of the assessment (as at 10/9/2018) as per the assessment guidelines</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke District Local Government timely paid suppliers during the for FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Sampled payments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00018 Construction of a 2 classrom block at Mpunge Primary School by Rio SR Investments Voucher No. ED00289 where payment was requested on 5/3/2018 and paid on 12/4/2018;</li> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00017 Construction of a 2 classrom block at Ngoma Primary School by Rio SR Investments Voucher No. ED00288 by Abaziwa Construction Co where payment was requested on 7/3/2018 and paid on 9/4/2018;</li> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00004 Fencing of Semuto Health Centre by Acutus Services Limited Voucher No. HE 00141 where payment was requested on 29/5/2018 and paid on 25/6/2018;</li> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00001 Drilling of 3 Boreholes in selected sites where payment was requested on 6/12/2017 and paid on 19/12/2017;</li> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00003 Construction of VIP Latrines at Bwanga Market where payment was requested on 11/10/2017 and paid on 24/11/2017;</li> </ul>	<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>Nakaseke Distict Local Government has NO substantive Senior Internal Auditor</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke Disrict Local Government produced quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/18 and submitted for:Quarter 1 on 22/10/2017, Quarter 2 on 15/3/2018, Quarter 3 on 18/5/2018 and Quarter 4 on 20/8/2018.</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 specific 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>The LG PAC Meetings held deliberated Audit issues for backlog of 2016/17 and previous Financial years and Not specifically internal audit findings for financial year 2017/18.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Internal Audit Reports for FY 2017/18 were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, BUT LG PAC has held meeting to deliberate audit issues for backlog of 2016/17 and previous Financial years and Not specifically internal audit findings for financial year 2017/18 and thus LG PAC has not reviewed FY 2017/18 Internal Audit Findings and hence no followed-up.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke District Local Government 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>Nakaseke District Local Government had an unqualified audit opinion as per Auditor General's Report for FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Nakaseke District council Met and discussed service delivery issues as per the minutes seen and verified where they discussed reports among others issues, in the following minutes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Min. 41/NDC/16-17 FY :(4(1) Second quarter District Service Commission (DSC) report, 2016/17 FY, which sat on 25th May,2017;</li> <li>Min.45/NDC/17-18FY: b( c) 1 District Service Commission (DSC) report for 2nd Quarter 2017/18 FY which sat on 24th May,2018;</li> <li>Min.II/NDC/17-18FY:b ( 3 ): Tabling of statutory bodies reports: District Public Accounts (DPAC) [quarter 3 &amp; 4 2016/17 FY] District Service Commission (DSC) (quarter 1 2017/2018 FY and District Land Board (DLB) (annual 2016/17 FY which sat on 26th October 2017; and</li> <li>Min.32/NDC/17-18 FY: Consideration of standing committees reports( Observation &amp; recommendations on District state of Affairs Address as at 21st December,2017,Departmental 2nd Quarter performance reports 2018/19 FY and updated 5 year development plan, 2016/17-2020/21 FY sat on 27th February 2018.</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke DLG designated Senior Labour Officer Mr. Mubeezi Richard on 29th /April/2013 Ref: CR/D/10598 person to coordinate responses to feedback (grievances/complaints)</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>No specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances thats displayed at LG offices and publically available</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG payroll was Not Publicised on any Notice boards</p> <p>No Pensioners schedule were pinned up on Main Noticeboard and on all other Notice boards</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The procurement plan and awarded contracts was never published on the notice board</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no Evidence of LG assessment results and implications published for Previous financial Year 2017/2018</p>	<p>0</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>Nakaseke DLG Circulated and explained guidelines for Utilization of DDEG fund 2017/2018</p> <p>Letter Ref: FIN/11/12/01 on 23rd /Feb/2018 to all Heads of Departments and Lower Local Governments</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>No discussions with public to provide feedbacks on stutas of activity implemtation</p>	<p>0</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 no evidence that Nakaseke LG Gender focal person and CDO provided guidance and support sector departments to mainstream gender.</p>	<p>0</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>The gender focal person planned two activities for the current financial year, however in the previous financial year a budget of five hundred thousand was not implemented.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of environmental screening of projects, plans and mitigation measures were budgeted and planned for, these include,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of classroom blocks, staff rooms and latrines at 5 primary schools in 5-subcounties in Nakaseke District under Global Partnerships for education in 2017/2018;</li> <li>Construction of OPD section at Diddabigya Health Center III under PHC 2017/2018;</li> <li>Construction of medical storage facility at Butalangu Nakaseke District Headquarter;</li> <li>Drilling of 10 deep boreholes in selected sub-counties and parishes in Nakaseke District 2017/2018. All the screening certificates were signed on 28th February 2018 and</li> <li>Construction of office block at Kikoni Sub County in Nakaseke District. NAKA569/WRKS/17-18/00035.</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 LG Integration of environment and social management and health safety plans in the contract bids as verified by the following projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of hand pump platform and engraving;</li> <li>Water quality testing and analysis;</li> <li>Site cleaning;</li> <li>Surveying and siting;</li> <li>Mobilization of personnel equipment for protection and</li> <li>Building of temporary facilities at the site like latrines Insurance of workers and plans against damage to persons and property.</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>Nakaseke LG projects are implemented where LG has proof of ownership for examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidabugya Health Center III block No 379 plot no 29.</li> <li>District Land at Bulemeezi Block No 794 Plot 49 and 75</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 all completed projects had environmental and social mitigation certification form completed and signed by Sekagya Moses as per the report dated 20th July 2018.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that contract payment certificated were seen for the schools built by world bank.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1</li> </ul>	<p>CERTIFICATION</p> <p>There was evidence that Environmental Officer and CDO monthly report included completed checklist, deviations observed with pictures and corrective actions taken. This was verified in schools built by World bank.</p>	<p>1</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>From the performance contract, List of schools and staff Lists obtained from the DEO's office, it is evident that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY with a budget provision on 5,583,044,264.</p>	4
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Nakaseke LG education department deployed a head teacher per school however, the following schools were found having less than seven teachers: Nyakalongo P/S (5 teachers):Bwami buwome ( 06 ):Gomero P/s (04 ) and Kiranda primary school (4 teachers).</p>	0
<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100%: score 6</li> <li>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</li> <li>o If below 80%: score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke LG currently has 932 teachers (94%) out of the approved structure of 987 teachers with a wage provision of 5,583,044,264.</p>	3

<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>As per the approved Nakaseke LG staff structure dated 26/09/2017, It is evident that all the three inspectors of schools were appointed as per the following minutes :Katamba Kayungirizi Min/146/2005 (15) :Galiwango Annet Min/94/2008/(0) (9) and Kalema kayemba Yahaya Min/94/2008 (0) (1) .</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary Teachers: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that on 6/09/2018 the DEO submitted a recruitment plan of 55 teachers to the HRM for the current FY.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>According to the approved staff structure for the current FY there is no vacant position of school inspectors.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Monitoring and Inspection</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% school inspectors: score</li> </ul> <p>3</p>	<p>Three [ 3] Inspectors of Schools were appraised during the FY 2017 / 2018. as per the evidence seen on personal file, these inspectors were as follows ;</p> <p>Mrs. Galiwango Annet was appraised on 17 April 2018</p> <p>Mr. Katamba Kayungirinzi was appraised on 3rd May 2018</p> <p>Kalema Kayemba Yahaya was appraised on 9th May 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>Four head teachers out of (10 ) sampled in Nakaseke were appraised for the FY 2017/2018 as evidenced by files number CRD and the school attached to;</p> <p>The Head Teacher of Kirinya (CR/D/30040)was appraised on 3rd May 2018,</p> <p>The Head Teacher of Kalole Christine (CR/D/30089) was appraised on 2nd April 2018,</p> <p>The Head Teacher Bukuuku Ddegeya (CR/D/30711) was appraised on 9th February 2018,</p> <p>The Head Teacher St Kizito Kijaguzo (CR/D/30321) was appraised on 13th March 2018,</p> <p>How ever six teacher were appraised before the end of the year as below ;</p> <p>The head Teacher of St kizito Kasambya (CR/d/30129) was appraised on 6th June 2017</p> <p>The Head Teacher of Bukuuku Hidayat (CR/D/301901) was appraised 19th September 2017,</p> <p>The Head Teacher of Lukyamu R/c (CR/D/30229) was appraised on 7th September 2017,</p> <p>The Head Teacher of Nvunamwa C/U (CR/D/30693) was appraised on 4th October 2017,</p> <p>The Head Teacher of Kalole Christine (CR/D/30089) was appraised on 2nd April 2018,</p> <p>The Head Teacher Kyoga Baptist was appraised (CR/D/30734) on 2nd October 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>There was no evidence from the sampled schools to show that the LG Education department communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that Nakaseke LG Education department held meetings with primary school head teachers to explain and sensitise them on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59 % score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The district has a total of 118 licenced and registered schools where 113 are government aided while 05 are private schools Term 3 (2017)Govt 52/113: Private 0/05 :Term 1 (2018)Govt 47/113 :Private 0/05 :Term 2(2018) Govt 52/113 : Private 0/05 Therefore average percentage of inspected schools is 42%.</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 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>From the departmental reports and inspection reports reviewed at the DEO's office, there was no evidence to show that the School inspection report were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective action during the previous FY 2017/2018.</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>Acknowledgements to show that the LG submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) were not seen.</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 inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>From the sampled schools : wakayamba, Kinoni, Kizongoto ,Balatira Primary school and magoma RC P/s, There was no evidence to show that the recommendation from inspections are followed.</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>There was evidence that Nakaseke LG has 113 schools in the EMIS which is also consistent with PBS reports.</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 in the EMIS is 45,500 which is not consistent with and PBS report which is 45,723 pupils.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>LG council committee on education met and discussed service delivery issues in Social Service Standing committee where education sector on</p> <p>14th /May/2018 and discussed Departmental workplans and approval of Budget speech Min 33/HESC/2017/2018 financial Year</p> <p>17th /April/2018 Discussed performance report Quarter 3-for Jan -March 2018</p> <p>Min. 28/HESS/201/18</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The education sector committee presented issues to council as required for Council approval on 19th /August/2017 at District Headquarters</p> <p>Min. 4/HESS/17-18 FY Annual Performance review of previous 2016/2017</p> <p>Min. 5/HESS/17-18 Review departmental Budget Statement and Workplan for 2017/2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% schools: score 5</li> <li>80 to 99% schools: score 3</li> <li>Below 80 % schools: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseka DLG has a Total of 113 Government Aided and 56 Private schools, a random sample 5 schools was taken:</p> <p>a. St. Andrew Baggwa primary school; SMC approved on Ref: EDU/20/01 on 27th /June 2018: evidence of Meeting Min. 7/04/2017 Elections</p> <p>b. St. Josephs Kiziba SMC approved Ref: EDUC/20/01; Meeting held on 28th /03/2018- Min. (VII) School workplan discussion for 2018 term -I</p> <p>c. Kasagga C/U primary School- meeting held on 8th /June/2017: Min 25/SMC/PTA/2017 renovation of main hall; Min. 14/SMC/PTA/2017- Workplan term II</p> <p>d. Kiriibwa P/S held meeting on 16th/June/2017; Min. 05/02/2017 UPE Funds</p> <p>e. Mayirikiti P/S held meeting on 16th /Feb/2018; Min. (V): UPE Capitalisation Grant</p> <p>The mandatory Meetings were held in all the 5 schools sampled. 4 schools had discussed school budgets and resource issues</p> <p>That is 80% of the sample taken</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</li> </ul> <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>Nakaseke LG education department publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants by posting on public notice boards (not dated).</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, 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>Nakaseke education department submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on 09/08/2018. This was late as per the april dealine.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.</li> </ul>	<p>All payments requests for Nakaseke District Local Government Education department were timely certified and recommended as per copy of contracts as per the following sampled contacts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00018 Construction of a 2 classroom block at Mpunge Primary School by Rio SR Investments Voucher No. ED00289 requested on 5/3/2018 and paid on 12/4/2018</li> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00017 Construction of a 2 classrom block at Ngoma Primary School by Rio SR Investments Voucher No. ED00288 by Abaziwa Construction Co requested on 7/3/2018 and paid on 9/4/2018</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The Education department submitted on:</p> <p>Quarter - 1 NO record of date of submission to the planner</p> <p>Quarter-2 on 17th January 2018</p> <p>Quarter-3 on 23rd June 20118</p> <p>Quarter-4 NO record of date of submission to the planner</p>	<p>0</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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If sector has no audit query 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> </li> </ul>	<p>All queries were not Responded to by Nakaseke District Local Government Education department.</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 on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills.</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 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>As per the sampled schools which: Kinoni p/s , Kizongoto P/s,Nakaseke Tel center P/s,Magoma orthodox,Magoma RC and Nakulamudde primary school, there was evidence that education department in collaboration with the gender focal person issued guidelines to ensure that toilet facilities cater for the PWD as well as clearly demarcating a facility for both boys and girls.</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 the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>As per the sampled schools which are:Kinoni P/S (5 females 7 males ),Kizongoto P/S (6 females 7 males ),Nakulamudde P/s(5 females 7 males) Kinoni p/s,(5 females 9 males) P/s,Magoma RC (4 females 9 males ),Magoma orthodox(5 females 8 males).Their School Management Committees meet the guideline on gender composition.</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>From the sampled schools :Magoma Orthodox,Kizongoto and Kinoni ,there was evidence to show that 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.</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 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 evidence that environmental screening for the construction of Kinoni p/s,Kizongoto P/s,Nakaseke Tel center P/s,Magoma orthodox and Nakulamudde funded by world bank was done by the environmental officer on 15/10/2017.</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>• 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>From the sampled schools mentioned above, there was no evidence to show 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>Nakaseke District Local Government had filled 457 out of 506 (90%) positions in the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY.</p>	8
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>There was no recruitment plan made. The Ministry of Public Service halted all recruitments as per the Circular Standing Instruction No.5 of 2018 dated 29th June 2018. Nonetheless, the recruitment plan should have been submitted by the time the circular was released.</p>	0

<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 in-charges of the sampled health facilities were not appraised in the FY 2017/2018. The sampled facilities are as below;</p> <p>Kapeka HCIII for CR/D / 10149.</p> <p>Nakaseke hospital for CR/D 10395</p> <p>Ngoma HC IV for CR/D / 10005 .</p> <p>Kalagala HC II for CR/D/ 10534.</p> <p>Butalangu HCII CR/D10556</p> <p>Kalege HCII CR/D/10577</p>	<p>0</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>Nakaseke District Local Government health department did not deploy health workers across health facilities in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY since there were differences in staff on the deployment list and what appeared in the budget as reflected in the following examples:</p> <p>Nakaseeta HC II:</p> <p>The deployment list at District had one Enrolled Nurse instead of two in the budget; it also had 3 Nursing Assistants yet the budget had 2.</p> <p>Kikamulo HC III:</p> <p>The deployment list at District had no Enrolled Midwife yet the budget had 4.</p> <p>Kalagala HC II:</p> <p>The deployment list had 4 Nursing Assistants instead of the 3 that are in the budget.</p> <p>Ngoma HC IV:</p> <p>The staff deployment list at the District had a Senior Medical Officer not budgeted for, while 9 Enrolled Midwives were deployed yet only 6 were in the budget.</p> <p>Wakyato HC III:</p> <p>The staff deployment list at the district had a Stores Assistant yet none was budgeted for.</p>	<p>0</p>



Monitoring and Supervision			
<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 District Health Officer (DHO) did not receive any of the prioritised policies / guidelines. All the five sampled facilities including; Nakaseeta HC II; Kikamulo HC III; Kalagala HC II; Ngoma HC IV and Wakyato HC III did not receive any of the three prioritised policies / guidelines.</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 DHO'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 District Health Team (DHT) did not supervise all the two hospitals and three HCIVs at least once in a quarter.</p> <p>In quarter 4, only Nakaseke Hospital and Ngoma HCIV were supervised as reflected in the report dated 24th July 2018.</p> <p>In quarter 3, only Semuto and Ngoma HCIV were supervised as reflected in the report dated 18th April 2018.</p> <p>In quarter 2, only Nakaseke Hospital, Semuto and Ngoma HCIVs were supervised as reflected in the undated report dated for supervision conducted from 11th to 20th December 2017.</p> <p>In quarter 2, only Nakaseke Hospital, Semuto and Ngoma HCIVs were supervised as reflected in the undated report dated for supervision conducted from 20th to 29th September 2017.</p> <p>There was no record of supervision of St.Ciprian HCIV.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% supervised: score 3</li> <li>• 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>• Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Health Sub District (HSD) supervised four (80%) of the five sampled health facilities in all the quarters. Supervision was as follows:</p> <p>Wasalange HCII was supervised in 3 quarters on; 3rd September 2017; 10th October 2017; 27th October 2017; 4th December 2017; and 2nd March 2018.</p> <p>Wakyato HCIII was supervised in 2 quarters on; 3rd September 2017; 26th October 2017; and 14th December 2017.</p> <p>Ngoma HCIV was supervised in 2 quarters on 24th January 2018 and 16th August 2018.</p> <p>Semuto HCIV was supervised in 1 quarter on 7th February 2018.</p> <p>Records of supervision of Kinyogoga HCIII were not available.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of the DHT's discussion of supervision reports in the available minutes of DHT meetings.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed</li> <li>– up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>There was no record of follow up of recommendations / action points in the DHT minutes and reports.</p>	<p>0</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>List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke District Local Government health department submitted accurate and consistent reports / data since all the 21 health facilities that received PCH funds were also on lists of HMIS reports.</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>LG Council committee members for Health met on</p> <p>14th /May/ 2018 discussed Budget speech and departmental workplan</p> <p>Min.33/HESS/2017/18</p> <p>17th /April/2018 Discussed Quarter-3 Performance report Min. 28/HESS/2017</p> <p>Min. 29/HESS/2017/18 update District 5 year Development Plan 2016/17-2020/23</p> <p>On 27th /Nov/2017 Review Departmental progress reports for Quarter-2 2017/2018, Min. 16/HESS/17-18</p> <p>25th /Sept/2017 discussed Departmental Budget Statements &amp; Workplan Min.10/HES/17-18;</p> <p>Min. 11/HESS/17-18 Review and Updating of Departmental Budget statement for quarter - 2</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>Nakaseke DLG Council committee members for Health met on 19th August 2017 and subsequently</p> <p>Presented the health issues and Budget to LG council for approval Min. 46/NDG/17-18</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6</li> <li>• If 80-99 %: score 4</li> <li>• If 70-79: %: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Out of the five health facilities sampled, three (60%) had functional Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) and Hospital board as reflected in the following meetings:</p> <p>Nakaseke Hospital Board discussed budget issues in all the 4 mandatory quarterly meetings held on; 14th June 2018 (Min 170/HMC/06/2018); 6th March 2018 (Min 158/HMC /03/2018); 12th December 2017 (Min 153/HMC/12/2017); and 3rd October 2017 (Min 147/HMC/10/2017).</p> <p>Kapeeka HCIII HUMC discussed budget issues in one of the 4 mandatory quarterly meetings held on; 19th June 2018 (paragraph 4); 5th April 2018 (No budget discussion); 5th April 2018 (No budget discussion); 4th January 2018 (Not signed and no budget discussion); and 27th September 2017 (No budget and not approved).</p> <p>Semuto HCIV HUMC discussed budget issues in all the 4 mandatory quarterly meetings held on; 11th May 2018 (Min 3); 30th March 2018 (Min 6/ 03/2018); 1st December 2017 (Min 5/ 12/2017); and 12th September 2017 (Min 3).</p> <p>Biddabuja HCIII HUMC held a quarterly meeting on 6th June 2018 and discussed resource allocation (No minute numbers were indicated). Minutes of other quarterly meeting were available.</p> <p>Wakyato HCIII HUMC meeting minutes were not available.</p>	<p>2</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>Nakaseke District Local Government health department had publicised facilities that received PHC non-wage funds. A list of health facilities with PHC non-wage figures for all the quarters was pinned on the DHO's notice board though it had no date.</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 Procurement and Disposal Unit (PDU) received a procurement plan from the health department on 18th July 2018. It catered the procurement of a laptop.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The PDU received form PP1 from the health department on 16th January 2018 covering the procurement of a laptop. This was after the deadline of 30th September 2017.</p>	<p>0</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>Nakaseke District Local Government Health department timely certified and recommended as per copy of contracts as per the following sampled contact; Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00004 Fencing of Semuto Health Centre by Acutus Services Limited Voucher No. HE 00141 requested on 29/5/2018 and paid on 25/6/2018</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>There was NO evidence that the Health department submitted annual performance report by mid July to the planner for consolidation</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>There were no Audit Queries for all the four quarters for Health sector due to no specific audit of this sector because Nakaseke District Local Government uses the risk based approach and Health sector was not audited.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Four out of five sampled health facilities met the 30% gender requirement as shown below; Kapeeka HCIII HUMC had 43% (3 females out of 7 members); Semuto HCIV HUMC had 43% (3 females out of 7 members); Nakaseke Hospital board had 46% (5 females out of 11 members); Biddabuja HCIII HUMC had 29% (2 females out of 7 members); and Wakyato HCIII HUMC had 40% (2 females out of 5 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>Nakaseke District Local Government health department had not issued sanitation guidelines to all health facilities. The sanitation guidelines were found in only three out of the five sampled health facilities including; Kapeeka HCIII; Semuto HCIV and Nakaseke Hospital.</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 screening form for the construction of the OPD at Bidadbuja HCIII; Construction of a medical store at district headquarters dated 15th October 2017 and signed by the District Environment Officer was available. However, the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines was not used.</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 checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke District Environmental Officer and Community Development Officer did not visit the site to check whether the mitigation plan was complied with since there was no inspection report.</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke District Local Government health department did not issue guidelines on medical waste management to all health facilities. Charts on medical waste management were found at only three out of the five sampled facilities including Kapeeka HCIII, Semuto HCIV and Nakaseke Hospital.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	---	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 7</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 4</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Five sub-counties in Nakaseke District have their safe water coverage below the district average which currently stands at 84% as per the District Atlas Report on the Ministry of Water and Environment website, and 85% at the beginning of the financial year 2017/2018 as per the Uganda Water Supply Atlas available at the District Water Office. These sub-counties are Butalaga TC (71%), Kinoni (31%), Kinyogoga (57%), Ngoma (61%) and Ngoma TC (58%)</p> <p>According to the water budget allocation for the current FY, only 15% was allocated to these sub-counties.</p> <p>According to the District Water Officer, these sub-counties have no viable safe water options that would fit within the available financial resources. There was information that some dry boreholes had been drilled in some of these sub-counties.</p>	0
<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: 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>	<p>The district water department planned to implement 7 water projects in the targeted sub-counties below the average district safe water coverage. The projects include drilling 2 new boreholes (1 in Kinyogoga and 1 in Ngoma) and rehabilitation of 5 boreholes (2 in Kinyogoga, 1 in Ngoma and 2 in Kinoni)</p> <p>Six of these projects were successfully implemented which represents 86% of the 7 planned projects. The executed water projects include 1 drilled borehole in Kinyogoga and 5 rehabilitated boreholes (2 in Kinoni, 2 in Kinyogoga and 1 in Ngoma).</p> <p>The District Water officer pointed out that the planned borehole in Ngoma sub-county was not viable/failed to yield any water, and was instead implemented at Wakyato Seed School in Wakyato Sub-County</p>	10

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>Construction monitoring and supervision reports for the 8 newly drilled boreholes and 14 rehabilitated water sources were available on file.</p> <p>This represents 76% of the 29 implemented projects.</p>	<p>7</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5</li> <li>• List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>The data contained in the District Annual Work Plan is similar to the information in the MIS report obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment, and includes 9 new boreholes and 14 boreholes to be rehabilitated.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>The water facilities listed in the MIS report obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment reflects that 9 boreholes were planned to be drilled and 9 were achieved. It also reflects that all the 14 boreholes planned for rehabilitation were rehabilitated. This was consistent with the performance information obtained from the PBS report for the 4th quarter</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The procurement plan seen was submitted and acknowledged by the DPU on 28th/June/2018.</p> <p>However procurement requisitions seen were prepared by the District Water Officer and approved by Ag. District Engineer on 30th/April/2018 but received and acknowledged by CAO on 16th/May/2018</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>Mr. Godfrey Kigozi was appointed as the Contract Manager and doubles as the District Water Officer.</p> <p>Samples of monthly contract management reports for months of September 2017, December 2017, January-March 2018 and June 2018 were seen.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The following completed facilities were sampled and inspected: Boreholes: DWD 60653 in Kivumu Village, DWD 60655 in Mulungi-Omu Village, DWD 60656 in Njagala-Bwami, Kimwanyi Village, DWD 60653 in Gangu Village, and DWD 56503 in Wakyato Village. They were all found to be functioning and well maintained, and the visible elements were confirmed to have been constructed as per design.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There were no official handover reports of the completed facilities seen, but the facilities sampled and visited had been passed on to the Water and Sanitation Committees for management, and they were functional.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The completion certificates for the projects completed during the previous FY were seen on file and verified.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<p>Nakaseke District Local Government Water department were timely certified and recommended as per copy of contracts as per the following sampled contacts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00001 Drilling of 3 Boreholes in selected sites requested on 6/12/2017 and paid on 19/12/2017</li> <li>Contract No Naka569/WRKS/17-18/00003 Construction of VIP Latrines at Bwanga Market requested on 11/10/2017 and paid on 24/11/2017</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Submitted Annual Performance report to the District Planner and Ministry of Water and Environment on 17th July 2018 for Quarter-4 Ref: Adm/07/18</p> <p>it was not mid-July, rather a late submission</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If sector has no audit query score 5</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 3</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>If queries are not responded to score 0</p>	<p>There was no Audit Query under water Department.</p>	<p>5</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>The water and sanitation committee discussions of service delivery issues On 29th /June/2018 under Min 10/Qtr4/2017/018</p> <p>Min.35/WNRS/2017/2018 on 16th /May/2018-Scrutiny of Budget speech and departmental Workplan for 2017/2018 FY.</p> <p>Min.30/WNRC/2017/2018 scrutiny of revised 5 year Development plan 2015/16-2020/2021</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The water sector committee presented the issues required for council approval on 25th /May/2017</p> <p>Min.41/NDC/16-17</p> <p>As well as Updated 5 YEAR DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2018/2019-2022/23 and Budget for Nakaseke DLG on 24th /o5/2018 under Min. 46/NDG/17-18</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no information on the notice boards regarding the AWP, Budget, Grant Releases and expenditures. No verifiable information could be provided to indicate that they had been displayed on the notice boards before.</p> <p>The District Water Officer attributed this gap to the recently concluded renovations of the district headquarters thus the notice boards had not been fixed back onto the walls.</p> <p>There is evidence that advocacy meetings were held in some sub counties and minutes available on file.</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>All WSS projects visited had reference numbers, location and date of construction but no details on source of funding and the contractor.</p> <p>The VIP latrine in Bwanga Market, Nakaseke Sub-County was not labelled.</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The information on tenders and contract awards was not on the notice board and no evidence that some information was removed from notice boards and kept on file.</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>Reports on formation of WSCs together with application letters from the different communities are available on file.</p> <p>The attendance lists of these meetings were also seen.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&amp;M funds, ii( carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they 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>The facilities visited were functioning and well maintained, with most fenced for protection.</p> <p>There was also evidence of community contributions towards maintenance of the water and sanitation facilities from the receipts available on file and also minutes of community meetings from sampled committees were readily available.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Screening reports for the new sites where borehole drilling took place were available on file. They were also signed by the District Environment Officer, Mr. Sekagya Moses.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There were no follow up reports on file. However no environmental issues had been raised in the screening reports or were noticeable during the site visits to the sampled projects.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The construction and supervision contracts examined have clauses on environmental protection:</p> <p>1) Clause 4.2.2 C, Bullet 8 of drilling and supervision contract terms and conditions provides for conformity to environmental guidelines and regulations.</p> <p>2) Clause 32 of Specifications for the Drilling Contract has provisions for waste management and restoration of sites.</p> <p>There was compliance with good environmental and social protection practices as evidenced from the sampled sites</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>All the sampled WSCs have a women representation of less than 50% though all committees have women occupying key positions.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>There was only one VIP latrine constructed for Bwanga Market, Nakaseke Sub-County. It had separate stances for men and women though not labelled.</p> <p>There are no access ramps for the PWDs and the latrine is difficult to access due to the steps at the entrance. There were also no supports for PWDs</p>	<p>0</p>