

**REPORT ON THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW OF ROAD
MAINTENANCE PROJECTS IN GOMBA DISTRICT LOCAL
GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY-DECEMBER 2016**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1.1.	Introduction.....	3
1.2.	Objective of the technical and financial reviews	3
1.3.	Scope of Review.....	3
1.4.	Performance assessment.....	4
1.5.	Summary of performance	4
1.6.	Conclusion.....	4
1.7.	Summary of issues and action matrix	5
2.	DETAILS OF THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW FINDINGS.....	6
3.	SPECIFIC TECHNICAL REVIEW FINDINGS ON SELECTED ROADS INSPECTED.....	13
3.1.	Routine mechanised maintenance of Bukalagi-Namabeya-Kakoma road (7.6 km)	13
3.2.	Routine mechanised maintenance of Bulwadda-Butanga road (9 km).....	14
3.3.	Routine mechanised maintenance of Kigayaza-Kyabagamba road (5.8km)	15
4.	APPENDICES	16
4.1.	Appendix I - Schedule of inadequately supported expenditure	16
4.2.	Appendix II – Table of detailed performance assessment.....	17

REPORT ON TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW OF ROAD MAINTENANCE PROJECTS IN GOMBA DISTRICT LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2015-16

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. Introduction

The Uganda Road Fund Act 2008 established the Uganda Road Fund (URF) for the purpose of financing routine and periodic maintenance of public roads; to facilitate the delivery of road maintenance services; to provide for the management of the Fund; and for other related matters.

The objectives are:

- To finance routine and periodic maintenance of public roads in Uganda;
- To ensure that public roads are maintained at all times; and
- To advise the Minister, in consultation with the Minister responsible for roads and the Minister responsible for local governments on; the preparation, efficient and effective implementation of the Annual Road Maintenance Programme; and the control of overloading of vehicles on public roads.

1.2. Objective of the technical and financial reviews

The URF performed a technical and financial review of road maintenance projects in Gomba DLG for the period July 2015 to June 2016. The purpose of the review was to provide assurance to the URF Board that funds disbursed in the period under review were utilised in accordance with the provisions in the work plans, performance agreements and the URF Act. Furthermore, the review aimed to verify that the use of such resources was efficient, effective and with due regard to economy and transparency.

The specific objectives of the review were:

- To establish financial propriety in management of URF funds;
- To establish the extent of compliance with laws, regulations, guidelines, performance agreements and work plans in fund management, procurement and program implementation;
- To determine the extent to which funded works and services were executed by Gomba DLG; and
- To determine effectiveness of oversight and support organs such as Internal Audit on work plans and programs of Gomba DLG.

1.3. Scope of Review

The review was carried out based on the relevant laws and regulations including but not limited to:

- a) The Uganda Road Fund Act 2008;
- b) The Public Finance Management Act 2015;
- c) The Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Act 2003;
- d) The Internal Audit Manual of the Uganda Road Fund;
- e) The Finance and Accounting Manual of the Uganda Road Fund;
- f) One Year Road Maintenance Plans for FY2015/16 and FY2016/17;
- g) Performance agreements for FY2015/16 and FY2016/17; and
- h) Other standards of sound professional practice.

The budget of the District for the period January-December 2016 was UGX 554,303,000/= which was planned to finance the activities summarised below in:

	Routine Manual	Routine Mechanised	Periodic Maintenance	Mechanical Imprest	Other Works	Totals
Gomba District	85,976,000 (377.32 KM)	203,543,000 (61.86 KM)	0	69,092,000	60,229,000	418,840,000
Gomba CARs	60,512,000 (26.5 KM)	0	0	0	0	60,512,000
Kanoni Town Council	8,224,000 (52.24 KM)	0	49,931,000 (3.4 KM)	12,796,000	4,000,000	74,951,000
Total	154,712,000	203,543,000	49,931,000	81,888,000	64,229,000	554,303,000

1.4. Performance assessment

This report presents performance of the Gomba DLG during the period, identifying the critical exceptions in governance, financial management, procurement, project implementation and reporting that need to be addressed. The agency was rated and scored in the above mentioned performance areas against a standard scale as defined below:

Overall performance rating (%)

0-25	Unsatisfactory
25-50	Weak
50-75	Adequate
75-100	Good

The report also includes suggested recommendations and proposed way forward.

1.5. Summary of performance

The table below summarises the District's performance in the various areas reviewed by the audit team. Details of the assessment are attached in Appendix II.

No.	Performance Area	Weight (%)	Aggregated Score (%)
1	Planning and Budgeting	20	16
2	Procurement Processes	8	08
3	Project Management and Control	30	21
4	Actual Works Done	25	14
5	Oversight	10	07
6	Agency Capacity	7	04
	Total	100	68

1.6. Conclusion

Based on the evaluation of the function areas highlighted above, the performance of the District is rated at 68% which is **adequate**. Management needs to put in place an appropriate action plan to address the issues noted and ensure effective utilisation of URF's funds in future.

1.7. Summary of issues and action matrix

Issue	Action Required	Action by	Deadline
1. Deviation from engineering design, practices and implementation standards: a. Lack of unit rates schedule for planning, b. Inadequate quality control procedures, c. Lack of routine manual maintenance, and d. Failure to construct end structures on installed culverts, e. Lack of final accounts / reports for completed projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To prepare a schedule for unit rates to guide planning on annual basis To start conducting quality control tests for construction materials To follow MoWT standards for road works at all times To recruit road gangs to undertake RMM Start preparing final accounts / reports that are specific to particular road projects implemented. 	CAO	Effective FY2017/18
2. Failure to maintain records and information for the key functions and activities like: a. Records to track budget performance for projects by the District.	The District should maintain the requisite records to enable tracking of funds and implementation of projects.	CAO	Immediate
3. Undermining independence of functions in financial and technical management.	Ensure independence during the preparation of accountability reports	CAO	Immediate
4. Inadequate oversight over road maintenance by the DRC.	To conduct quarterly DRC meetings to provide oversight on road maintenance activities.	CAO	Continuous
5. Lack of capacity to implement road maintenance programs a. Inadequate equipment fleet b. Inadequate funds to effectively address all road maintenance needs c. Inadequate staffing levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that all equipment are available and maintained all the time to enable continuity. Ensure presence of key staff at all times Lobby for more funding from MoFPED to bridge the road maintenance needs.	CAO URF	Continuous
6. Poor financial management records including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to certify bank reconciliation statements Discrepancies in expenditures reported to URF and that recorded in the cash book. Payment of road gang allowances to staff 	Provide explanations to the anomalies and ensure proper financial management procedures	CAO	Immediate

2. DETAILS OF THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW FINDINGS

AREA	STATEMENT OF CONDITION/FINDING	IMPLICATION	RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATIONS
PLANNING AND BUDGETING	<p>✓ Annual work plans</p> <p>The annual work plans for the FY2015/16 and FY2016/17 were in place and submitted to the URF. However, the following observations were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A schedule of unit rates for formulation of the annual work plan was not availed nor used in the budgeting process. 	<p>Lack of a unit rates' schedule makes assessment of the reasonableness of road maintenance costs impossible</p>	<p>A unit rates schedule is available. However, these usually vary due to scope changes. Going forward a specific schedule for unit rates shall be derived and documented.</p>	<p>The District LG should also derive unit rates to guide its planning and project implementation process and attached to the workplans submitted to URF.</p>
	<p>✓ Budget performance monitoring</p> <p>The data on budget performance was not availed during the review. Extraction of information was difficult because the financial records do not analyse costs based on the activities in the work plan.</p>	<p>This prohibits tracking of the work plan and performance</p>	<p>The agencies commits to capture budget performance data timely and be kept on file going forward.</p>	<p>The agency should regularly track its performance and budget in order to guide the decision making processes.</p>
PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES	<p>✓ Procurement plan and records</p> <p>The audit team was availed with the procurement plan of the period under review and a list of pre-qualified suppliers for the FY 2015/16. It included the planned procurements for road maintenance. However, the district did not provide a pre-qualified list of suppliers for the FY 2016/17 for review.</p> <p>Procurement records for the supply of materials and hire of equipment used in road maintenance activities were in place. In addition the District executed framework</p>	<p>Apart from the failure to provide a list of pre-qualified list of suppliers for the FY 16/17, procurements were carryout in a transparent and competitive manner.</p>	<p>The list of pre-qualified suppliers is now available for review.</p>	<p>The agency should keep it up.</p>

AREA	STATEMENT OF CONDITION/FINDING	IMPLICATION	RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATIONS
	contracts during the period under review which made the supply of materials be undertaken in a fairly timely manner.			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL	<p>✓ Inadequate quality and cost control procedures</p> <p>Clause 9 (e) of the performance agreements stipulates that the designated agencies must ensure that all maintenance works are conducted in accordance with quality standards.</p> <p>Gomba DLG failed to implement adequate quality control procedures. For example, there were no records of quality tests conducted on materials such as gravel utilised for the construction works and neither was there any record of quality tests conducted during project implementation.</p> <p>✓ Project management documentation</p> <p>Gomba DLG took an effort to maintain project budgeting tools such as the engineers' estimates. However, it lacked key project implementation documents such as records of measurement of actual works done at completion (final accounts) for the implemented projects.</p> <p>✓ Discrepancies in unit rates</p> <p>Section 26 of the URF Budgeting Guidelines gives tabulated estimates of unit rates various road maintenance activities.</p> <p>From this, the upper limit for routine mechanised maintenance under force</p>	<p>✓ Value for money cannot be ascertained due to uncertainty on the quality of materials used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is poor project implementation control. There is a possibility of misuse of funds and poor accountability. There is a risk that funds were utilised for activities outside the work plan 	<p>Going forward, the agency shall strengthen quality management during project implementation to ensure value for money.</p> <p>Project management documentation shall be improved going forward to include a final account of the actual works executed per project.</p> <p>The large variation in cost for the maintenance of Kigayaza-Kyabagamba (4km) road was as a result of unique scope. The works included heavy grading, and bottleneck removal.</p>	<p>All works should be executed in accordance with acceptable standards in relation to design, documentation and testing suitability of materials used.</p> <p>Gomba DLG should improve project management documentation and include final accounts that are specific to road projects implemented.</p> <p>Gomba DLG should align the unit rates used to those in the URF planning and budgeting guidelines.</p>

AREA	STATEMENT OF CONDITION/FINDING	IMPLICATION	RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>account in central Uganda is expected to be UGX 2.3M/= per km maintained. Hence, Gomba DLG was expected to undertake routine mechanised maintenance within those limits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Therefore the RMeM of Kigayaza-Kyabagamba (4km) road should have cost on average UGX 10M/= and not the 45M/= and presented by the agency in its quarterly accountability reports submitted to URF. 		<p>The road had earlier been abandoned since it was impassable due to the bottle necks. In fact the road required rehabilitation hence the extended scope for maintenance and therefore a discrepancy in unit rates</p>	
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT RECORDS	<p>✓ Inadequately supported expenditure</p> <p>Contrary to S 181 of the Treasury Accounting Instructions, payments amounting to UGX 33,861,400/= lacked vital supporting documents. Summary is in <i>appendix I attached</i>.</p> <p>✓ Discrepancies in accountability records and reports</p> <p>Section 5 (b) (i) of the performance agreement requires the DA to provide comprehensive and satisfactory accountability reports for the funds disbursed in a form prescribed by URF. A review of the accountability records revealed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The financial accountability reports for the period January-December 2016 were prepared and signed off by the District Engineer and not the Head of Finance. This undermines independence of functions in financial and technical management. 	<p>There is a risk of diversion of funds to other projects without detection.</p> <p>This leads to inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the accountability reports submitted to URF.</p>	<p>All supporting documents have been attached and available for verification.</p> <p>This shall be rectified going forward.</p>	<p>Gomba DLG should always ensure to account for all expenditure in a timely manner and maintain readily available accountability records</p> <p>Financial accountability reports of the District should be prepared and signed by the Head of Finance.</p>

AREA	STATEMENT OF CONDITION/FINDING					IMPLICATION	RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Expenditure reported to URF was not in agreement with the accounting records. Discrepancies are summarised below:						The agency's expenditure and revenue refers to actual figures as given in the table (a) attached herein whereas the auditor is referring to actual expenditure compared with budget figures resulting into big variances. Q4 expenditure is not true, it is 86,204,319.	The Chief Administrative Officer should reconcile the discrepancies.
	FY		Cashbook (UGX)	Report (UGX)	Variance (UGX)			
	Q3	FY 15/16	25,442,000	99,496,000	(74,054,000)			
	Q4	FY 15/16	135,959,736	69,995,000	65,964,736			
	Q1	FY 16/17	93,948,484	166,776,000	(72,827,516)			
	Q2	FY 16/17	91,377,371	82,575,000	8,802,371			
	<p>✓ Failure to certify cashbooks and bank reconciliation statements</p> <p>Contrary to Section 6.4.2.6 of the LGFAM, 2007, reconciliation statements for the period January-December 2016 prepared were not reviewed and certified by a senior finance official as required.</p>					Lapses in reconciliation may result in loss of cash without detection.	The bank reconciliation statements have been prepared and certified. Going forward, this omission shall not re-occur.	Bank reconciliations should be prepared should be reviewed and certified by a senior finance official at the district.
	<p>✓ Diversion of URF road maintenance funds</p> <p>A review of the road maintenance expenditure for the period under audit revealed that UGX 14,000,000/+ was used to purchase one (01 No.) motorcycle from Honda Uganda Limited. This is expenditure of a capital nature and therefore not a qualifying road maintenance expenditure</p>							
	<p>Funds may have been utilised on personal</p>							

AREA	STATEMENT OF CONDITION/FINDING	IMPLICATION	RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>✓ Payment of allowances to road gangs</p> <p>The review noted instances of transactions amounting to UGX 29,322,500/= being allowances to road gangs advanced directly to staff instead of the beneficiaries. There is no evidence that the direct beneficiaries received their respective allowances.</p>	activities.	Payment sheets to the beneficiaries are available and have been attached for verification.	The Accounting officer should ensure allowances are paid directly to the road gangs.
EVALUATION OF PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED	<p>✓ Physical inspection of projects</p> <p>Clause 9 (k) of the performance agreements required Gomba DLG to install appropriate signage at the beginning and end of every road on all road works under URF funding. The signage should show road name, funder, financial year, length of the road, activity being undertaken and the road management type. Gomba DLG did not install any signage on all the district roads that were inspected.</p> <p>Field inspections further revealed that all roads were constructed with inadequate drainage provisions such as mitre drains and culverts and routine manual maintenance was generally underperforming.</p> <p>✓ Falsified accountability</p> <p>The accountability records for Gomba DLG recorded an expenditure to the tune of UGX 45M/= on the RMeM of <i>Kigayaza-Kyabagamba</i> road (5.8km). However, field inspections revealed that only 4km of the road were graded at an estimated UGX10M/=.</p>	<p>This implies lack of compliance with guidelines and performance agreements.</p> <p>Risk of extended damage on the road asset value hence increased maintenance costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk that funds have been utilised for activities not in the work plan. • Submission of inaccurate reports and 	<p>Gomba DLG commits to follow standard project implementation standard practices going forward.</p> <p>The large variation in cost for the maintenance of <i>Kigayaza-Kyabagamba</i> (4km) road was as a result of unique scope. The works included heavy grading, and bottleneck removal.</p>	<p>Gomba DLG should place signage on all major projects as a standard practice.</p> <p>Gomba DLG should follow standard construction methods for road works.</p> <p>Recruit and manage road gangs for effective RMM.</p> <p>The agency should ensure preparation and submission of accurate accountability reports as well as final accounts of completed projects</p>

AREA	STATEMENT OF CONDITION/FINDING	IMPLICATION	RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATIONS
	Hence a balance of UGX 35M/= remains unaccounted for.	inconsistent data makes it difficult to monitor physical and financial performance.	The road had earlier been abandoned since it was impassable due to the bottle necks. In fact the road required rehabilitation hence the extended scope for maintenance and therefore the large project cost.	
OVERSIGHT	<p>✓ Oversight on URF projects</p> <p>The team reviewed DRC minutes for the meeting held on 26th August 2016 which handled the election of the chairperson and progress of road maintenance activities in the district. However, the agency convened only one DRC meeting during the period under review instead of the four recommended DRC meetings.</p> <p>Although the team reviewed the internal audit reports on road maintenance activities for the FY under review, it was noted that there is inadequate oversight on road maintenance funds.</p>	<p>There is no adequate oversight on road maintenance activities by the DRC</p> <p>Lack of assurance during project implementation</p>	<p>The agency promises to hold regular DRC meetings as required by the URF Act.</p> <p>This has been noted and shall be improved upon going forward</p>	<p>The Accounting officer should convene four meetings as required by the URF Act to discuss and provide oversight on the road maintenance activities in the district.</p> <p>Oversight over road maintenance funds should be increased to ensure value for money.</p>
CAPACITY	<p>✓ Staffing</p> <p>At the time of the review, Gomba DLG had an Ag. District Engineer working without a supervisor of works and road inspectors. Therefore, the staffing levels are inadequate for the implementation of the road maintenance programs.</p>	<p>Improper planning and inability to properly implement road maintenance programs by Gomba DLG</p>	<p>The department has 3No. Staff i.e. Senior Civil Engineer, Superintendent of works and assistant engineering officer. However, at the time of the review, only the Senior</p>	<p>Gomba DLG should ensure adequate staffing levels at all times</p>

AREA	STATEMENT OF CONDITION/FINDING	IMPLICATION	RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>✓ Equipment</p> <p>At the time of the review, Gomba DLG had its Changlin motor grader broken down for over 5 months. Hence mechanised road maintenance works were halted.</p> <p>✓ Funding</p> <p>Preliminary estimates indicate that Gomba DLG requires UGX 800M as funding to achieve satisfactory performance of its road maintenance programs. However, currently the agency has an indicative planning figure of UGX 378M/= which is 47% of the needs.</p>	<p>Inability to implement her road maintenance programs</p> <p>Inability of the agency to adequately fund its road maintenance needs hence extended damage to the existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Civil Engineer was available. The agency has a plan to recruit more staff depending on availability of funds.</p> <p>The agency promises to continuously maintain the equipment but sometimes it's beyond the financial capacity of the agency despite owning only one grader.</p> <p>The agency takes note of the concern</p>	<p>The Agency should ensure that all key equipment are available and maintained all the time to enable continuity.</p> <p>URF should lobby for more funding from MoFPED to bridge the road maintenance needs.</p>

3. SPECIFIC TECHNICAL REVIEW FINDINGS ON SELECTED ROADS INSPECTED

3.1. Routine mechanised maintenance of Bukalagi-Namabeya-Kakoma road (7.6 km)

Planned amount (UGX)	24,500,000/=
Actual sum (UGX)	24,014,000/=
Variance	486,000/=
Start date	Not on file
Completion date	Not on file
Management type	Force Account
Supervisor	District Engineer
Activity done	Routine mechanised maintenance
Project Description and Condition	
<p>The project is a 7.6 km unpaved district road with 7.5 m wide and 6.0 m roadway and carriageways respectively.</p> <p>The road received routine mechanised maintenance by grading and drainage improvement in Q4 FY2015/16 estimated to cost UGX 24M/=.</p> <p>At the time of the review exercise, the road was in a fair condition.</p>	
Review Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of project information profile board, • Installed culverts lacked end structures, • Lack of routine manual maintenance, • Earthworks were undertaken with inadequate compaction, • Lack of quality control tests for all materials utilised on the project, and • Lack of project final account of physical works undertaken. 	

Photographs from field inspection of Bukalagi-Namabeya-Kakoma road (7.6 km)



Ch. 1+700: Inadequate routine manual maintenance



Ch. 4+500: Poorly installed cross culvert lacking end structures and inadequate routine manual maintenance

3.2. Routine mechanised maintenance of Bulwadda-Butanga road (9 km)

Planned amount (UGX)	21,000,000/=
Actual sum (UGX)	21,000,000/=
Variance	00/=
Start date	Not on file
Completion date	Not on file
Management type	Force Account
Supervisor	District Engineer
Activity done	Routine mechanised maintenance
Project Description and Condition	
<p>The project is a 6 km unpaved district road with 7.5 m wide and 6.0 m roadway and carriageways respectively.</p> <p>The road received routine mechanised maintenance by grading and drainage improvement in Q2 FY2016/17 estimated to cost UGX 21M/=.</p> <p>At the time of the review exercise, the road was in a fair condition.</p>	
Review Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of project information profile board, • Installed culverts lacked end structures, • Misrepresentation of project actual costs in the accountability reports submitted to URF, • Inadequate drainage provisions for offshoots and swamp filling, and • Lack of project final account of physical works undertaken. 	

Photographs from field inspection of Bulwadda-Butanga road (9 km)



Ch. 2+900: Swamp section requiring multiple culvert installations



Ch. 3+200: Extended graded section lacking mitre drains

3.3. Routine mechanised maintenance of Kigayaza-Kyabagamba road (5.8km)

Planned amount (UGX)	45,000,000/=
Actual sum (UGX)	45,000,000/=
Variance	00/=
Start date	Not on file
Completion date	Not on file
Management type	Force Account
Supervisor	District Engineer
Activity done	Routine mechanised maintenance
Project Description and Condition	
<p>The project is a 5.8km unpaved district road which is a section of the 35km Kyayi-Kyetume-Kalusiina-Kyabagamba link. It has a 7.5 m wide and a 6.0 m roadway and carriageways respectively.</p> <p>The 5.8km were meant to receive routine mechanised maintenance by grading and drainage improvement in Q2 FY2016/17 estimated to cost UGX 45M/=.</p> <p>At the time of the review, only 4km had been worked on. The road was in a poor state and not motorable in certain sections.</p>	
Review Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of project information profile board, • Incomplete works, • Falsified accountability and reporting of actual works done, • Inadequate drainage provisions, • High unit rate for routine mechanised maintenance under force account at 7.7M/= per km against the standard estimate of 2.3M/= per km, and • Lack of project final account of physical works undertaken. 	

Photographs from field inspection of Kigayaza-Kyabagamba road (5.8km)



Ch. 2+600: Impassable low section



Ch. 6+500: Worked section lacking adequate drainage provisions

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Appendix I - Schedule of inadequately supported expenditure

Beneficiary	Date	PV No	Amount	Purpose
Sinago Investments Limited	10.03.2016	5.3.16	3,615,000	Fuel for road works for Bukalagi-Mpuge-Lwanganzi road
Sinago Investments Limited	14.04.2016	8.4.16	7,594,000	Fuel for road works for Bukalagi-Mpuge-Lwanganzi road
Sinago Investments Limited	2.05.2016	2.5.16	5,594,400	Fuel for road works for Bukalagi-Namabeya-Kakoma road
Kalumba Allan	17.05.2016	11.5.16	1,998,000	Fuel and allowances for the annual district roads survey
Sinago Investments Limited	31.05.2016	21.5.16	15,060,000	Fuel for road works for Bukalagi-Namabeya road
TOTAL			33,861,400	

4.2. Appendix II – Table of detailed performance assessment

No.	PERFORMANCE AREA	Priority	Score	%age	Aggregate
		(%)	(0-3)	Score	score
1	PLANNING AND BUDGETING	20			
1.1	Road Inventory and condition surveys		2.20	0.12	2
1.2	Work plan		2.50	0.14	3
1.3	Performance agreements		3.00	0.17	3
1.4	Adequacy of the unit rates		2.50	0.14	3
1.5	Budget performance monitoring		1.00	0.06	1
1.6	Procurement plan		3.00	0.17	3
	18				16
2	PROCUREMENT PROCESSES	8			
2.1	Compliance with PPDA guidelines		3.00	1.00	8
	3				8
3	PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL	30			
3.1	Checklist of expected documents (BOQs etc.)		2.20	0.18	6
3.2	Quality and cost control records		2.00	0.17	5
3.3	Supervision reports		2.20	0.18	6
3.4	Financial management records		1.80	0.15	5
	12				21
4	ACTUAL WORKS DONE	25			
4.1	Signage		0.00	0.00	-
4.2	Verification of actual works done		2.20	0.18	5
4.3	Adherence to construction standard practices		1.50	0.13	3
4.4	Justification of maintenance needs		3.00	0.25	6
	12				14
5	OVERSIGHT	10			
5.1	Internal audit reports		1.50	0.13	1
5.2	District Roads Committee		2.00	0.17	2
5.3	DEC		2.30	0.19	2
5.4	CAO		2.20	0.18	2
	12				7
6	AGENCY CAPACITY	7			
6.1	Staffing levels and competencies		2.00	0.17	1
6.2	Equipment		1.00	0.08	1
6.3	Funding needs		1.50	0.13	1
6.4	IT Infrastructure		1.50	0.13	1
	12				4
	TOTALS	100			68