



**LGMSD 2021/22**

Namutumba District

(Vote Code: 574)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	74%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	70%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	68%
Educational Performance Measures	74%
Health Performance Measures	65%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	71%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	24%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG infrastructure DDEG funded projects in the previous FY were functional and in use as evidenced in the 3 sampled projects below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of Administration block Phase V at a cost of Shs. 130,000,000 as indicated on page 10 of the budget which was completed at a cost of Shs. 1261,206,000 functional and in use as indicated on page 38 of the ABPR.</li> <li>2. Construction of a five-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/s at a cost of Shs. 22,500,000 as indicated on page 33 of the budget which was completed, functional and in use as indicated on page 62 of the ABPR.</li> <li>3. Construction of a five-stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/s at a cost Shs. 22,500,000 as indicated on page 33 of the budget which was functional and in use as indicated on page 62 of the ABPR.</li> </ol>	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	Not Applicable	0

Service Delivery  
Performance

Maximum 6 points on  
this performance  
measure

b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.

- If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3
- If 80-99%: Score 2
- If below 80%: 0

The LG implemented 6 (six) DDEG funded projects which were completed and in use as evidenced below:

1. Completion of Administration block Phase V at a cost of Shs. 121,206,000 as indicated on page 10 of the budget which was completed as indicated on page 38 of the ABPR.
2. Construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/s at a cost of Shs.22,500,000 as indicated on page 33 of the budget which was completed as indicated on page 62 of the ABPR.
3. Construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/s at a cost of Shs.22,500,000 as indicated on page 33 of the budget which was completed at a cost of Shs. 22,500,000 as indicated on page 62 of the ABPR.
4. Construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine at Iwungiro P/s at a cost of Shs.22,500,000 as indicated on page 33 of the budget which was completed at a cost of Shs. 22,500,000 as indicated on page 62 of the ABPR.
5. Supply of borehole spare parts Lot 1 at a cost of Shs. 72,000,000 as indicated on page 44 of the budget which was completed at a cost of Shs. 72,000,000 as indicated on page 74 of the ABPR.
6. Preparation and implementation of Magada Trading Centre Physical Development Plan at a cost of Shs. 40,000,000 as indicated on page 10 of the budget but which was completed at a cost of Shs. 38,836,000 as indicated on page 78 of the ABPR.

Percentage of planned projects that were completed was:  $6/6 \times 100 = 100\%$

Investment  
Performance

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0.

The LG budgeted to spend Shs. 910,779,384 on DDEG funded projects in the previous FY as indicated on pages 59-68 of the approved budget which was spent on eligible projects/activities as evidenced below:

1. Completion of Administration block Phase IV at a cost of Shs. 130,000,000

as indicated on page 10 of the approved budget and completed at a cost of Shs.121,206,000 as on page 38 of the ABPR. It was eligible for DDEG funding Code 148272 as on pages 7 of the implementation guidelines.

2. Construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/s completed at the at a cost of Shs.22,500,000 as indicated on page 62 of the ABPR was eligible for funding under DDEG as on page 7 under Code 078181 of the implementation guidelines.

3. Construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/s completed at the at a cost of Shs.22,500,000 as indicated on page 62 of the ABPR was eligible for funding under DDEG as on page 7 under Code 078181 of the implementation guidelines.

4. Construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine at Iwungiro P/s completed at the at a cost of Shs.22,500,000 as indicated on page 62 of the ABPR was eligible for funding under DDEG as on page 7 under Code 078181 of the implementation guidelines.

5 Supply of borehole spare parts Lot 1 at a cost of Shs. 72,000,000 as indicated on page 44 of the budget which was completed at a cost of Shs. 72,000,000 as indicated on page 74 of the ABPR was eligible for funding under DDEG Code 098151 as on page 8 of the implementation guidelines.

6. Preparation and implementation of Magada Trading Centre Physical Development Plan at a cost of Shs. 38,836,000 was completed as indicated on page 78 of the ABPR and was eligible for funding under DDEG as in 2.3 of the foreword on page 16 of the implementation guidelines.

Investment  
Performance

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,

score 2 or else score 0

The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled DDEG projects were as follows:

Variation = 100% ((Contract Price – Engineers Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))

- Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00025 Completion of District admin Block Phase V –budgeted at UGX 130,000,000/= actual contract price was UGX 126,999,180/= with a variation of UGX 3,000,820/= represented by -2.3%

- Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00012 Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S Budgeted at 22,500, 000/= actual contract price was UGX 21,007,900/= with a variation of 1,492,100 /= represented by - 6.63 %

- Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00011 Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/S; budgeted at UGX 22,500,000/=, actual was UGX 22,349,200/= with a variation of 150,800/= represented by 0.67%.

In conclusion,

The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual.

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported  
information

Maximum 4 points on  
this Performance  
Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standard was accurate. Evidence was confirmed by comparing the approved structure against staff list from the 3 sampled and visited LLGs indicated below;

a) In Namutumba Town Council,

Kamega Loy was the Commercial Officer by Structure and Staff List

b) In Mazuba Sub county,

Weere Nelson was the CDO by Structure and Staff List.

c) In Magada Sub County,

Tafanika Cissy was deployed as CDO both as per staff list and approved structure

NB: Total number deployed at LLGs was equal to the number registered at the DLG

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>The following 3 (three) infrastructure projects using DDEG were all in place as evidenced in the quarterly monitoring reports for the previous FY.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of Administration block Phase V in place as indicated on page 2 of Q3 monitoring report dated 14/4/2022 that works were still ongoing.</li> <li>2. Construction of 5-stance lined pit latrines at Bulagala and Irimbi Primary schools respectively in place as indicated on page 1 &amp; 2 of Q4 monitoring report dated 6/7/2022 that construction works had been completed and functional.</li> </ol>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence for the LG consolidated &amp; Submitted staffing requirements FY 2022/2023 to MoPS by 30/09/2021. HRM provided submission of Wage, pension &amp; Gratuity estimates F/Y 2023/2024 dated 29/09/2022 CR/HR/152 which was received on 03/10/2022 by MoFPED</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District conducted tracking and analysis of staff attendance on monthly basis. For stance according to attendance analysis for June 2022, Lamwaka Alice (Records Officer and Kiire Noah (Communications officer) had poor attendance remarks having reported for duty for only 10 and 13 days and scored 45% and 59% respectively</p>	2

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to confirm that HoDS were appraised during the FY 2021/2022. Findings from the files reviewed indicated that only two were appraised but still their appraisal date was after the time frame;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Basalirwa George (CFO) was appraised on 1/08/2022 and scored 80.5%</li> <li>2. Waako Stephen (DCO) was appraised on 15/07/2022 and scored 4%</li> </ol> <p>The below were completely not appraised</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Musita Augustus Apollo (DPO)</li> <li>4. Naabye Henry (D.Planner)</li> <li>5. Babalanda Khalif (DCDO)</li> <li>6. Ziraba Moses (Principal Internal Auditor)</li> <li>7. Babiita Harriet (Ag.D.Engineer)</li> <li>8. Isiko Mohammed (DEO) and</li> <li>9. Dr. Kiirya James (DHO)</li> </ol>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed regarding implementation of administrative rewards and sanctions for Heads of Departments as at the time of assessment</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The CC was established on 27/06/2022 but wasn't functional at the time of assessment. Committee Members include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kauma Rose Kagere PACAO (Chair)</li> <li>2. Kagoya Zainabu PHRO-Secretary</li> <li>3. Isiko Muhammed DEO</li> <li>4. Musita Apollo DPO</li> <li>5. Nambi Esther-UNATU Secretary</li> <li>6. Kabalanda Khalif DCDO</li> <li>7. Ndaye Richard</li> <li>8. Muzaale Henry</li> <li>9. Simonyi Isaac</li> <li>10. Kiirya James DHO</li> </ol>	0

8	Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:  Score 1.	No evidence. The District recruited a total of 220 staff but none of them accessed payroll within two months of their appointment	0
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	No evidence. The District retired a total of 15 staff but only 1 staff accessed pension payroll	0
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	<p>The DDEG budget for LLGs was Shs.910,779,38of the approved budget for the previous FY.</p> <p>The DDEG to LLGs was directly transferred in full as evidenced below:</p> <p>Q1 of Shs. 303,593,128 was transferred on 10/8/2021.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Mazuba Sc: Shs. 19,703,518</li> <li>2. Nangonde Sc: Shs. 19,333,872</li> <li>3. Nsinze Sc: Shs. 31,680,059</li> <li>4. Nabweyo Sc: Shs. 23,621,769</li> <li>5. Kibaale Sc: Shs.22,808,547.</li> <li>6. Namutumba Sc: Shs. 42,695,519</li> <li>7. Bulange Sc: 49,423,082</li> <li>8. Ivukula Sc: 26,578,940</li> <li>9. Magada Sc: 52,971,687</li> <li>10.Namutumba TC: 14,776,135</li> </ol> <p>TOTAL: 303,593,128</p> <p>Q2 of Shs. 303,593,128 was transferred on 26/10/2021.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Mazuba Sc: Shs. 19,703,518</li> <li>2. Nangonde Sc: Shs. 19,333,872</li> <li>3. Nsinze Sc: Shs. 31,680,059</li> <li>4. Nabweyo Sc: Shs. 23,621,769</li> <li>5. Kibaale Sc: Shs.22,808,547.</li> <li>6. Namutumba Sc: Shs. 42,695,519</li> <li>7. Bulange Sc: 49,423,082</li> </ol>	2
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---



- 8. Ivukula Sc: 26,578,940
- 9. Magada Sc: 52,971,687
- 10. Namutumba TC: 14,776,135
- TOTAL: 303,593,128

Q3 of Shs. 303,593,128 was transferred on 2/2/2022.

- 1. Mazuba Sc: Shs. 19,703,518
- 2. Nangonde Sc: Shs. 19,333,872
- 3. Nsinze Sc: Shs. 31,680,059
- 4. Nabweyo Sc: Shs. 23,621,769
- 5. Kibaale Sc: Shs. 22,808,547.
- 6. Namutumba Sc: Shs. 42,695,519
- 7. Bulange Sc: 49,423,082
- 8. Ivukula Sc: 26,578,940
- 9. Magada Sc: 52,971,687
- 10. Namutumba TC: 14,776,135
- TOTAL: 303,593,128

SUMMARY

- Q1: 303,593,128
- Q2: 303,593,128
- Q3: 303,593,128
- TOTAL: 910,780,384

10

Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):

Score: 2 or else score 0

The LG did timely warrant of direct DDEG transfers for the 3 (three) quarters to the LLGs for the previous FY (MoFPED released DDEG funds to LGs in only 3 quarters) as indicated below:

Q1 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 9/7/2021 and warranted on 14/7/2021 within 4 working days as evidenced on IFMS.

Q2 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 5/10/2021 and warranted on 7/10/2021 within 3 working days as evidenced on IFMS.

Q3 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 4/1/2022 and warranted on 6/1/2022 within 3 working days as evidenced on IFMS.

From the observations above the LG met the 5 working days deadline as per the requirements.

2

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG DDEG funds for the 3 (three) quarters of the previous FY were uploaded, invoiced and communicated to LLGs within the required 5 working days except for Q1 as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 DDEG funds were uploaded on 9/7/2021 and the LG invoiced and communicated the transfer to LLGs on 16/7/2021 6 working days later from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.</p> <p>Q2 DDEG funds were uploaded on 5/10/2022 and the LG invoiced and communicated the transfer to LLGs on 11/10/2021 after 4 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.</p> <p>Q3 DDEG funds were uploaded on 4/1/2022 and the LG transferred to LLGs on 7/2/2022 5 working days later from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.</p> <p>From the above observation, Q1 was contrary to the requirements.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG mentored the LLGs at least once per quarter as evidenced in the mentoring reports below:</p> <p>Q1 Mentoring report dated 15/9/2021 captured mentoring of LLGs staff on minute writing, lay out and numbering, agenda, structuring notes among others.</p> <p>Q2 Mentoring report dated 17/12/2021 captured mentoring of LLGs staff on better understanding of minute writing, methods on minute of data collection.</p> <p>Q3 Mentoring report dated 10/3/2022 captured mentoring of LLGs staff on strategic planning and the 5 steps in strategic planning.</p> <p>Q4 Mentoring report dated 22/6/2022 captured mentoring of LLGs staff on better understanding of monitoring and evaluation.</p>	2

11

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:

Score 2 or else score 0

Monitoring reports for the previous FY were discussed in TPC meetings as evidenced below:

Q1 monitoring report dated 13/10/2021 was discussed in TPC meeting held on 2/12/2021 Agenda 5 under Min. No. 4/DTPC/30/05/2022 and recommended lobbying for a road unit from MoWT to ease road maintenance.

Q2 monitoring report dated 4/1/2022 was discussed in TPC meeting held on 3/3/2022 Agenda 5 under Min. No. 05/DTPC/03/03/2022 and recommended for more development funds and timely release of grants.

Q3 monitoring report dated 14/4/2022 was discussed in TPC meeting held on 30/5/2022 Agenda 5 under Min. No. 2/DTPC/8/07/2022 and recommended construction of a parking yard to protect the road unit.

Q4 monitoring report dated 6/7/2022 was discussed in TPC meeting held on 8/7/2022 Agenda 3 under Min. No. 2/DTPC/08/07/2022. And recommended procurement of a supervision van.

## Investment Management

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:

Score 2 or else score 0

**Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0**

The LG maintained an IFMIS assets register as indicated below:

1.Assets register for Land &buildings:

- Subcounty land
- Health Facilities land

2. Assets Register for M/V & Heavy Plants:

- Yamaha M/Cycle 125cc UG 3848R
- Double Cabin Mazda LG 0017-089.
- Isuzu Tipper LG 021-11
- Motor Grader UG 2000W

3.Assets General

- ICT Equipment
- Furniture & fittings.

2

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:

Score 1 or else 0

The District Annual BoS report for the previous FY dated 12/8/2022 Ref. CR/Adm/108 was available with recommendations as indicated on page 3 of the report to board off the following unserviceable assets among others:

- Grass crushing Machine
- M/Cycle UACE 187Z.
- Recommended construction of a District store.

The process of taking action on the BoS recommendations began on 27/9/2022 when CAO wrote to the Principal Land Management Officer requesting for a valuer to conduct the valuation of the recommended assets.

In addition, CAO wrote twice on 27/9/2022 and 4/10/22 to the Head PDU to follow-up the request letter to MoLHUD for a valuer and also to work with him until the disposal was completed since the Auditor General in his report of FY 2020/2021 had also queried the non-disposal of boarded assets

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.

The District had a functional Physical Planning Committee which comprised of 9 (nine) members with the 4 sets of minutes but without evidence of submission of all of them to MoLHUD at the time of assessment as indicated below:

Q1 PPC minutes for the meeting held on 22/7/2021 with attendance of 6 out of 9 members were not submitted to MoLHUD.

Q2 PPC minutes for the meeting held on 28/10/2021 attended by all the members were not submitted to MoLHUD

Q3 PPC minutes for the meeting held on 19/5/2022 attended by 7 out of 9 members were not submitted to MoLHUD

the Q4 PPC minutes for the meeting held on 26/5/2022 attended by 8 out of 9 members were not submitted to MoLHUD

NOTE: Failure to submit all the four sets of PPC minutes for the previous FY to MoLHUD was due to lack of facilitation. The AWP for the previous FY provided for Shs. 1,000,000 for submission of PPC minutes but which was not provided.

The PPC comprised of 9 (nine) members appointed by CAO by position as indicated below:

1.CAO appointed as Chairperson by DCAO on 4/5/2020 Ref. CR/Adm

2.District Environment Officer appointed on 8/5/2020 Ref.CR/Adm.

3. District Physical Planner appointed on 4/5/2020 Ref, CR/Adm.

4.District Agricultural Officer. appointed on 4/5/2020 Ref. CR/Adm

5.TC Namutumba TC appointed on 4/5/2020 Ref. CR/Adm.

6. DCDO appointed on 4/5/2020 Ref. CR/Adm

7. DEO appointed on 4/5/2020 Ref. CR/ADM.

8. DHO appointed on 4/5/2020 Ref. CR/Adm.

9. District Engineer appointed on 4/5/2020 Ref. CR/Adm.

Plans Registration Book was in place with a record of 3 plans submitted in FY 2021/2022.

The District Physical Development Plan was not in place. but had Area Physical Development Plan for Magada Trading Centre approved by Council on 31/5/2022 under Min. No. 17/COU/31/MAY/2022.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects; Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not provide evidence of desk appraisal for all projects in the budget at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not provide evidence of field appraisal for all projects implemented in the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG developed project profiles with costings for the current FY 2022/2023 as indicated on pages 337 of the LGDP III which included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 12-5stance lined pit latrine at Nsongwe, Busini, Kasimizi, Budunda, P/s among others costed at Shs. 324,000,000 as on page.</li> <li>2. Construction of School facilities at Bukono Seed Secondary School costed at Shs. 600,000,000 as on page.</li> <li>3.Fencing District Administration Offices Southern wing costed at Shs. 80,000,000.</li> </ol> <p>The project profiles were discussed in TPC meeting held on 2/12/2021 Agenda 4 under Min. 03/DTPC/02/12/2021.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG had screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures were required before being approved for construction using checklists evidenced by the following screening forms that were signed by the DEO &amp; DCDO as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed construction of a five-stance pit latrine at Bulagala P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 01/03/2021</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed construction of five stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 05/03/2021</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed partial completion of District Administration Block Phase V by the DEO and DCDO on 02/11/2021</li> </ul>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>PDU of the DLG had evidence that all infrastructure projects for current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan signed on 30th Jun 2022 by the DCAO and Received by PDU on 01st July 2022</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had evidence of Contracts Committee approving all DDEG projects for current FY contained in meeting dated 16TH Sep 2022. Some of the projects include; under MIN: 11/NDCC/16/09/2022-23-ii of the 3rd contracts committee meeting. These include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00035 Fencing of District Admin block office southern wing. Proc Ref:</li> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00036 Reconstruction of Admin block council hall wing roof and ceiling</li> </ul>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had a project implementation team established as per CAO letter of appointment of team members dated 06th Sep 2021; the team members included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kizito Mukasa Fred (CAO)</li> <li>• Babita Harriet (Ag. DE)</li> <li>• Kambuga Frank (SAEO)</li> <li>• Bubalanda Hadad Khalif (DCDO)</li> <li>• Isiko Muhammed (DEO)</li> <li>• Kambuga Yusuf (SLO)</li> <li>• Kisanufu Yosuf (DNRO)</li> <li>• Kauma Rose Kagere (PAS)</li> <li>• Kirija James (DHO)</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The sampled infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG did not followed the standard technical design; the sampled projects include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of District admin Block Phase V. The Tarrazzo was good, the ceiling showed some areas of Leakage.</li> <li>• Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S. The PWD had no handles on both sides, Poor Mix which led to poor screed finish on the Ramp to PWD, paint was Peeling off.</li> <li>• Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/S; Poor finish on the Ramp to PWD, Aggregates used to cast the ramp were too big that even bonding of concrete was not proper, Only one handle in the PWD was fixed it was not painted, rust was all over the surface, Floor edges were already broken, Major Crack in the wall Joining the Urinal and the stances, Soak Pit was open, Eave was shorter than that in the design.</li> </ul>	0



Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0

From the reviewed site supervision reports sampled below provided evidence of Supervision by relevant technical officers prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY

- Completion of District admin Block at the district Headquarters, Reports and site meetings where all technical officers attended on 25th May 2022, Works certified by the Engineer on 15th June 2022 and signed E&S certification form on 28th June 2022.

- 100% Status completion report on Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S, Valuation date 25th May 2022, certified by the Engineer on 2nd June 2022, and signed E&S certification form on 28th June 2022.

- 100% Status completion report dated 14th June 2022 on Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at bwiwula P/S, Certification by the Engineer on 14th June 2022, and signed E&S certification form on 28th June 2022.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):

Score 1 or else score 0

The LG had evidence of Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes in sampled project examples:

- Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00025 Completion of District admin Block Phase V – Masubo General Enterprises as the contractor; 1st payment request made by the contractor on 28th March 2022 certified by the DE on 4th March 2022 and subsequent payment of 49,200,415/= initiated and timely paid on 20th April 2022 under Voucher No. 42754943. 2nd payment request made by the contractor on 15th Jun 2022 Certified by the DE on 15th Jun 2022 and subsequent payment of 64,616,276/= initiated and timely paid on 29th Jun 2022 under Voucher No. 44593524

- Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00012 Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S. Alcon Priority Investments (U) Ltd as the contractor; payment request made by the contractor on 25th May 2022 certified by the DE on 02nd Jun 2022, Environmental and CDO on 28th Jun 2022 and subsequent payment of 18,760,055/= initiated and timely paid on 29th Jun 2022 under Voucher No. 44593523.

- Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00011 Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/S; Mepalink Ltd as the contractor; payment request made by the contractor on 14nd Jun 2022 and approved by the DE on 14nd Jun 2022, Environmental and CDO on 28th June 2022 and subsequent payment of 19,957,836/= initiated and timely paid on 29th Jun 2022 under Voucher No. 44593470

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From a sample of 3 files, there was evidence the LG had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA. Examples of project files reviewed alongside the contract register include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00025 Completion of District admin Block Phase V – Approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 04th Feb 2022 Under MIN: 38/NDCC/4/02/2021-22i. Masubo General Enterprises as the contractor and Contract signing was done on 03rd Mar 2022</li> <li>• Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00012 Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S. approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 14th Feb 2022 Under MIN: 42/NDCC/4/02/2021-22xii. Alcon Priority Investments (U) Ltd and Contract signing was done on 22nd Mar 2022</li> <li>• Namu 574/wrks/21-22/00011 Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/S; Approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 14th Feb 2022 Under MIN: 42/NDCC/4/02/2021-22xi. Mepalink Ltd as the contractor and Contract signing was done on 22nd Mar 2022</li> </ul>	1
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

#### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance / complaints) as by the appointment letter of Mr. Babalanda Khalif Al-Hadad the DCDO by the CAO on 07/10/2020, Ref: CR/156/1 and the acceptance letter by the DCDO on 08/10/2020, Ref: CMM/501</p> <p>The District had also established a Central Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) as per the appointment letters of GRC members by the CAO dated 31/06/2020, Ref: CR /Admin/106 consisting of the following members;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAS - Committee Member</li> <li>• Ag DCDO – Committee Member</li> <li>• Ag DEO – Committee Member</li> <li>• Ag DE - Committee Member</li> <li>• Ag DCO - Committee Member</li> <li>• DHO – Committee Member</li> <li>• DWO – Committee Member</li> <li>• DPO – Committee Member</li> <li>• SLO – Committee Member</li> </ul>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>LG had a specified system for Recording, investigating and responding to grievances, evidenced by the centralized complaints log Book as of July 2020 from the Grievance Redress Framework for DLG of July 2020 by the Grievance Focal Person</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>LG had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms and aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress evidenced by the publicized grievance redress/ reporting mechanism as evidenced by the list of GRC members with their phone contacts publicized on the district notice board by the Grievance Focal Person dated and signed on 11/06/2021</p>	1

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0

The LG integrated Environment, Social and Climate change interventions into the LGDP III, AWP and Approved Budget for the current FY as evidenced below:

1. Environment and climate change interventions.

LGDP III:

Environment/ Climate change interventions including Malarial mainstreaming, environment, climate change and sanitation issues were captured in the District Chairperson's foreword on page 16 of the LGDP III and other environmental/climate issues were captured on pages 180 & 262 of the LGDP III.

AWP

Provision in the AWP for FY 2022/2023 was Shs. 711,298,000 not page numbered.

BUDGET

Environment and climate change interventions were provided for in the approved budget with Shs.203,066,000 not page numbered.

2.Social safeguards

LGDP III:

Social safeguards interventions which included Population issues, gender and equity budgeting, HIV/AIDS issues, human rights issues among others were captured in the District Chairperson's foreword on page 16 and other social safeguards concerns like HIV/AIDS, gender and equity were provided for in the LGDP III as on pages 168, 214,242,249-250,258,318, and 332.

AWP

Provision in the AWP for FY 2022/2023 was Shs. 739,536,000 pages not numbered.

BUDGET

Social safeguards interventions were provided for in the approved budget with Shs.739,536,000 pages not numbered.

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management

score 1 or else 0

The LG disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines through TPC meeting attended by SAs and CDOs which was held on 3/3/2022 Agenda 7 under Min. No. 03/03/2022 page 4. The District Planner informed members about the objectives, eligible and ineligible nature of items under DDEG funding.

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	LG had incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects for FY 2021/2022 evidenced by;  The BoQs in the contract agreement for the completion of the District Administration Block Phase V dated 03/03/2022, Procurement Ref: Namu 574/Wrks/21-22/00025, item specified as Environment, Health and Safety Training at 100,000/= on page 7 of the BoQs	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	LG had no Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change as required	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	LG did not have proof that projects were implemented on land where it had rightful ownership as required	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	LG environmental officer and DCDO conducted quarterly not monthly support supervision and monitoring as required, for example;  • E&S monitoring report for the construction of a staff house at Kagulu HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 30/07/2022  • E&S Monitoring Report for the catchment afforestation on 15 borehole sites in Namutumba DLG DEO&DCDO on 30/06/2022	0

15

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:

Score 1 or else score 0

E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by DEO and DCDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects evidenced by the following;

- E&S Certification Form of 650,000/= for the proposed construction of a five-stance pit latrine at Bulagala P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 28/06/2022
- E&S Certification Form of 550,000/= for the proposed construction of five stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 28/06/2022
- E&S Certification Form of 355,000/= for the proposed partial completion of District Administration Block Phase V by the DEO and DCDO on 28/06/2022

## Financial management

LG makes monthly  
Bank reconciliations

Maximum 2 points on  
this Performance  
Measure

a. Evidence that the LG makes  
monthly bank reconciliations and  
are up to-date at the point of time  
of the assessment:

Score 2 or else score 0

The LG made monthly bank reconciliations for the  
previous FY but only up to June 2022 as indicated  
on the 3 sampled accounts below:

1.General Fund Account:

General Ledger Cash Balance as at 30th/6/2022:  
Shs. 12,820,462

Bank Statement Closing balance as at 30th/6/2022:  
Shs. 12,820,462

General Fund Account:

General Ledger Cash Balance as at 31st/7/2022:  
Shs. 20,554,613

Bank Statement Closing balance as at 31st /7/2022:  
Shs. 20,554,613

General Fund Account:

General Ledger Cash Balance as at 31st /8/2022:  
Shs. 23,976,563

Bank Statement Closing balance as at 31st/8/2022:  
Shs. 23,976,563

General Fund Account:

General Ledger Cash Balance as at 30th/9/2022:  
Shs. 19,308,661

Bank Statement Closing balance as at 30th/9/2022:  
Shs. 19,308,661

2. YLP Recovery Account:

General Ledger Cash Balance as at 30th/6/2022:  
Shs. 4,687,890

Bank Statement Closing balance as at 30th/6/2022:  
Shs. 4,687,890

3.UWEP Account:

General Ledger Cash Balance as at 30th/6/2022:  
Shs. 9,129,750

Bank Statement Closing Balance as at 30th/6/2022:  
Shs. 9,129,750

However, the bank reconciliations for July to-date  
for YLP Recovery and UWEP accounts disappeared  
during the system update which was conducted by  
MoFPED and had not been re-stated back on the  
system despite the reminder made on 11/11/2022 at  
the time of assessment.

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG produced all the quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY as evidenced below:</p> <p>Q1 internal audit report was produced on 26/10/2021 unreferenced.</p> <p>Q2 internal audit report was produced on 14/1/2022 unreferenced.</p> <p>Q3 internal audit report was produced on 13/6/2022 unreferenced.</p> <p>Q4 internal audit report was produced on 12/7/2022 unreferenced</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not provide evidence of information provided to the Council Chairperson and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY at the time of assessment</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>All the Quarterly Internal Audit Reports for the previous FY were submitted to CAO and LGPAC as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 report was submitted to CAO and LGPAC on the same day of 28/10/2021</p> <p>Q2 report was submitted to CAO and LGPAC on the same day of 14/1/2022</p> <p>Q3 report was submitted to CAO and LGPAC on the same day of 22/6/2022 as per records in the LG.</p> <p>Q4 report was submitted to CAO and LGPAC on the same day of 4/8/2022</p> <p>However, LGPAC reviewed and followed up only Q1 &amp; Q2 of the previous internal reports as evidenced by the LGPAC reports to Council dated 27/6/2022 and 27/9/2022 respectively.</p>	0

**Local Revenues**



18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG original budget for local revenue was Shs. 294,000,000 as on page 16 of the draft AFS for the previous FY.</p> <p>Actual local revenue collected was Shs. 154,150,138 as on page 16 of the draft AFS for the previous FY.</p> <p>The budget realization was</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">-47.6% above the recommended limit of -10%.</p> <p>Workings: <math>154,150,138/294,000,000*100 = 52.4\%</math></p> <p><math>52.4\% - 100\% = - 47.6\%</math></p> <p>The low local revenue collection was attributed to the prolonged lock down during the Covid -19 pandemic.</p>	0
19	<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 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The OSR collected in the previous FY but one (excluding sale of assets) was Shs.178,071,200 as on page 36 of the audited AFS for FY 2020/2021 whereas actual OSR collected in the previous FY was Shs.154,150,138 as on page 16 registering a decrease of Shs. 23,921,062 representing 72.5%.</p> <p>Workings: <math>178,071,200 - 154,150,138 = 23,921,062</math> (decrease)</p> <p><math>23,921,062/ 178,071,200*100 -13.4\%</math>.</p> <p>The decrease was caused by the prolonged lock down during the Covid-19 pandemic.</p>	0

Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0

Not all LG local revenue collected was eligible for sharing e.g. Property Tax and Bidding fees was ineligible. However LST was eligible and the total collected as on page 35 of the draft AFS for the previous FY was Shs. 109,429,406.

The LG remitted Shs. 53,783,475 representing 49.1% to the LLGs which was below the recommended 65% as evidenced below:

1. Ibulanku Sc: Shs. Mazuba Sc: Shs. 3,450,250 on 23/12/2021
  2. Nangonde Sc: Shs. 2,228,250 on 23/12/2021
  3. Namutumba Sc: Shs. 8,655,875 on 23/12/2021
  4. Nsinze Sc: Shs. 5,150,500 on 23/12/2021.
  5. Nabweyo Sc: Shs. 2,455,000 on 23/12/2021
  6. Kibaale Sc: Shs. 2,475,000 on 23/12/2021
  7. Namutumba TC: Shs. 7,241,600 on 23/12/2021
  8. Bulange Sc: Shs. 8,221,500 on 23/12/2021
  9. Ivukula Sc: Shs. 5,950,500 on 23/12/2021
  10. Magada Sc: Shs. 7,955,000 on 23/12/2021
- TOTAL: 53,783,475

### Transparency and Accountability

21

LG shares information with citizens

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0

The procurement Unit awarded contracts and amounts for FY 2021/2022 were available, endorsed by CAO and Senior Procurement Officer, published on the procurement Notice Board. The sampled awarded contracts were:

- Consultancy services for design of a piped water system. Proc Ref: Namu574/Srvs/21-22/00014, the contract was given to Virmar Technical Investments Ltd at 63,300,000/= display date was 29th Sep 2022
- Drilling of 14 deep wells Proc Ref: Namu574/wrks/21-22/00015, the contract was given to KLR (U) Ltd at 307,460,800/= display date was 29th Sep 2022
- Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00071 Construction of a 3 stance VVIP latrine at Kagula HC III. the contract was given PAB-Contractors Co. Ltd at 39,150,000/= display date was 11th April 2022

2

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG performance assessment results and implications for 2021 were publicized on the notice board as evidenced by the undated circular. The results posted were as indicated below:</p> <p>Cross cutting MCs: 43%</p> <p>Education Sector MCs: 45%</p> <p>Health Sector MCs: 60%%</p> <p>Water Sector MCs: 45%</p> <p>MSI: 0%</p> <p>Cross cutting PMs: 49%</p> <p>Education PMs. 75%</p> <p>Health PMs: 46%</p> <p>Water % Envt:55%</p> <p>MSI II : 0</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the 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 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG conducted discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation during the District budget conference held on 11/11/2021 at Basoga Nsadhu Memorial Institute as per report dated 12/11/2021.</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG publicized the local revenue strategy for FY 2021/2022 comprising of tax rates, collection and complaints procedure as per circular dated 29/4/2022 addressed to the SASs, TCs and posted on the LG Notice board. at the time of assessment.</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have any cases of alleged fraud and corruption to warrant IGG investigations in the District during the previous FY.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.  Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year  • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0	There LG PLE pass rate improved by 4% between 2020 and 2019;  In 2020 a total of 3547 pupils passed in Division 1, 2 and 3 out 5654 who sat accounting to 62%  In 2019 a total of 3131 pupils passed in division 1,2 and 3 out of 5310 who sat accounting to 58%  % Pass rate = 62% - 58% = 4%	2
1	Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.  Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year  • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0	The LG UCE pass rate increased by 6% between 2020 and 2019;  In 2020 a total of 822 students passed in Division 1, 2 and 3 out of 1781 accounting to 46%  In 2019 a total of 589 students passed in division 1, 2 and 3 out of 1469 students accounting to 40%  Percentage increase = 46% - 40%=6%	3
2	Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.  Maximum 2 points	a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year  • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0	Not Applicable	0

3

Investment Performance: a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0  
The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

2

The Education development grant of Shs150,829,000 in the approved budget page 28 was spent on projects which were in line with sector guidelines on page 24 which clearly stated the eligible projects that included; construction of sanitary facilities, classrooms among others.

basing on the District Annual Performance Report FY 2021/22 the as undertaken projects involved;

1. Construction of three 5 stance pit latrines at Bulagala P/S at Shs 22,000,000
2. Construction of three 5 stance pit latrines at Nabikabala P/S at Shs 22,000,000
3. Construction of a two-classroom block at Bunyinkira P/S at Shs 65,000,000
4. Construction of a two-classroom block at Nakawuzo P/S at Shs 65,000,000
5. Construction of a two-classroom block at Nakawuzo P/S at Shs 65,000,000

3

Investment Performance: b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0  
The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

2

The Education sector construction projects were properly executed and works duly certified by DEO, Environment Officer and CDO prior to payment to the contractors as evidenced below:

1. Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Nalende P/s by M/s OHKA General Supplies & Builders Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 21,348,435 on 17/6/2022

DEO recommended for payment on 18/6/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 1 dated 16/6/2022 for payment of Shs.20,262,922 Environment officer and CDO certified the works on the same day on 10/3/3022.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 21,123,716 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593517

2. Construction of a 5-stance latrine with a urinal at Muyinda Memorial P/s by M/s Alikoba Investment (U) Ltd.

The Contractor claimed for payment of Shs.20,240,100 on 13/6/2022.

DEO recommended for payment on 6/14/2022

DE certified 14/6/2022 certificate No. 1 dated 14/6/2022 for payment of Shs. 20,240,100

Certification by both Environment Officer and CDO was made on the same day on 19/3/2022.

The contractor was paid Shs. 20,044,928 on 24/6/2022 vide Payment Voucher No. 44593495

.

3. Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/s by M/s. MEPA LINK Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 20,152,160 on 14/6/2022

Certificate No. 01 dated 14/6/2022 for Shs. 20,152,160.

DEO recommended for 14/6/2022

Environment officer and CDO certified on the same day of 10/3/2022.

Payment of Shs.19,957,836 was made on 29/6/2028 under EFT No. 44593470.

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled projects were as follows:</p> <p>Variation = 100% ((Contract Price – Engineers Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00009 Construction of a 5-stance lined pit Latrine at Nabitula P/S was budgeted at UGX 22,500,000, Contract Price was UGX 20,700,000/= with a variation of UGX 1,800,000 /= represented by -8%,</li> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00013 Construction of a 5-stance lined pit Latrine at Iwungiro – budgeted at UGX 22,500,000 contract price was 22,350,000/= with a variation of UGX 150,000/= represented by -0.67%</li> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00067 Remodeling of District Education offices. Budgeted at 182,927,966/= contract price was 179,350,500/= with a variation of UGX 3,577,466/= represented by - 1.96%</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion,</p> <p>The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools)were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was a SEED secondary approved in the FY 2021-2022 Work plan but as per the time of assessment, no construction had yet taken Place.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 – 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had recruited 1483 teachers against the required 2122 as per the staff ceiling for the 109 primary schools which represented 70%</p> <p>1483/2122*100 = 70% staffing</p>	1

Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,

- If above 70% and above score: 3
- If between 60 - 69%, score: 2
- If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
- Below 50 score: 0

71% of the 109 schools in the assets register met the required minimum standards of DES in regard to presence of staff accommodation, adequate classrooms and adequate latrine stances as indicated below;

51% schools of the 109 in the assets register had a single staff accommodation on ground which represented 56 schools

90% schools of the 109 had classrooms for each learning group as required which represented 99 schools

73% schools of the 109 had latrine stances capable of catering for both girls and boys separately which represented 80 schools

Hence 56 schools meet the basic minimum standards set by DES of the 109 schools.

**On the basics of presence of basic staff accommodation, classrooms and latrine stances**

$$51+90+73/3= 71\%$$

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement



Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.

• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

• Else score: 0

There was accurate reporting on teachers observed on the deployment list May 2022 and the corresponding staff lists at the three sampled schools as indicated below;

Kasuleta P/S had 13 teachers on its staff list as witnessed on the deployment list, the teachers were found present at the school as observed in the arrival book on the page dated 24th November 2022 and they included;

Janga Gilbert, Waira Godfrey, Basalirwe Abudu and others.

Matyana P/S teachers on the school staff list were 18 as on the deployment list, these had all signed in the school teacher attendance book dated 24th November 2022

and they included;

Olaki Augustus, Takuwa Sarah, Kibeesi Fredrick and Others.

Magada P/S had 7 teachers on the school staff list as on the deployment list. All teachers had signed in the attendance book on 24st November 2022 as indicated below;

Kiria Stela, Oguga Charles, Womooli Aloysius, Kateme Proscovia and others.

Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

There was accuracy in reporting on infrastructure in the LG assets register as evidenced in the 3 sampled schools below;

Magada P/S had on ground 8 classrooms, 5 latrine stances, 68 desks and no teacher houses.

Matyama P/S had 10 classrooms, 15 latrine stances, 111 desks and 0 teacher accommodation.

Kasuleta P/S had on ground 8 classrooms, 5 latrine stances, 110 desks and no teacher accommodations

All these infrastructures aligned well with the assets register report.

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>100% of the schools had submitted their annual reports of the 2021 school year to the DEO's office from the sampled 3 schools</p> <p><math>3/3=100\%</math></p> <p>These included;</p> <p>Bugobi P/S submitted its report on 29th November 2021, with an enrollment of 1154, PLE performance of 47 candidates, Assest register details signed by Kawanguzi Samuel the Headteacher and Rev Wabyi Stephen the SMC</p> <p>Mawungwe primary school that submitted on 29th November 2021 signed by Mutesi Petralina the Head teacher and Nabakoza Margret the SMC</p> <p>Kibenge Memorial Primary school submitted its report on 27th September 2021 signed by Kibenge peter the Head master and Waiswa Samuel the SMC</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30– 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>All the 3 sampled primary schools in the LG that included Kasuleta, Matyana and Magada P/S had School Improvement plans for 2022 in place</p> <p><math>3/3* 100 =100\%</math></p> <p>In line with implementing the Sips especially in the area of Academic &amp; staff organization and improvement. The district Education department organized an SMC induction meeting on 6th June 2022 to equip School management Committees with knowledge about their roles and responsibilities</p>	4

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The list of schools on PBS and OTIMS corresponded well with each having 109 primary and 7 USE schools which was 100%</p>	4
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The district budgeted Shs 12,699,299,344 for 109 head teachers and 1483 teachers in 109 primary schools according to the district approved budget 2022/23 FY</p>	4
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>Teachers had been deployed as required by the sector guidelines with a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per class for schools with classes reaching P7 as evidenced from the sampled 3 schools below;</p> <p>Kasuleta P/S had a headteacher and 12 teachers deployed.</p>	3
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Matyana P/S had a head teacher and 17 teachers

Magada P/S had a head teacher and 14 teachers deployed as required.

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Teacher deployment data for the year 2022 had been publicized in all the sampled 3 Primary schools Kasuleta had 13 staff, Matyana had 18 teachers and Magada Primary School had 15 teachers on its staff lists</p>	1
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

All were appraised on 1/09/2022 which was after the time frame. The sampled included;

1. Mubeezi Samuel (Igerere P/S)
2. Wangolo Rose (Muyinda P/S)
3. Wamani Samson (Nawampanda P/S)
4. Hamba Kenani (Namaato P/S)
5. Egessah Patrick (Kizuba P/S)
6. Waibi Peter (Nawansogwa P/S)
7. Mukose Hakim (Busoona P/s)
8. Muzaale Henry (Namuwondo P/S)
9. Kirunda Charles (Kigalama P/S)
10. Kyakutema Racheal (Namalowe P/S)

Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The District had 7 Secondary School Head Teachers but HRM only presented 5 files for review. From the files checked, there was no evidence to confirm that all were appraised during FY 2021/2022.

- 1) Mbago Mugasa Charles (Ivukulu SS) was appraised on 5/11/2022
- 2) Samanya Fred (Kibaale SS) was appraised on 25/11/2022
- 3) Mangeni Nathan (Bugobi SS),
- 4) Kyadida Addi (Bukonte Seed SS) and
- 5) Babalanda Winfred Ochieng (Kisiki College) were not appraised at all.

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>No evidence. 6 files were presented for review and findings indicated that none of them was appraised. Files included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Namugwano Sarah (Senior Inspector) of schools</li> <li>2. Mugoya Robert (Inspector) of schools</li> <li>3. Kalisengawa Fred (Inspector) of schools</li> <li>4. Batana Damalie (principal Education Officer)</li> <li>5. Konso Fiida (Senior Educ.officer) and</li> <li>6. Bwaita Godfrey (Sports Officer)</li> </ol>	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was a training plan for the Education department 2021/2022 for the identified staff capacity gaps. Some of the key training involved;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training teachers on First Aid administration in March 2022</li> <li>• Computer literacy training for teachers and district education department staff.</li> <li>• Effective records management training</li> </ul>	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually. If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG did not confirm in writing the list of its Primary schools, USE schools with their total enrollment as required</p>	0
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The district spent Shs 89,359,399 on monitoring and inspection of 109 primary schools Q4 report 2021/22 FY which was in line with the sector guidelines page 14 that stipulate that at a minimum, inspection must be allocated a fixed rate of Uganda shillings 4 million per LG, plus Shs 112,000 (3 inspections at Shs 37,333) per school for the 3 terms.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG submitted timely warrants for school's capitation grant for the previous FY as indicated below:</p> <p>Q3 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 4/1/2022 and school's capitation was warranted on 6/1/2022 within 3 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>Q4 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 11/4/2022 and school's capitation was warranted on 14/4/2022 within 4 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>There were no school's capitation grant releases in Q1 and Q2 of the previous FY due to schools' closure during Covid-19 lock down.</p> <p>From the observations above the LG met the 5 working days deadline as per the requirements.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

9

Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.

If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0

The LG invoiced and CAO communicated capitation releases to all schools but later than the required 3 working days as indicated below:

Q3 Capitation funds were uploaded on 4/1/2022 and the LG transferred to all schools on 5/5/2022 4 months later from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.

Q4 Capitation funds were uploaded on 11/4/2022 and the LG transferred to all schools on 6/6/2022 after 36 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.

There were no school's capitation grant releases in Q1 and Q2 of the previous FY due to schools' closure during Covid-19 lock down

From the above observation, the LG did not meet the 3 working days in all the 3 (three) quarters of the previous FY as per the requirements.

0

10

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.

• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0

The LG had an inspection plan for term two 2022 covering 109 primary schools running from 9th May 2022 to 31st May 2022.

Meetings to plan for school inspections had been organized

On 10th January 2022 under Min 01/PIMM/2022 by the Inspectorate Department. In this meeting the roles of school inspectors were discussed, and the inspection plan for term 2 was developed.

2



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>100% of primary schools had been inspected in all the three required school terms as indicated below;</p> <p>In the inspection reports of term 1, 2 of 2021/22 FY a total of 327 schools had been inspected out of the required 327 inspections for the 109 primary schools in all the three terms</p> <p><math>327/327 * 100 = 100\%</math> inspection rate</p> <p>In term 1 2022, 109 schools had been inspected</p> <p>In term 2 2022, 109 schools had been inspected</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Inspection reports had been discussed by the Education department on 13h March 2022 in minute 9/13/2022. The inspection findings included; Conflict in Kibenge P/S administration staff. Teachers need for Psycho Social Support.</p> <p>To this, a recommendation to offer psycho social support to teachers and head teachers was reached.</p> <p>On 21th February 2022 inspection reports had been discussed that included; the inadequate staff in schools like Iwatama, Bunagwe under Minute 3/21/2/2022 with resolutions reached that included; conducting special inspections for schools that had administrative conflicts.</p> <p>The resolutions meant to solve administrative conflicts in schools due to lack of clear job description and financial mismanagement were followed up through conducting training of SMC on 6th June 2022 to equip them with knowledge about their roles and responsibilities.</p>	2

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0

Inspection findings had been presented to the three sampled and visited primary schools that included Kasuleta, Matyana and Magada Primary Schools.

On 7th June 2022 & 31st January 2022 inspection findings had been shared with Matyana P/S these included the issue of lack of inadequate classrooms. Inadequate hand washing facilities.

On 2nd March 2022 inspection findings like poor hygiene in kitchen had been shared with Magada Primary School.

On 18th May 2022 inspection findings that included stinking urinals had been shared with Kasuleta Primary school.

Term 1 and 2 inspection reports had been submitted to DES on 29th July 2022 and 20th May 2022 respectively

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Council committee responsible for Education (Education Committee) met and discussed service delivery issues in the previous FY as evidenced below:</p> <p>Education committee met on 9/12/2021 and discussed schools' inspection reports in which it was noted that schools like Busoma P/s had weak soils making it difficult to construct lasting toilets.</p> <p>Education committee met on 24/3/2022 and discussed delayed construction of Nabwayo Seed Secondary School and mismanagement of Covid-19 Rehabilitation funds.</p> <p>Council meeting held on 12/10/2021 under Min. No. 003/Council/12/10/2021 considered PLE pass rate in 2017: 84.1%, 2018: 88.7% and 2019: 79%.</p> <p>Council meeting held on 31/5/2022 under Min. No. 18/COU/31/05/2022</p> <p>Approved laying of the budget and Work plan for FY 2022/2023.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, score: 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Activities of Mobilization to attract and retain children at school for the year 2022 had been conducted on 6th June 2022 During the SMC induction workshop When parents were called upon to actively participate in implementation of Education policies by the principal education Officer</p>	2

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>The assets register was in place for the 109 primary schools with assets relative to basic standards since most primary schools had at least a classroom for each learning group teacher and latrine stances capable of catering for both girls and boys separately as required.</p> <p>Matyama Primary School had 10 classrooms, 111 desks, 0 staff accommodation and 15 latrine stances.</p> <p>Magada Primary had 8 classrooms, 5 latrines, 68 desks, 0 staff accommodations.</p> <p>Kasuleta Primary had 8 classrooms,5 latrines, 110 desks and 0 staff accommodations.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, score: 1 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail evidence of desk appraisal conducted for all sector projects in the budget for the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail evidence of field appraisal conducted to establish compliance with technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs for the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no SEED Secondary School incorporated in the procurement plan of the current FY 2022/23</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of the school infrastructure that was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General;</p> <p>Construction of Nabweyo SEED secondary school, (8551,223,247) the committee sat on 03rd Mar 2022 Under MIN: 45/NDCC/03/03/21-22, letter of submission to the Solicitor General was on 30th March 2022 cleared by the solicitor General on 11th April 2022, but funds came late and the project didn't start in the FY 2021-2022.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG had a project implementation team established as per CAO's letter of appointment on 30th August 2021; for the period from 1st July 2021 to 31st June 2022, the team members included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kizito Mukasa Fred (CAO)</li> <li>• Babita Harriet (Ag. DE)</li> <li>• Kambuga Frank (SAEO)</li> <li>• Bubalanda Hadad Khalif (DCDO)</li> <li>• Isiko Muhammed (DEO)</li> <li>• Kambuga Yusuf (SLO)</li> <li>• Kisanufu Yosuf (DNRO)</li> <li>• Kauma Rose Kagere (PAS)</li> <li>• Kirija James (DHO)</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was a SEED secondary approved in the FY 2021-2022 work plan, but as per the time of assessment, no construction had yet taken Place.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was a SEED secondary approved in the FY 2021-2022 but as per the time of assessment, no construction had yet taken Place. Funds were the main cause of the delay and that's why construction also delayed; therefore, no site meetings had been held.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence of Reports and Minutes on the planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY by the joint technical teams involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	<p>The Education sector construction projects were properly executed and payments to contractors made on time as evidenced below:</p> <p>1. Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Nalende P/s by M/s OHKA General Supplies &amp; Builders Ltd.</p> <p>The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 21,348,435 on 17/6/2022</p> <p>DEO recommended for payment on 18/6/2022.</p> <p>DE certified certificate No. 1 dated 16/6/2022 for payment of Shs.20,262,922 Environment officer and CDO certified the works on the same day on 10/3/3022.</p> <p>The Contractor was paid Shs. 21,123,716 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593517 within 12 days.</p> <p>2.Construction of a 5-stance latrine with a urinal at Muyinda Memorial P/s by M/s Alikoba Investment (U) Ltd.</p> <p>The Contractor claimed for payment of Shs.20,240,100 on 13/6/2022.</p> <p>DEO recommended for payment on 6146/2022</p> <p>DE certified 14/6/2022 certificate No. 1 dated 14/6/2022 for payment of Shs. 20,240,100</p> <p>Certification by both Environment Officer and CDO was made on the same day on 19/3/2022.</p> <p>The contractor was paid Shs. 20,044,928 on 24/6/2022 vide Payment Voucher No. 44593495 within 16 days</p> <p>.</p> <p>3. Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Bulagala P/s by M/s. MEPA LINK Ltd.</p> <p>The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 20,152,160 on 14/6/2022</p> <p>Certificate No. 01 dated 14/6/2022 for Shs. 20,152,160.</p> <p>DEO recommended for 14/6/2022</p>	1

Environment officer and CDO certified on the same day of 10/3/2022

Payment of Shs.19,957,836 was made on 29/6/2028 under EFT No. 44593470 within 15 days.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	The LG Education department submitted its procurement plan on 16th April 2021 in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the Procurement Unit	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each school Infrastructure contract with all records as  required by the PPDA  • Construction of Nabweyo SEED secondary school, (8551,223,247/=) the contracts committee sat on 03rd Mar 2022 (date of evaluation report) Under MIN: 45/NDCC/03/03/21-22, Submission letter to the Solicitor General was on 30th March 2022 and clearance was done on 11th April 2022,  Though the project contract was signed in the FY 2022/2023 and as of the time of assessment construction had not yet started. However, there was no evidence of contract signing	<b>0</b>

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, <i>score: 3, else score: 0</i>	There was no grievances recorded under education sector in the FY 2021/2022 but the Central Grievance Log was available as of July 2020	<b>3</b>
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

15	Safeguards for service delivery. <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation  <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	Environmental guidelines had been issued to all the head teachers of the three sampled schools Kasuleta, Mutyama, and Magada on 10th June 2022 at Namutumba Primary school under minute 02/ENV/2022.	3
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	LG had costed ESMPs for 2021/2022 FY incorporated within the BoQs evidenced by the following contract agreements;  • Completion of the District Administration Block Phase V dated 03/03/2022, Procurement Ref: Namu 574/Wrks/21-22/00025, item specified as Environment, Health and Safety Training at 100,000/= on page 7 of the BoQs  • Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S dated 22/03/2022, Procurement Ref: NAMU 574/WRKS/21-22/00012, item specified as Environment Mitigation Measures, Health, Safety and Social Safeguards at 400,000/= on unspecified page number of the BoQs	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	LG had no proof of land ownership of school projects that were implemented in FY 2021/2022 as required	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	LG did not have proof that the DEO and DCDO conducted monthly support supervision and monitoring as required	0



Safeguards in the delivery of investments

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments

*Score: 1, else score:0*

The E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and DCDO prior to executing the project contractor payments evidenced by;

- E&S Certification of 650,000/= for the proposed construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Buyange P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 28/07/2022
- E&S Certification of 900,000/= for the proposed construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kagulu P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 28/06/2022
- E&S Certification of 280,000/= for the proposed construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Ivukula P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 28/06/2022

Health Performance  
Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.  Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries).  • By 20% or more, score 2  • Less than 20%, score 0	The sampled health facilities had deliveries as follows:  FY2020/21  Magada HC III 795  Namutumba HC III 935  Nsinze HC IV 887  Total 2617  FY2021/22  Magada HC III 979  Namutumba HC III 1214  Nsinze HC IV 1153  Total 3326  Percentage change = $(3326 - 2617) / 2617 * 100 = 27\%$	2

Investment performance:  
The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.

The LG budgeted Shs. 396,512,000 for Health development grant as indicated on page 22 of the approved budget for the previous FY which was spent on 3 (three) out of the 11 (eleven) prioritized investments as indicated on pages 25-26 evidenced below:

1. Renovation of medicine store at Kiranga HC II at a cost of Shs. 2,000,000

2. Renovation of DHO's Office at a cost of Shs. 13,000,000

3. Placenta pit at Nangonde HC II at a cost of Shs. 5,000,000

4. Placenta pit at Kiranga HC II at a cost of Shs. 5,000,000

5. Construction of 2-stance lined pit latrine at Namwenda HC II at a cost of Shs. 10,000,000

6. Fencing of Bulange HC III at a cost of Shs. 30,000,000

7. Fencing Magada HC III at a cost of Shs. 65,000,000

8. Furniture for DHO's Office at a cost of Shs. 12,000,000

9. Projector for DHO's Office at a cost of Shs. 4,000,000

10. Construction of staff house at Kagulu HC III at a cost of Shs. 190,000,000

11. Reroofing of Kisimu HC II at a cost of Shs. 20,000,000

NOTE: It was only projects No. 8,9 and 10 which were implemented in the previous FY while Nos. 1 – 7 were all forwarded to UPDF Engineering brigade.

Investment performance:  
The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers score 2 or else score 0

The Health sector construction projects were properly executed and certification of works duly done by DHO, District Engineer with the exception of the Environment Officer and CDO prior to payment to the contractors as evidenced below:

1. Construction of a staff house at Kagulu HC III by M/s PAB Contractor Company Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 35,419,831 on 16/6/2022

DHO recommended for payment on 20/6/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 2 dated 17/6/2022 for payment of Shs.33,602,187  
No evidence of certification by both Environment officer and CDO at the time of assessment.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 21,123,716 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593630.

2. Construction of a staff house at Kagulu HC III by M/s PAB Contractor Company Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 59,590,222 on 17/6/2022

DHO recommended for payment on 20/7/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 3 dated 12/7/2022 for payment of Shs.56,014,809  
No evidence of certification by both Environment officer and CDO at the time of assessment.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 56,014,809 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593630.

3. Construction of a staff house at Kagulu HC III by M/s PAB Contractor Company Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 52,039,634.5 on 16/6/2022

DHO recommended for payment on 16/6/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 1 dated 15/6/2022 for payment of Shs.52,039,634.5

No evidence of certification by both Environment officer and CDO at the time of assessment.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 52,039,635 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593630.

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled projects were as follows:</p> <p>Variation = 100% ((Contract Price – Engineers Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00071 Construction of a 3 stance VVIP latrine at Kagula HC III. budgeted at UGX 40,000,000/= actual contract price was 39,150,000/= with a variation of UGX 850,000/= represented by - 2.13%</li> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00004 Construction of a staff house at Kagula HC III. budgeted at 150,000,000/= actual was 149,864,669/= with a variation of UGX 135,331/= represented by - 0.090%</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion,</p> <p>The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no HC II upgraded to HC III in FY 2021/2022</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG recruited staff for all HC IIIs and HC IV as follows:</p> <p>Bulange HC III 16 out of 19</p> <p>Ivukula HC III 18 out of 19</p> <p>Kagulu HC III 14 out of 19</p> <p>Magada HC III 21 out of 19</p> <p>Nabisoigi HC III 21 out of 19</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 22 out of 19</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 44 out of 48</p> <p>Total 166 out of 162</p> <p>Percentage = <math>166/162 \times 100 = 102\%</math>.</p>	2

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <p>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no HC II upgraded to HC III in FY 2021/2022</p>	2
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Namutumba HC III had 22 H/Ws on the list dated 1/07/2022 so was the District. Nsinze HC IV had 44 HWs on the list dated 2/08/2022 so was the District. Magada HC III had 21 on the list dated 1/07/2022 so was the District.</p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no health facility upgrade in the FY 2021/2022</p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The health facilities submitted the Annual Workplans FY2022/23 as follows:</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 8/03/22</p> <p>Magada HC III 28/03/22</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 29/03/22</p>	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The health facilities submitted the Annual Budget Performance Reports for FY2021/22 as follows:</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 13/07/22</p> <p>Magada HC III 13/07/22</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 4/07/22. Though they were timely all were not endorsed by the Chairman HUMC.</p>	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The sampled health facilities submitted the performance improvement plans as follows:</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 4/07/22</p> <p>Magada HC III 4/07/22</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 4/07/22. They all contained issues OPD attendance, ANC attendance, inadequate drugs and Infection control.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>July 2021</p> <p>Magada HC III 6/08/21</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 6/08/21</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 6/08/21</p> <p>August 2021</p> <p>Magada HC III 5/09/21</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 7/09/21</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 6/09/21</p> <p>September 2021</p> <p>Magada HC III 7/10/21</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 6/10/21</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 6/10/21</p> <p>October 2021</p> <p>Magada HC III 5/11/21</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 5/11/21</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 4/11/21</p> <p>November 2021</p> <p>Magada HC III 6/02/21</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 4/12/21</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 6/12/21</p> <p>December 2021</p> <p>Magada HC III 4/01/22</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 5/01/22</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 5/01/22</p> <p>January 2022</p> <p>Magada HC III 4/02/22</p> <p>Namutumba HC III 4/02/22</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV 5/02/22</p>	2
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

February 2022

Magada HC III 7/03/22

Namutumba HC III 6/03/22

Nsinze HC IV 7/03/22

March 2022

Magada HC III 7/04/22

Namutumba HC III 6/04/22

Nsinze HC IV 6/04/22

April 2022

Magada HC III 6/05/22

Namutumba HC III 5/05/22

Nsinze HC IV 6/05/22

May 2022

Magada HC III 6/06/22

Namutumba HC III 5/06/22

Nsinze HC IV 6/06/22

June 2022

Magada HC III 5/07/22

Namutumba HC III 6/07/22

Nsinze HC IV 7/07/22

Quarterly

1st Quarter 2021/22

Magada HC III 7/10/21

Namutumba HC III 6/10/21

Nsinze HC IV 6/10/21

2nd Quarter 2021/22

Magada HC III 4/01/22

Namutumba HC III 5/01/22

Nsinze HC IV 5/01/22

3rd Quarter 2021/22

Magada HC III 7/04/22

Namutumba HC III 6/04/22

Nsinze HC IV 6/04/22

4th Quarter 2021/22

Magada HC III 5/07/22

Namutumba HC III 6/07/22

Nsinze HC IV 7/07/22



6	Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.	e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0	The sampled health facilities Namutumba HC III, Magada HC III and Nsinze HC III submitted the RBF invoices to the DHO on the same day 1/08/22 after the deadline of 15/07/2022.	0
	Maximum 14 points on this performance measure	Note: Municipalities submit to districts		
6	Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.	f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0	The LG submitted the RBF invoices for the 6 health facilities on 1/08/2022 after the deadline of 28/07/2022.	0
	Maximum 14 points on this performance measure			
6	Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.	g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0	The LG compilation and submission of the 4 (four) quarterly budget performance reports to the Planner was timely as evidenced below:	1
	Maximum 14 points on this performance measure		Q1 submitted on 10/10/2021 Q2 submitted on 14/1/2022 Q3 submitted on 11/4/2022 Q4 submitted on 13/7/2022	

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG developed Performance Improvement Plan for all facilities mainly focusing on Support Supervision on 4/07/2022.</p>	1
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Performance Improvement Plan was implemented in the 1st Quarter FY2022/23 (17- 21/09/22).</p>	1
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG budgeted for 217 H/Ws at 4,814,323,040= . This was to cater for 68% of the Staff filled.</p>	0
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had only 6 out of 23 health facilities with at least 75% of staff required.</p> <p>Those with at least 75% staff filled were:</p> <p>Bulange HC III (16/19) 84%</p> <p>Ivukula HC III (18/19) 95%</p> <p>Mugada HC III (21/19) 111%</p> <p>Nabisoigi HC III (21/19) 111%</p> <p>Namutumba HC III (22/19) 114%</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV (44/48) 92%.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health workers were working in the health facilities where they were deployed. Namutumba HC III had 22 H/Ws on the list dated 1/07/2022, they were found in the attendance book, Magada HC III had 21 H/Ws on the list dated 1/07/2022, they were found in the attendance book. Nsinze HC IV had 44 H/Ws on the list dated 2/08/2022, they were available in the attendance book.</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Namutumba HC III displayed 21 H/Ws on the notice board dated 1/07/2022. Magada HC III displayed 21 H/Ws dated 1/07/2022. Nsinze HC IV displayed 44 H/Ws on the notice board.</p>	2

Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

The District had 33 In Charges but there was no evidence from the 10 files sampled of appraisal being done and these included;

1. Lubiite Allan (MO – Nsinze HCIII)
2. Ndhaye Richard (SMCO-Namutumba HCIII)
3. Walujjo Emmanuel (CO-Kagulu HCIII)
4. Balikowa Robert (CO-Magada HCIII)
5. Kyaterekera Paul(SCO-Bulange HCIII)
6. Mutabuza Jeanipher (Enrolled Nurse-Bugobi HCII)
7. Idhwege Nairuba (Enrolled Midwife-Namuwondo HCII)
8. Kairanya Ronald (Enrolled Nurse – Magada HCIII)
9. Namutondo Olivia (Enrolled Nurse – Irimbi HCII)
10. Kyebajja Gorret Esther -SCO

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence found. The record obtained indicated that some were appraised after the appraisal time frame.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Waiswa Hosea (Askari) Magada HC III was appraised on 2/07/2022 and scored 4</li> <li>2. Nandeyo Halima (Porter) Magada HC III was appraised on 7/7/2022</li> <li>3. Batenda Ernest (Askari) Kagulu HC III was appraised on 5/08/2022</li> <li>4. Mutesi Betty (Nursing Assistant) Namutumba HC III was appraised on 11/08/2022</li> <li>5. Nangobi Perudasi (Nursing Assistant) Ivukulu HC III was appraised on 6/7/2022</li> <li>6. Ishadi Hellen (Porter) Magada HC III was appraised 2/07/2022</li> <li>7. Mutesi Margret (Nsinze) HC IV was appraised on 25/07/2022</li> <li>8. Mutesi Alima (Nursing Assistant) HC IV was appraised on 25/07/2022</li> <li>9. Babirye Harriet (Porter) Kagulu HC III was appraised on 5/08/2022</li> <li>10. Nandago Apofia (Nursing Assistant) Nsinze HC III was appraised on 28/07/2022</li> </ol>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no corrective action taken based on the appraisal report.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</li> </ol>	<p>The LG trained 30 H/Ws in HIV Counselling and Testing on 8-9/11/2021 at Basoga Nsadhu Memorial Technical Institute. The H/Ws trained included 6 Midwives, 16 Nurses, 5 Clinical Officers and 3 Nursing Assistants.</p>	1

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The training activity of 30 H/Ws in HIV/Counselling that took place on 8-9/11/2022 at Basoga Nsadhu Memorial Technical Institute was entered into the training data base.</p>	1
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The CAO in the e-mail sent to Brenda Apio of the MOH on 20/09/2021 communicated the 33 Health facilities that receive PHC nonwage grant.</p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services as evidenced below:</p> <p>Total PHC NWR received in FY 2021/2022 was Shs. 512,702,000 as on page 24 ABPR.</p> <p>15% of Shs. 512,702,000 was Shs; 76,905,300 which was utilized as indicated on page 27 of the ABPR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.support supervision to lower health facilities.</li> <li>2.Distribution of vaccines and health supplies</li> <li>3. RBF quantification and verification.</li> <li>4. Support to HMIS data collection and reporting.</li> <li>5. Reproductive health activities supported.</li> </ol>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	2
		<p>The LG submitted timely warrants for school's capitation grant for the previous FY as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 9/1/2022 and PHC NWR grant release was warranted on 14/1/2022 within 5 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>Q2 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 5/10/2021 and PHC NWR grant release was warranted on 7/10/2021 within 3 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>Q3 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 4/1/2022 and PHC NWR grant release was warranted on 6/1/2022 within 3 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>Q4 The LG cash limits were uploaded on 11/4/2022 and PHC NWR grant release was warranted on 14/4/2022 within 4 working days as evidenced on IFMS.</p> <p>From the observations above the LG met the 5 working days deadline as per the requirements.</p>	

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	0
		<p>The LG communicated all the quarterly PHC NWR grant transfers for the previous FY to all health facilities in charges but the assessment could not confirm whether the communication was done within the recommended 5 working days due to the LG failure to access the dates of uploading the cash limits on IFMS.</p> <p>Q1 PHC NWR funds of Shs. 100,172,946 were communicated to all the 17 health facilities in charges on 15/8/2021</p> <p>Q2 PHC NWR funds of Shs. 100,172,946 were communicated to all the 17 health facilities in charges on 22/10/2021</p> <p>Q3 PHC NWR funds of Shs.100,306,279 were communicated to all the 17 health facilities in charges on 12/1/2022</p> <p>Q4 PHC NWR funds of Shs. 100,039,614 were communicated to all the 17 health facilities in charges on 3/5/2022.</p>	

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG publicized the quarterly PHC NWR funds for the previous FY to all health facilities as evidenced on the LG notice board.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Q1 PHC NWR funds were uploaded on 9/7/2021 and the LG communicated to all health facilities on 11/8/2021 22 working days later from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.</p>	
			<p>Q2 PHC NWR funds were uploaded on 5/10/2021 and the LG communicated to all health facilities on 11/11/2021 25 working days later from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.</p>	
			<p>Q3 PHC NWR funds were uploaded on 4/1/2022 and the LG communicated to health facilities on 1/2/2022 19 working days later from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.</p>	
			<p>Q4 PHC NWR funds were uploaded on 11/4/2022 and the LG communicated to all health facilities on 5/5/2022 15 working days later from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED</p>	
			<p>From the above observation, the LG did not meet the 5 working days in all the 4 quarter of the previous FY contrary to the requirements.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands - on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The performance review meeting held at Basoga Nsadhu Memorial Institute on 30/09/2021 recommended the In-charges to up date the Integrated Child Health Days data. During the meeting that took place on 23/06/2022, it was reported that the data had been updated.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands - on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The meeting held on 23/06/2022 at Basoga Nsadhu Memorial Technical Institute was attended by among others official from USAID, MJAP and LPHS. The one held on 30/09/2021, there was no evidence of Development partners or any other person apart from health facility in-charges.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands - on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no hospital in the LG but Nsinze HC IV was supervised (23/09/21, 18/12/21, 30/03/22 &amp; 30/06/22)</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands - on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Bulange HC III, Bukonte HC III (PNFP), Namutumba HC III and Magada HC III were supervised (20/09/21, 18/12/21, 30/03/22, 30/06/22).</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands - on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>During the 3rd Quarter 2021/22 supervision on 30/03/2022 health facility In charges were urged to display duty rosters on their notice boards; the subsequent supervision that took place on 30/06/2022 Ivukula HC III, Magada HC III and Namutumba HC III were found to have displayed their duty rosters on their notice boards.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands - on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The DMMS supported Nsinze HC IV, Bulange HC III, Magada HC III in ordering, prescribing and storing medicines and health supplies (14-21/11/2021).</p>	1

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0	The LG allocated at least 30% of the DHO's budget to health promotion and prevention as indicated on page 54 of the ABPR.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		30% of Shs. 76,905,300 was Shs. 23,071,590 which was expended as evidenced on page 27 of the ABPR:	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Home improvement campaigns.</li> <li>2. Community dialogue.</li> <li>3. Water quality testing.</li> <li>4. Supervision and inspection of food houses.</li> <li>5. Orientation of SOPs in health care waste management.</li> <li>6. Covid-19 prevention and control.</li> </ol>	
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	The SHE led community dialogue meetings on Malaria, COVID-19 and Vaccination campaigns in villages like Kikalu, Nawaibite, Kabale, Bulafa among others in the 1st Quarter 2021/22.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	The ADHO/EH conducted water quality surveillance of 20 water points in the sub counties of Magada, Ivukula and Kibaale on 9/09/21.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

### Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0	The LG had an updated register that set out health facilities and equipment. Ivukula HC III had PIMA machine, Thermometer, Artery forceps. Magada HC III had BP Machine, Thermometer, artery forceps. Nsinze HC IV had operation bed, oxygen concentrator and ultra sound.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail evidence of desk appraisal conducted for all sector projects in the budget for the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail evidence of field appraisal conducted to establish compliance with technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs for the previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG health facility investments were not screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures not put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist as required</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Health department timely submitted all its infrastructure requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan,</p> <p>As per a copy of the health sector procurement plan for current FY prepared by the DHO, date of submission to PDU 20th Mar 2022 which was before 30th April as required by PPDA laws.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter FY 2022-2023 on 14th Jun 2022 the projects submitted include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of fencing of Bulange HC II</li> <li>• REnovation of Ceiling at Nangonde HCII</li> <li>• Renovation of two staff House at Nsinze HC IV</li> <li>• Renovation of Namusita HC II</li> <li>• Construction of a staff House at Magada HC III</li> <li>• Upgrading of Kiranga HC II to HC III</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no health infrastructure that was approved by the contracts committee which required clearance by the Solicitor General. Projects Included;</p> <p>Construction of a 3 stance VVIP latrine at Kagula HC III at 39,150,000/=</p> <p>Construction of a staff house at Kagula HC III at 149,864,669/=</p> <p>The cost of each project was below the threshold of 200m/= and therefore did not require clearance by the Solicitor General.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects; appointed by the CAO;</p> <p>Appointment letters for the contract manager DHO dated 06th Sep 2021 for the period from 1st July 2021 to 31st June 2022 members included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kizito Mukasa Fred (CAO)</li> <li>• Babita Harriet (Ag. DE)</li> <li>• Kambuga Frank (SAEO)</li> <li>• Bubalanda Hadad Khalif (DCDO)</li> <li>• Isiko Muhammed (DEO)</li> <li>• Kambuga Yusuf (SLO)</li> <li>• Kisanufu Yosuf (DNRO)</li> <li>• Kauma Rose Kagere (PAS)</li> <li>• Kirija James (DHO)</li> </ul>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no HC II upgraded to HC III in FY 2021/2022</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Clerk of Works maintained daily record.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no HC II upgraded to HC III in FY 2021/2022</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There Was no evidence that showed they carried out Monthly supervision by the relevant officers</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0

The DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within 2 weeks after receiving the payment requests as evidenced below:

1. Construction of a staff house at Kagulu HC III by M/s PAB Contractor Company Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 35,419,831 on 16/6/2022

DHO recommended for payment on 20/6/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 2 dated 17/6/2022 for payment of Shs.33,602,187

The Contractor was paid Shs. 21,123,716 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593630 after 9 days.

2. Construction of a staff house at Kagulu HC III by M/s PAB Contractor Company Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 59,590,222 on 17/6/2022

DHO recommended for payment on 20/6/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 3 dated 12/6/2022 for payment of Shs.56,014,809.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 56,014,809 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593630 after 9 days.

3. Construction of a staff house at Kagulu HC III by M/s PAB Contractor Company Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 52,039,634.5 on 16/6/2022

DHO recommended for payment on 16/6/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 1 dated 15/6/2022 for payment of Shs.52,039,634.5

The Contractor was paid Shs. 52,039,635 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593630 after 13 days.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. Examples include;	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00071 Construction of a 3 stance VVIP latrine at Kagula HC III. Approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was on 01st Jun 2022 under MIN: 70/NDCC/1/06/21-22-ii, awarded to PAB-Contractors Co. Ltd and contract signed on 17th Jun 2022</li> <li>• Proc Ref: Namu 574/wrks/22-23/00004 Construction of a staff house at Kagula HC III. Approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was on 11th May 2022 under MIN: 55/NDCC/11/04/21-22-i, awarded to PAB-Contractors Co. Ltd and contract signed on 04th May 2022</li> </ul>	

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0	LG had no grievances recorded under health for the previous FY but the Grievance Log was available as of July 2020	2
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0	The LG disseminated guidelines on health care waste management. WASH in Health Care Facilities 2022 was found in Nsinze HC IV, Magada HC III and Namutumba HC III.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0	The LG had a functional system for medical waste management. The health facilities like Magada HC III, Namutumba HC III and Nsinze HC IV had bin liners and placenta pits. Nsinze HC IV had an incinerator. The DHO signed the District Waste Transfer Forms with Green Label Services LTD on 15/09/22 a Registered waste management service provider.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	The LG trained 30 H/Ws in health care waste management on 5/04/2022 at Basoga Nsadhu Technical Institute. The trained included 10 EM, 6 NA, 4 EN, 5 HIA and 5 HA.	1
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	LG had no costed ESMPs incorporated bidding documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY as required	0
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	LG had no evidence that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access and availability as required	0
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	LG DEO and DCDO conducted quarterly not monthly support supervision and monitoring of health projects as required; for example,  E&S monitoring report for the construction of a staff house at Kagulu HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 30/07/2022	0
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	LG had no proof that the Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the DEO and DCDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects as required	0



No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional.  If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	From the Ministry MIS, the Percentage of functional rural water sources = 88%	1
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:  o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	From the Ministry MIS, the Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees = 99%	2
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.  If LG average scores is  a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0  (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	The LLG assessment results were under verification by the IVA at the time of assessment and hence performance could not be determined	0

Service Delivery  
Performance: Average  
score in the water and  
environment LLGs  
performance  
assessment

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

b. % of budgeted water projects  
implemented in the sub-counties  
with safe water coverage below the  
district average in the previous FY.

o If 100 % of water projects are  
implemented in the targeted S/Cs:  
Score 2

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The LG implemented 31% of the budgeted water  
projects in the FY 2021/2022 in the sub counties  
with safe water coverage below the district  
average in the FY 2020/2021

From page3 of 3 excel sheet attachment (budget  
line) of the annual progress report approved on  
8/07/2022, the total budgeted water projects  
implemented in the LG for the FY 2021/22 = 16  
(Drilling and installation of 15 deep boreholes and  
one feasibility study and design of the piped  
water scheme)

Sub counties that were below the district average  
( 57% access) in the previous FY but one include;

Bulange S/c at 49%

Ivukula S/c at 32%

Mazuba S/c at 45%

Projects implemented in the sub county with safe  
water coverage below the district average  
include;

One (1) new borehole and one feasibility study  
and design of a piped water scheme in Bulange  
S/c ,

One (1) new borehole in Ivukula S/c

One (1) new borehole in Mazuba S/c

Total number of implemented projects in sub  
counties below the average = 5

Percentage of budgeted projects implemented in  
sub counties with safe water coverage(Access)  
below the district average =  $5/16 \times 100 = 31\%$

Service Delivery  
Performance: Average  
score in the water and  
environment LLGs  
performance  
assessment

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

c. If variations in the contract price  
of sampled WSS infrastructure  
investments for the previous FY  
are within +/- 20% of engineer's  
estimates

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

From the three (3) sampled project contracts, the  
percentage contract price variations for all the  
three project contracts sampled were all within -  
+20% as follows;

Sitting , drilling and installation and platform  
casting of the 15 boreholes

Proc.Ref no. Namu574/WRKS/21-22/00015

Engineer's estimate = 315,000,000

Contract sum = 307,460,800

Percentage Variation = -2.4% equivalent to

Shs. -7,539,200

Completion of plumbing works and renovation of  
the floor for district office

Proc.Ref no. Namu574/WRKS/21-22/00016

Engineer's estimate = 74,143,000

Contract sum = 74,122,296

Percentage contract price Variation = -0.03%  
equivalent to

-20,704

Consultancy service for design piped water  
supply system

Proc.Ref no. Namu574/WRKS/21-22/00014

Engineer's estimate = 54,240,000

Contract sum = 54,000,000

Percentage Variation = -0.4% equivalent to

Shs. -240,000

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From page 3 of 3 excel sheet attachment (Summary of the planned activities) of the AWP for the previous FY approved on 19/8/2021, the LG planned to drill fifteen (15) new boreholes, completion of the plumbing and renovation of water office block and conduct a feasibility study and design of a piped water supply system . Page 3 of 3 of the annual progress report approved on 08/07/2022 indicated that, all the fifteen (15) new boreholes, a feasibility study and design of a piped water supply scheme and completion of the plumbing and renovation of the DWO block were implemented and completed in the FY 2021/22.</p> <p>Total number of planned projects = 17</p> <p>Total projects implemented = 17</p> <p>Percentage of projects completed as per the AWP = <math>17/17 \times 100 = 100\%</math></p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If there is an increase: score 2</li> <li>o If no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>From the Ministry MIS, there was no increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/21 and 2021/22.</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2020/21 = 88%</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2021/22 = 88%</p> <p>Percentage change = 0%</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</li> <li>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</li> <li>o If there is no increase : score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>From the Ministry MIS, there was no increase in the percentage of rural water and sanitation facilities with functional committees.</p> <p>Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committee in the FY 2020/21 = 99%</p> <p>Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committee in the FY 2021/22 = 99%</p> <p>Percentage change = 0%</p>	0

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance

*Maximum 3 points on this performance measure*

The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3

The DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities was as reported.

From page 3 of 3 of the excel attachment to the annual progress report approved on 08/07/2022, the DWO drilled and installed 15 deep boreholes in the FY 2021/2022, completed the plumbing and renovation of the DWO block and conducted the feasibility study and design of the piped water system.

Findings from the field visit of the three sampled projects showed that all projects were in place and functional, boreholes were well protected/fenced with no deep latrines in the radius of 30m, trees/vegetation were planted around, water yield and water quality was visually good and all had functional WUCs.

The 3 sampled projects include

- Nabutyerera village borehole (DWD No. 78941) completed on 17th/06/2022 and found in Bulange S/c.
- Bumbala community borehole (DWD No. 78934) completed on 13/06/2022 and found in Mazuba S/c.
- Bugomba village borehole (DWD No. 78940) completed on 17th/06/2022 and found in Ivukula S/c.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG water office collected and compiled quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation as evidenced below.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report was submitted on 15/10/2021 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on page 2 of the report.</p> <p>Similarly quarter 2 report was submitted on 14/01/2022 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on page 2 of the report.</p> <p>Quarter 3 report was submitted on 14/04/2022 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on page 3.</p> <p>Quarter 4 report was submitted on 08/07/2022 with form ones for all the 15 new deep bore holes drilled in the previous FY 2021/2022 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on page 2,4 and 12</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG Water Office updated the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities. The MIS was last updated in July/2022 with new functionality date and the 15 new boreholes</p>	3
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The assessment had just been concluded in the current FY 2022/2023 and therefore there was no performance improvement plans for the lowest performing LLGs</p>	0

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that DWO budgeted for staff totaling to UGX. 35,171,184. The Staff include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kagwa Abey (Water Officer)</li> <li>2. Mukama Samuel (Borehole Maintenance technician)</li> <li>3. Tiwuwe Harriet (Secretary)</li> </ol>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Environment and Natural Resources Officer budgeted for all staff totaling to UGX. 92,000,000. The staff budgeted for include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ikaaba Dauda (DNRO)</li> <li>2. Kiirya Moses (Environment Officer)</li> <li>3. Samanya Paul (Physical Planner)</li> <li>4. Bamusubiire William (Forest Officer)</li> <li>5. Nkuma Robert (Forest Ranger)</li> <li>6. Kikonge Richard (Forest Guard)</li> </ol>	2
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>No evidence. The staff were two but not appraised and they included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kagwa Abey (Water Officer)</li> <li>2. Mukama Samuel (BMT)</li> </ol>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>The District Water Office identified Capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and submitted the capacity needs to the PHRO in a letter dated 13th/08/2021, the training plan was in place but the plan did not cater for the water office capacity needs, the training was not conducted (no training reports and capacity needs assessment report was availed for assessment).</p>	0

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

- a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:
- 
- If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3
- If 80-99%: Score 2
- If 60-79: Score 1
- If below 60 %: Score 0

From page 3 of 3 of the excel sheet attachment (Budget line) to the AWP for the current FY approved on 16th/07/2022, the DWO allocated 46% of the budget to the four sub counties below the district average

Sub counties that were below the district average(58%) in the FY 2021/2022 include;

Bulange S/c at 48%

Ivukula S/c at 31%

Mazuba S/c at 44%

The DWO allocated One (1) new borehole and one piped water supply system to Bulange S/c all amounting to 218 ,965,062

Two (2) new boreholes amounting to 40,400,000 to Ivukula S/c

One (1) new borehole amounting to 20,200,000 to Mazuba S/c

Total project budget for sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average = 279,565,062

Page 3 of 3 of the budget line attachment to AWP approved on 29/07/2022 indicated that the LG planned to Drill and install 17 boreholes amounting to 343,400,000, partial construction of a piped water supply system amounting to 198,765,062 and drilling of a production well amounting to 62,420,000

Total water source project Budget for all the sub counties = 604,585,062

Percentage budget allocation to sub counties below the district average =  $279,565,062 / (604,585,062) * 100 = 46\%$



Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3

The DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY in the letter of communication made on 31/05/2022 on the district and sub county notice boards. The allocations were as below;

The DWO allocated two (2) new boreholes to Ivukula S/c amounting to 40,400,000, two (2) new boreholes to Nangonde S/c amounting to 40,400,000, and a piped water supply system amounting to 196,765,063, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Bugobi S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Kagulu S/c, one bore hole and a 4-stance latrine all amounting to 41,300,000 to Kiwanyi S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Magada S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Mazuba S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Nabweyo S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Nawaikona S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Nsinze, S/c, two (2) new boreholes to Namutumba S/c amounting to 40,400,000 among other allocations.

Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)

- If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4

- If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2

- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

The District Water Office monitored on average 95% WSS facilities quarterly as follows;

From the List of water and sanitation projects (form 4), and DWO MIS, Namutumba LG had 694 water and sanitation facilities. From the first Quarter monitoring report dated 30/09/2021, the DWO monitored 676 sources out of the total equivalent to 97%.

In the second (2) quarter monitoring report dated 20/12/2021, the DWO monitored 612 facilities equivalent to 88%.

In the third (3) quarter monitoring report, the DWO monitored 676 facilities out of 1193 equivalent to 97%.

In the fourth (4) quarter monitoring report dated 01/06/2022, the DWO monitored 666 WSS facilities equivalent to 96%.

Average =  $(96+97+88+97)/4=95\%$

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and discussed the key issue presented in the monitoring reports.</p> <p>The following quarterly minutes for DWSCC quarterly meetings were in place with rehabilitation and water user committee training needs discussed;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter 1 DWSCC minutes dated 29th/09/2021 with key issues discussed under action point No.2 of the minute.</li> <li>2. Quarter 2 DWSCC minutes dated 9/12/2021 with key issues discussed on under Min.Q2/21-22/04</li> <li>3. Quarter 3 DWSCC minutes dated 30/03/2022 with key issues discussed minute Coord/30/03/05.</li> </ol> <p>Quarter 4 DWSCC minutes dated 23/06/2022 with key issues discussed Coord/28/06/05</p> <p>The remedial actions of borehole rehabilitations were incorporated in the approved current FY AWP and 17 borehole Were to be drilled in this current FY together with training of the water user committees.</p>	2
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO publicized the budget allocations to the LLGs in the current FY in the letter of communication made on 31/05/2022 on the district and sub county notice boards. The allocations were as below;</p> <p>The DWO allocated two (2) new boreholes to Ivukula S/c amounting to 40,400,000, two (2) new boreholes to Nangonde S/c amounting to 40,400,000, and a piped water supply system amounting to 196,765,063, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Bugobi S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Kagulu S/c ,one bore hole and a 4-stance latrine all amounting to 41,300,000 to Kiwanyi S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Magada S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Mazuba S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Nabweyo S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Nawaikona S/c, one bore hole amounting to 20,200,000 to Nsinze , S/c, two (2) new boreholes to Namutumba S/c amounting to 40,400,000 among other allocations.</p>	2
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:  • If funds were allocated score 3  • If not score 0	The DWO allocated 53% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget greater than 40% to mobilization activities.  Page 2 of 3 of the excel sheet attachment to the AWP approved on 19/08/2021 a long side page 2 of 3 of the budget line attachment to annual progress report for the FY 2021/2022 indicated that, the DWO allocated 40,234,500/= equivalent to 53% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget (76,049,422/=) towards mobilization activities	<b>3</b>
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.	There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the Community Development Officer established and trained WSCs on their roles on O &M of WSS facilities  From the software report for the previous FY 2021/2022 dated 30/06/2022 and item 6.5 of the budget line/excel sheet attachment to the APR, 15 new WUCs was formed and trained as indicated in the training reports dated 5/10/2021 and 12/11/2021  For the sampled WSS in Mazuba S/c, Bulange S/c and Ivukula S/c, the 3 sampled members of the WSCs was able to remember the training that was given to them about the O & M including daily cleaning of the water source, fencing the water sources and collection of the water user fees of 1000 per household.	<b>3</b>
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

**Investment Management**

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:  Score 4 or else 0	There was evidence of existence of an updated LG asset register which set out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG.  The DWO presented an updated asset register that was last updated in the FY 2021/2022 with the 15 new borehole water sources constructed in the previous FY 2021/2022.	<b>4</b>
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG DWO conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget. The AWP for the current FY 2021/2022 indicated that 17 new deep boreholes, one production well, a piped water supply system and a 4-stance lined pit latrine were to be implemented the current FY 2022/2023 and the desk appraisal report indicated that all these investments were derived from the approved district development plan approved on 06/05/2021 on page 175-176 and were eligible for expenditure under the DWSCG and UGIFT guidelines.</p>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>All the 15 boreholes that were to be implemented in the current FY had application forms and some applications were for those communities that had requested for boreholes before the previous FY 2020/2021 and in the previous FY 2021/2022 and did not get the opportunity for a water source due to limited financial resource at the district, their requests were to be considered in the current FY 2022/2023 as below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application for a borehole by Ituba B village community in Namutumba S/c dated 23/06/2022</li> <li>• Application for a borehole by Budatu village community in Nabweyo S/c dated 17/02/2022</li> <li>• Application for a borehole by Kyalla village community in Magada S/c dated 15/2/2018</li> <li>• Application for a borehole by Namutumba Seed Secondary school in Nawampandu Village, Namutumba S/c dated 02/12/2020</li> <li>• Application for a borehole by ST.Matia SS in Magada S/c dated 24/08/2017</li> <li>• Application for a borehole by Namutumba H/C III in Namutumba S/c dated 09/04/2021 among others.</li> </ul>	2

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted field appraisals for all the current FY 2022/23 water projects.</p> <p>The DWO presented the following reports;</p> <p>A feasibility study reports for the 17 boreholes that was to be drilled in the current FY 2022/23 dated 12/07/2022, Feasibility study report for the partial construction of the piped water system dated 08/07/2022 and a feasibility study report dated 18/07/2022 for the construction of the 4-stance lined pit latrine. All the 15 boreholes to be drilled, the piped water system and the 4-stance lined pit latrine for the current FY 2022/23 were screened for technical, environmental and social acceptability and all were feasible to be implemented on their respective sites.</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>LG had no proof that water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts by the DEO&amp;DCDO as required</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure investments for Current FY were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan endorsed by CAO on 30th Jun 2022; Sampled projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partial Construction of Piped water system at Bubusa in Bulanga S/C Phase 1</li> <li>• Motorised drilling, Csting and installation of 17 hand Pumped deep wells and one Production well</li> <li>• Construction of a 4 stance Pit latrine at Buwindi RGC</li> <li>• Piped water connection to DWO block</li> </ul>	2

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction  
Score 2:

There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure projects for the previous FY were approved by the contracts committee before commencement as indicated below.

Completion of Plumbing works and Renovation of floor for District water office Ref: Namu574/wrks/21-22/00016 approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was done on 29th Sep 2021 Under 16/NDCC/29/09/2021-22-ii

Feasibility study, design and tender documentation of Busira piped water supply scheme. Proc Ref: Namu574/Srvs/21-22/00014 approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was done on 29th Sep 2021 Under 16/NDCC/29/09/2021-22-x

Drilling of 14 deep wells Proc Ref: Namu574/wrks/21-22/00015 approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was done on 29th Sep 2021 Under 16/NDCC/29/09/2021-22-i

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines  
Score 2:

There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure projects for the previous FY were approved by the contracts committee and appointment made by the CAO on 25th Nov 2021 but the appointments left out the Environmental Officer and the Labour Officer;

- Kizito Mukasa Fred (CAO)
- Babita Harriet (Ag. DE)
- Bubalanda Hadad Khalif (DCDO)
- Ikaaba Dauda (DNRO)
- Naabye Henry (DP)
- Kisanufu Yosuf (SPO)
- Kauma Rose Kagere (PAS)
- Kagwa Abey (DWO)

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs. The three (3) sampled projects include;</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nabutyerera village borehole (DWD No. 78941) completed on 17th/06/2022 and found in Bulange S/c.</li> <li>• Bumbala community borehole (DWD No. 78934) completed on 13/06/2022 and found in Mazuba S/c.</li> <li>• Bugomba village borehole (DWD No. 78940) completed on 17th/06/2022 and found in Ivukula S/c.</li> </ul>	
			<p>All projects were in place and functional, boreholes were well protected with no deep latrines in the radius of 30m, trees were planted around, water quality and yield was generally good and it had a functional WUCs.</p>	
			<p>For the sampled borehole drilling contract (Namu574/Wrks/21-22/00015), BOQS specifications indicated that the contractor adopted the design A method of the hand pumps found in the standard technical design manual for LG</p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no sufficient evidence that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects. The following supervision reports and site meeting minutes were reviewed but there was no evidence that the Environment officer, the district Engineer and the CDO supervised the WSS projects.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>The supervision report dated 30/March/2022 for the drilling, test pumping, casting and installation of 15 deep bore holes, Supervision report dated 28/May/2022 for drilling, test pumping, casting and installation of 15 deep bore holes, Supervision report dated 20/June/2022 for drilling, test pumping, casting and installation of 15 deep bore holes, Minutes of site meeting held on 21/04/2022 for the design of piped water supply system for Bubusa Community in Bulange S/c and Minutes of site meeting dated 08/02/2022 for the completion of the plumbing works and renovation of the DWO block.</p>	

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts

o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2

o If not score 0

The DWO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within the specified time frames after receiving the payment requests as evidenced in the 3 sampled contracts below:

1. Siting, Drilling, Casting & Installation of 3 Deep Wells under FY 2020/2021 Lot 2 by M/s KAL-UGANDA Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 2,970,102 on 15/11/2021

Certificate No. 3 dated 22/12/2021 for Shs. 13,370,440

DWO verified the works and initiated payment to the contractor but on a date, which was not evidenced on the certificate at the time of assessment.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 13,370,440 on 29/4/2022 vide EFT No. 42952353. Not possible to establish timeliness of payment.

2. Siting Motorized drilling, Casting and Installation of 14 hand pumped Deep Wells under Procurement Ref. No. Namu 574/Works/21-22/00015 by M/s KAL-UGANDA Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 313,759,388 on 8/6/2022

DE certified certificate No. 2 dated 2/6/2022 for payment of Shs. 313,759,388

DWO recommended for payment on 8/6/2022.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 251,696,910 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 4459725 after 21 days.

3. Completion of plumbing works and renovation of floor for Water Office by M/s PAB Contractor Company Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 4,307,000 on 13/6/2022

DWO recommended for payment on 17/6/2022.

Certificate No. 2 for Retention dated 17/6/2022 for payment of Shs. 3,846,151

The Contractor was paid Shs. 3,846,151 on 29/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44593724 after 13 days.



12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Th DLG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;</p> <p>Sampled contracts</p> <p>Completion of Plumbing works and Renovation of floor for District water office Ref: Namu574/wrks/21-22/00016 approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was done on 29th Sep 2021 Under 16/NDCC/29/09/2021-22-ii, the contract was given to Native Investments Ltd and the contract was signed on 10th Nov 2021.</p> <p>Consultancy services for design of piped water System. Proc Ref: Namu574/Srvs/21-22/00014 approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was done on 29th Sep 2021 Under 16/NDCC/29/09/2021-22-x, the contract was given to Virmar Technical Investments Ltd and the contract was signed on 10th Nov 2021.</p> <p>Drilling of 14 deep wells Proc Ref: Namu574/wrks/21-22/00015 approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was done on 29th Sep 2021 Under 16/NDCC/29/09/2021-22-l, the contract was given to KLR (U) Ltd and the contract was signed on 3rd Mar 2022.</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>LG had one registered grievance under health as evidenced below;</p> <p>Wamutala Chrostopher of Makwi Village Vs the District Water Office over shifting of a bore hole from Makwi Village to Kabira Village received verbally by the DWO on 16/03/2021 and redressed the GRC in the meeting held on 30/06/2021 at Council Hall under item 4 on the Agenda, minute No. 4/30/6/2021 (way forward)</p>	3
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>LG had disseminated the guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management by the DNRO evidenced by the minutes of the social mobilisers meeting on 14/09/2022, item 05 on the agenda, minute SOC/14/09/04 (dissemination of guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management)</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>LG had no evidence that the water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared as required</p>	0

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:

Score 3, If not score 0

There was evidence that all WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent;

The LG implemented 15 deep boreholes in the previous FY2021/2022 and all had land agreements as listed below;

- Land agreement form for Kisiro North Village borehole located in signed on 20/01/2022 by Taabu Stephen as the land owner
- Land agreement form for the borehole located at Makwi Village in Nangonde S/c signed on 12/05/2022 by Parachu Jacob as the land owner
- Land agreement form for Nawangisa B village borehole located in Kibaale S/c signed on 09/05/2022 by Mudhe Patrick as the land owner
- Land agreement form for Kisimo village borehole located in Kisuba S/c signed on 08/05/2022 by Namugoya as the land owner
- Land agreement form for Nawansalya village borehole located in Kiwanyi S/c signed on 28/04/2022 by Isabirye George as the land owner
- Land agreement form for Bumbala village borehole located in Mazuba S/c signed on 30/04/2022 by Namukuya as the land owner
- Land agreement form for Bugomba village borehole located in Ivukula S/c signed on 01/05/2022.
- Land agreement form for Kibaale A village borehole located in kibaale S/c signed on 04/05/2022 by Ayazaka John as the land owner
- Land agreement form for Buyanga P/S village borehole located in Nawaikona S/c signed on 27/04/2022 by Sabuka Dominic as the land owner among others

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>E&amp;S Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and DCDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/ certificates at interim and final stages of projects evidenced by the E&amp;S Certification of the following projects by the DEO &amp; DCDO;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Certification of 1,040,000/= LOT 1 for the proposed sitting, drilling, casting and installation of 13 boreholes in 13 villages in Namutumba district by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 28/02/2022S</li> <li>• E&amp;S Certification of 1,040,000/= LOT 2 for the proposed sitting, drilling, casting and installation of 13 boreholes in 13 villages in Namutumba district by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 28/02/2022S</li> <li>• E&amp;S Certification of 1,040,000/= for the proposed completion of plumbing works and renovation of the office floor for the district water department by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 02/02/2022</li> </ul>	2
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The DCDO and DEO undertook quarterly monitoring and NOT monthly monitoring as required, for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Monitoring Report for the catchment afforestation on 15 borehole sites in Namutumba DLG DEO&amp;DCDO on 30/06/2022</li> </ul>	0

Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG as at the time of assessment 2021/2022</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	There were 20 LLG's in the District and each was supposed to have two extension workers which would translate to 40. However, findings indicated that some were not yet recruited. In the year of assessment, the LG had 10 operational LLGs and recruitment of extension workers was at 100%	2
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG as at the time of assessment.2021/2022	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022	0

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that information on position of extension workers filled was accurate. It was observed and confirmed from the 3 sampled and visited LLG's Staff List and Approved Structure (Namutumba TC, Mazuba and Magada)</p> <p>1. Kayuza Donald was the Agriculture Officer (AO) in Mazuba S/C.</p> <p>2. Nyombi Abdul was the Agriculture Officer (AO) in Namutumba TC</p> <p>3. Lubiite Micheal was the Veterinary officer (AO) at Magada S/C</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG as at the time of assessment.2021/2022</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022</p>	0

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment.2021/2022	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The LG had budgeted for 275,170,131/=shillings for 21 extension of workers as per the for micro-scale prepared by DPO and approved by CAO	1
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had deployed 21 extension workers as per the guidelines as evidenced by the staff list dated 16/05/22</p> <p>Isiiko Mailoux Animal husbandry officer -Nangonde S/C</p> <p>Baitenswa Charles -Agricultural officer-Bulange S/C</p> <p>Manyasi Fahadi -Agricultural officer-Ivukula S/C-</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that extension workers were working in LLG where they were deployed.</p> <p>1. Kikoby Elizabeth (AO) in Magada S/C reported for work at 8; 80am on 11/08/2022.</p> <p>2. Nyombi Abdul (AO) in Namutumba TC reported for work at 8:26am on 25/11/2022</p> <p>3. Kayuza Donald (AO) at Mazuba C/C reported for work at 8:20am on 15/11/2022</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that extension worker's deployment and staff lists were publicized and displayed on the Notice Boards of Namutumba TC, Magada SC and Mazuba SC</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			



8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>No evidence. 10 files were sampled for review but findings indicated that none of them was appraised. For stance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Isiiko Eliphias (Animal Husbandry Officer) Namutumba TC</li> <li>2. Kikoby Elizabeth (AO) Magada S/C</li> <li>3. Isiiko Jafali (AO) Nsinze S/C</li> <li>4. Kisubi Fred (AO) Namutumba S/C</li> <li>5. Nyombi Abdul (AO) Nabweyo S/C</li> <li>6. Lubiite Micheal (Assistant Vet Officer) Namutumba TC</li> <li>7. Mugaba Ivan (AO) Nangonde S/C</li> <li>8. Manyasi fahadi (AO) Ivukula S/C</li> <li>9. Luwenda Joel (Assistant Vet Officer) Kibaale S/C</li> <li>10. Nakiyaga Jesca (AO) Kizuba S/C</li> </ol>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence found</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022</p>	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.**

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Namutumba was a phase 2 DLG where 100% was complementary services at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that budget allocations made towards complementary services were in line with the sector guidelines as below  LG awareness creation 15%- Shs (41,275,520/=)  Farmer awareness creation 40%- Shs110,068,052/=  Irrigation demonstrations 30%- Shs82,551,039/=  Farm visits 15%- Shs41,275,520/=	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The co-funding was not reflected in the LG Budget at the time of assessment FY 2021/2022	0
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022</p>	0

10 Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines

c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0

Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022

0

Maximum score 8

10 Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines

d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0

Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022

0

Maximum score 8

11 Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.

a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0

Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022.

0

Maximum score 4

11 Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.

b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0

Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022

0

Maximum score 4

### Investment Management

12 Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines

a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0

Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022

0

Maximum score 8

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence found</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan endorsed by the CAO on approved on 30th Jun 2022 for the current FY stated as;  Supply and Installation of irrigation Kits to four Model farmers</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no list of pre-qualified suppliers by MAAIF because Micro irrigation wasn't operational in FY 2021/2022</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evaluation because Micro irrigation wasn't operational in FY 2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	There were no projects approved by the Contracts committee because Micro irrigation wasn't operational in FY 2021/2022	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	There were no contracts signed because Micro irrigation wasn't operational in FY 2021/2022	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	No procurement files because Micro irrigation wasn't operational in FY 2021/2022	2

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	LG had not displayed a list of details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently on the notice board of the production department	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	LG had no grievance recorded because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022	1
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	LG had no grievance investigated because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022	1
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	LG had no grievance responded to because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022	1
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	LG had no grievance reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022	1

### Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	Not applicable for Namutumba DLG at the time of assessment for FY.2021/2022	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---



15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	LG had no ESMPs prepared because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	LG had not carried out monthly Monitoring of irrigation impacts because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	LG had no EELS Certification forms completed and signed by DEO because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	LG had no EELS Certification forms completed and signed by DCDO because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022.	0

Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum  
Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The position wasn't formerly filled at the time of assessment. However, Byetaka Tonny was appointed by CAO as Ag. Senior Agriculture Engineer from 1/07/2022</p>	<b>0</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p><i>score 30 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>• Not Applicable (N/A) at the time of assessment because there were no micro scale irrigation investments in FY 2021/2022</p>	<b>0</b>

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Kagwa Abey (Water Officer) was appointed by CAO on 29/10/2008 Ref; CR/Per/156 under MIN NO. KLR/DSC/450/2008	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	N/A on the approved structure but CAO went and appointed Aliba Lydia as the Ag. Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization effective 15/11/2016	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mukama Samuel (Bore Hole) was appointed by CAO on 1/03/2010 Ref; CR/PER/156 under MIN NO. KLR/DSC/871 (j)/2010	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	This position was vacant at the time of assessment	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kiirya Moses was appointed by CAO on 1/01/2022 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/310/20/12/2021 (C ) (3)	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Bamusubire William was appointed by CAO on 21/05/2019 Ref: CR/HR/156/1 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/181/17/05/2019 (c ) 1	10

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	<p>LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed sitting, drilling, casting and installation of a borehole at Bukonte Village by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 07/03/2022</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed sitting, drilling, casting and installation of a borehole at Bubago Village by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 12/03/2022</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed sitting, drilling, casting and installation of a borehole at Bugomba Village by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 21/03/2022</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed sitting, drilling, casting and installation of a borehole at Buyugu Village by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 07/03/2022</li> </ul>	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	<p>All water projects that were executed in FY 2021/2022 did not require ESIAs given their small scope according to the National Environment Act No. 05 of 2019, hence costed ESMP was prepared by the DEO&amp;DCDO as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costed ESMP of 20,900,000/= for the proposed sitting, drilling, casting and installation of 15 deep wells in 15 villages including Bukonte, Bubago, Bugomba, Buyugu, among others by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 08/11/2021</li> </ul>	10

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

The LG did not implement any piped water supply system in the Previous FY 2021/2022 that may have required an abstraction permit.

Health Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kiirya James (DHO) was appointed by CAO on 1/04/2012 Ref: CR/Per/160 under MIN NO.KLR/DSC/038/2012 (IV) 6</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Ssegonga Margret was appointed by CAO on 1/06/2019 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/181/17/05/2019 (b) (2)</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Nakalama Susan was appointed by CAO on 1/06/2019 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/181/17/05/2019 (b) (1)</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Magoola Yakubu was appointed by CAO on 1/06/2019 Ref: CR/HR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/182/17/05/2019 (b) 1</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Balisanyuka Ronald was appointed by CAO on 1/06/2019 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/181/17/05/2019 (b) (3)</p>	10

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	Isabirye Julius was appointed by CAO on 18/01/2016 Ref: CR/Per/156/2 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/229/12/06/2015 (i)	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	Malunda Gerald was appointed by CAO on 2/12/2020 Ref: CR/Per/156 under MIN NO. KLR/DSC/1062 (ii) 2010/1	10
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0		

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)  Maximum score is 30	If the LG carried out:  a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	LG had no proof that the Environmental, Social and Climate Change for Health projects in 2021/2022 FYwere done as required	0
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)

Maximum score is 30

b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.

None of the Health projects executed in FY 2021/2022 required ESIAs given their small scope according to the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019, hence costed ESMP for health projects were meant to be prepared and signed by the DEO&DCDO which was not the case.



No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.</p> <p><i>The Maximum Score of 70</i></p>	<p>a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0</p>	<p>Isiko Muhammed (DEO) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2019 Ref: CR/HR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/139/18/12/2018 (a) (1)</p>	30
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.</p> <p><i>The Maximum Score of 70</i></p>	<p>b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.</p>	<p>All District Inspector of schools were substantively recruited and these include;</p> <p>1) Kalisengawa Fred (Senior Inspector of Schools) was appointed by CAO on 15/01/2013 Ref: CR/Per/161 under NTB/DSC/41/2012 (d)</p> <p>2) Hamba Godfrey (Inspector) was appointed by CAO on 1/03/2022 Ref: CR/HR/ 160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/317/03/02/2022 (a) 1</p> <p>3) Kiirya Ronald (Inspector) was appointed by CAO on 1/03/2022 Ref: CR/HR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/317/03/02/2022 (a) 2</p> <p>4) Mugoya Robert (Inspector) was appointed by CAO on 1/03/2022 Ref: CR/HR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/310/20/12/2021 (ii) (1)</p>	40
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p><i>The Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening of all education projects prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects as evidenced below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Buyange P/S by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 01/03/2021</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kagulu P/S by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 01/03/2021</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Ivukula P/S by the DEO&amp;DCDO on 02/03/2021</li> </ul>	15

Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.

All DDEG projects implemented in 2021/2022 FY did not require ESIAs given their small scope, according to the National Environment Act NO. 05 of 2019, costed ESMPs were conducted as follows;

- Costed ESMP of 700,000/= for the proposed construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Buyange P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 10/03/2021
- Costed ESMP of 700,000/= for the proposed construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kagulu P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 01/03/2021

Crosscutting Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Basalirwa George (CFO) was appointed by CAO on 26/02/2008 Ref: CR/Per/156 under MIN NO. 10/DSC/2008	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Naabye Henry (District Planner) was appointed by CAO on 13/12/2019 Ref: CR/156/2 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/222/13/12/2019 (1)	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The position wasn't substantively filled, however Ms. Babita Harriet was the Ag. District Engineer from 1/02/2019 to date	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Ikaaba Dauda (DNRO) was appointed by CAO on 1/11/2021 Ref: CR/HR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/301/22/10/2021 (b) (2)	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Musita Augustus (DPO) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2019 Ref: CR/HR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/139/18/12/2018 (b) (2)	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the  District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Babalanda Khalif-Al-Hadad (DCDO) was appointed by CAO on 1/01/2022 Ref:CR/HR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/311/10/12/2021 (b) (2)	3

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Waako Stephen (DCO) was appointed by CAO on 1/11/2021 Ref: CR/HR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/30/22/10/2021 (a) 1</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kasanafu Yusuf (SPO) was appointed by CAO on 10/04/2014 Ref: CR/Per/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/157/19/3/2014 (1) (i)</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Teefe Susan (PO) was appointed by CAO on 12/03/2019 Ref: CR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/ 170/01/03/2019 (ii) C 1</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kagoya Zainabu (PHRO) was appointed by CAO on 1/06/2018 Ref: CR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/112/14/05/2018 (b) 5</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Nabangi Stephen (SA) was appointed by CAO on 13/06/2017 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/44/02/06/2017 (b) (i)</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Ziraba Moses (PIA) was appointed by CAO on 6/03/2008 Ref: CR/Per/156 under MIN NO. 15/DSC/2008</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Ivaibi Charles (PHRO-DSC) was appointed by CAO on 1/05/2017 Ref: CR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/9/11/01/2017 (a)</p>	2
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>The LG had 10 LLGs and all the SAS's were substantively recruited. However, due to poor records management, only 6 files were provided for review as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kwajja Bumali Hissa (Kibaale S/C) was appointed by CAO on 05/04/2017 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (a) (I)</li> <li>2. Balimumiti Ali (Bulange S/C) was appointed by CAO on 1/06/2015 Ref: CR/Per/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/218/1/06/2015 (V)</li> <li>3. Higenyi Hassan (Nsinze S/C) was appointed by CAO on 1/06/2015 Ref: CR/Per/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/218/1/06/2015 (iii)</li> <li>4. Nsambi Alex (Nsinze TC) was appointed by CAO on 4/04/2008 Ref: CR/Per/156 under MIN NO. 26/DSC/2008</li> <li>5. Busiba Rogers (Ivukula S/C) was appointed by CAO on 05/04/2017 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (a) (2)</li> <li>6. Mwemeke Juliet (Nabweyo) was appointed by CAO on 13/06/2017 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/45/02/06/2017 (a) (i)</li> </ol>	0

New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.

All CDO's were formerly recruited and they include;

1. Muguywa Enock (CDO-Ivukula) was appointed by CAO on 5/04/2017 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO.  
NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (e ) (1)
2. Waiswa Sulaiman (CDO-Nabweyo) was appointed by CAO on 10/04/2014 under MIN NO. CR/Per/156  
NTB/DSC/157/19/3/2014 (2)
3. Kairu Nicholas (CDO-Bulange) was appointed by CAO on 14/12/2015 Ref: CR/Per/156 under MIN NO.NTB/DSC/237/10/11/2015 (i)
4. Nakaziba Mary (CDO-Magada) was appointed by CAO on 5/04/2017 Ref: CR/156 under MIN NO.  
NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (e ) (2)
5. Tafanika Cissy (Namutumba TC) was appointed by CAO on 1/09/2009 Ref: CR/Per/156 under MIN NO. KLR/DSC/758 (XV)/2009
6. Were Nelson (Mazuba) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2021 Ref; CR/HR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/262/22/12/2020 (b) (28)
7. Kweita Philip (Senior CDO-HQ) was appointed by CAO on 1/05/2022 Ref: CR/HR/160 under MIN NO.  
NTB/DSC/330/26/04/2022 (a) (i)

New\_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.

All Senior Accounts Assistants or Accounts Assistants were recruited formerly and included;

1. Kagulire Fred (SAA-Mazuba) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2019 Ref: CR/156/2 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/141/18/12/2018 (b) (3)

2. Babirye Sarah (Accounts Assistant – Nangonde) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2019 Ref: CR/Per/156 under MIN NO. KLR/DSC/688 (n)/2009

3. Balugambire Godfrey (SAA-Magada) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2019 Ref: CR/HR/160 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/139/18/12/2018 (c) (5)

4. Gasatu Prossy (SAA-Ivukula) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2019 Ref: CR/156/2 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/141/18/12/2018 (b) (4)

5. Namwano Samuel (SAA-Bulange) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2019 Ref: CR/156/2 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/141/18/12/2018 (b) (2)

6. Nyiiro Patrick (Accounts Assistant-Namutumba S/C) was appointed by CAO on 1/06/2009 Ref: CR/Per/156 under MIN NO. KLR/DSC/688 (n)/2009

7. Nakimansi Adija (Accounts Assistant-Namutumba TC) was appointed by CAO on 1/02/2021 Ref: CR/HR/156 under MIN NO. NTB/DSC/262/22/12/2020 (b) (32)

### Environment and Social Requirements

3

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

The allocated funds for Natural Resources department in the previous FY were Shs.164,202,725 as on page 16 of the draft AFS for FY 2021/2022.

Actual funds released were Shs. 128,292,273 as indicated on page 22 of the draft AFS representing 78.1%.

0

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>The allocated funds for Community Based department in the previous FY were Shs. 800,909,986 as on page 22 of the draft AFS for FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>Actual funds released were Shs. 764,939,656 as indicated on page 16 of the draft AFS representing 95.5%.</p>	0
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>LG carried out Environment and Social Screening of DDEG projects for FY 2021-2022 evidenced by the E&amp;S Screening Forms that were prepared and signed respectively by the DDEO &amp; DDCDO as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed construction of a five-stance pit latrine at Bulagala P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 01/03/2021</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed construction of five stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 05/03/2021</li> <li>• E&amp;S Screening form for the proposed partial completion of District Administration Block Phase V by the DEO and DCDO on 02/11/2021</li> </ul>	4



4

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),

score 4 or 0

All DDEG projects that were implemented in the FY 2021/2022 did not require ESIs given their small scope according to the National Environment Act No. 05 of 2019, hence costed ESMPs were prepared and signed by the DDEO & DDCDO as detailed below;

- Costed ESMP of 700,000/= for the proposed construction of a five-stance pit latrine at Bulagala P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 01/03/2021
- Costed ESMP of 700,000/= for the proposed construction of five stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 08/03/2021
- Costed ESMP of 500,000/= for the proposed partial completion of District Administration Block Phase V by the DEO and DCDO on 15/07/2021

4

4

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.

Maximum score is 12

c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;

score 4 or 0

LG had Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) which were prepared and signed respectively by the DDEO & DDCDO as follows;

- Costed ESMP of 700,000/= for the proposed construction of a five-stance pit latrine at Bulagala P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 01/03/2021
- Costed ESMP of 700,000/= for the proposed construction of five stance lined pit latrine at Irimbi P/S by the DEO and DCDO on 08/03/2021
- Costed ESMP of 500,000/= for the proposed partial completion of District Administration Block Phase V by the DEO and DCDO on 15/07/2021

4

## Financial management and reporting

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;	The LG had a clean audit opinion "Unqualified" for FY 2021/2022.	10
	Maximum score is 10	If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5		
		If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0		
6	Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).	If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),	The LG provided information to PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General's findings for FY 2020/2021 on 17/5/2022 Ref. CR/Fin/106 later than the mandatory deadline of 28/2/2022 as per the PFMA 2015 11 2g.	0
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.	The IAG findings which were responded to include the following;	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missing funds for Mpulira Farmers Association of Shs. 65,560,000.</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-performance of the District Coordination Team.</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-disposal of assets as recommended by BoS.</li> </ul>	
			In addition, responses to PS/ST on findings of the Auditor General for FY 2020/2021 were also belatedly submitted on 17/5/2022 beyond the mandatory date of 28/2/2022 as per provisions of PFMA 2015 section 11 2 g.	
			The findings of the AG which were responded to by Accounting Officer included the following:	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underpayment of Pension/gratuity of Shs.3,970,280</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under payment of salary of Shs. 20,977,492</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-deduction of PAYE from political leaders of Shs. 9,275,220.</li> </ul>	

7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG initiated the submission of the Annual Performance Contract to MoFPED through pbs@ifmis.go..ug to www.budget.go.ug on 27/7/2022 as evidenced on the inventory of LGs submissions to MoFPED</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG initiated the submission of the Annual Performance Contract to MoFPED through pbs@ifmis.go..ug to www.budget.go.ug on 23/8/2022 as evidenced on the inventory of LGs submissions to MoFPED</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for all the quarters of the previous FY to MoFPED as evidenced below:</p> <p>1st QBPR was submitted on 24/11/2021</p> <p>2nd QBPR was submitted on 6/2/2022</p> <p>3rrd QBPR was submitted on 26/5/2022</p> <p>4th QBPR was submitted late on 23/8/2022 within the recommended deadline of 31/8/2022.</p>	4