



Local Government Performance Assessment

Mukono District

(Vote Code: 542)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	78%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	35%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	63%
Educational Performance Measures	57%
Health Performance Measures	54%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	25%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that the DDEG projects completed below were being used/functional by the beneficiaries as per their profiles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Out Patient Department and latrine at Nakifuma Health Centre III at a cost of Ugx 157 Million started in 18/19 and completed on 22/6/2020; 2. A two classroom block at Kayanja Coomunity Primary School in Nagojje Sub County at a cost of Ugx 144 Million started on 11/9/2019 and completed on 27/6/2020; and 3. Works on completed main administrative block at Ugx 40 Million started on 3/1/2020 and completed on 30/6/2020. 	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"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	<p>This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed.</p>	0

2

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

There was evidence that the project planned to be implemented in the LG Annual Work Plan for the year 2019/20 (page 58), and were all completed 100%, quarter 4 Performance report page 91:

1. Out Patient Department and latrine at Nakifuma Health Centre III at a cost of Ugx 157 Million started in 18/19 and completed on 22/6/2020;
 2. A two classroom block at Kayanja Coomunity Primary School in Nagojje Sub County at a cost of Ugx 144 Million started on 11/9/2019 and completed on 27/6/2020; and
 3. Works on completed main administrative block at Ugx 40 Million started on 3/1/2020 and completed on 30/6/2020.
- 3 project were planned and completed, $3/3 \times 100\% = 100\%$.

3

3

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.

There was evidence that 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: The LG DDEG budgeted funds were Ugx 421,687,000 (page 58 of AWP) and it was spent (page 91 of Annual performance report) as below:

1. 2 class block and furniture at Ugx 144,364,000;
2. Completion of phased of OPD and latrine at Nakifuma health Centre III at Ugx 157,261,000 ;
3. Laptops for the OPD health Centre Ugx 13,472 ,000;
4. Works on main administration building at Ugx 40,000,000;
5. Furniture for OPD Centre at Ugx 7,200,000;
6. Capacity building at Ugx 30,000,000; and
7. Monitoring projects at Ugx 29,390,000.

2

3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY were within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimate. The sampled contracts include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of phased of OPD and latrine at Nakifuma health Centre III ; the estimate was Ugx 117,231,00, while the contract amount was Ugx 121,516,00 hence the variation was 3.56%. 2. Works on main administration building :the estimated contribution to the works (Shs 725,752,000) was Ugx 40,000,000 while the actual contribution was amount was Ugx 40,000,000 hence the variation was 0%. 	2
---	---	--	---	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Three LLGs were sampled for verification of filled positions; 1. Nakisunga SC, 2. Kasawo TC and 3. Kyampisi SC. The information was verified and found to be accurate as per the district staff structure obtained from HRM division and the LLGs staff lists examined at the sampled LLGs</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

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"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG funds was in place as per LG Annual Performance report page 91 :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Out Patient Department and latrine at Nakifuma Health Centre III at a cost of Ugx 157 Million started in 18/19 and completed on 22/6/2020; 2. A two classroom block at Kayanja Coomunity Primary School in Nagojje Sub County at a cost of Ugx 144 Million started on 11/9/2019 and completed on 27/6/2020; and 3. Works on completed main administrative block at Ugx 40 Million started on 3/1/2020 and completed on 30/6/2020. 	2
---	---	--	--	---

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise; If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs score 4 or else 0	This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed.	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results. Score: 2 or else score 0	This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed.	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed.	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	The district did not consolidate and submit staff requirements to the MoPS	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	The District conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as per the analysis worksheet examined	2

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0	The district had ten (10) Heads of Department, only two (2) were appraised as per the appraisal reports examined. They were appraised on the following dates; 1. District Planner – 18th August 2020 and 2. Chief Finance Officer	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	Administrative reward and sanctions were implemented as per the letter PER. 453/454/01 dated 29th September 2020 - Submission of the 4th Quarter, reward and sanctions committee report	1
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	The district had not established the Consultative Committee for staff grievance redress	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.	There was no information availed for verification of staff recruitment and access to the payroll	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.	There was no information availed for verification of retirement and access to the pension payroll	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	There was evidence that DDEG funds to LLGs were transferred in full as per the requirements in the budget for the year 2019/20. Copies of warrants submitted to MoFPED for the FY 2019/20 indicated that all DDEG funds were transferred in full to LLGs. A total of UGX 584,290,348 as budgeted in the 2019/20 AWP page 4, was fully transferred quarterly to LLGs as below:	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	Quarter 1 warrant of Ugx 194,763,450 was transferred on 22/7/2019;	
			Quarter 2 warrant of Ugx 194,763,449 was transferred on 8/10/2019; and	
			Quarter 3 warrant of Ugx 194,763,4501 was transferred on 15/1/2020.	
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	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:	The LG did not submit warrants in time for DDEG transfers to LLGs:	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	Quarter 1 warrant was on 22/7/2019, release date was 9/7/2019; 13 days	
			Quarter 2 warrant was on 8/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019; 6 days and	
			Quarter 3 warrant was on 15/1/2020 , release date was 8/1/2020;7 days.	
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:	The LG did not invoice nor communicate in time to LLGs about DDEG releases:	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	Quarter 1 invoicing was on 20/8/2019, release date was 9/7/2019, 41 days;	
			Quarter 2 invoicing was on 15/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019, 13 days; and	
			Quarter 3 invoicing was on 17/1/2020, release date was 8/1/2020,9 days.	
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	There was evidence that the LG supervised and mentored all LLGs . This was verified in Planners reports to the CAO dated 30/9/2019, 17/1/2020 and 2/4/2020 and 10/7/2020.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, as seen from the TPC minutes below:</p> <p>TPC of 31/10/2019 min 24/2019/20 ;</p> <p>TPC of 30/1/2020 min 46/1920 ; and</p> <p>TPC of 22/8/2020 min 03/20/21.</p>	2
----	---	--	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The LG maintained an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, Land etc. as per format in the accounting manual and was updated as of June 30, 2020.</p> <p>Assets breakdown were on page 37 of the Financial statements for the financial year 2019/20, Summary statement of stores and other assets (Physical assets) as at June 30, 2020:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land Ugx 0; 2. Building and structures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Non Residential buildings Ugx 2,891,757,216 ; b) Residential buildings Ugx 441,694,255; c) Roads and bridges Ugx 1,491,407,115 ; 3. Transport Equipment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Motor vehicles Ugx 92,939,103 ; 4. ICT equipment Ugx 10,000,000; and 5. Furniture and fittings Ugx 14,300,000; and 6. Cultivated assets Ugx 71,424,300. 	2
----	---	---	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG used the Board of Survey Report of the year 2018/19 to make Assets Management decisions.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The LG Physical Planning Committee was in place and functioning, at least 4 sets of minutes were submitted to MoLHUD as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meeting held on 30/6/2020,minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 31/7/2020; 2.Meeting held on 23/1/20,minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 21/2/2020; 3. Meeting held on13/12/2019 ,minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 15/1/2020; and 4. Meeting held on 19/9/19,minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 25/10/2019 . <p>The committee had a Physical development plan, it was fully constituted with 13 members and submission of new investments were considered within 30 days of submission. The LG Physical Development Plan was not approved, but Town Council development plans were approved.</p>	2
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;</p> <p>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 LG Development Plan; (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 LG conducted desk appraisals and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the reports dated 22/10/2019. The following projects were appraised:-</p> <p>Phase Construction of Seed Secondary school in Kimenyedde SC;</p> <p>Renovation of Nakifuma Health Centre III; and</p> <p>Construction of a two classroom block at Namulaba Primary school in Nagojje SC.</p>	2

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 LG conducted field appraisals and scrutiny for technical feasibility environmental and socially acceptability and designs customized for the investment project was done as indicated in the feasibility report dated 20 March 2019.</p> <p>The following projects were sampled and found to have been appraised and scrutinized:-</p> <p>Phase Construction of Seed Secondary school in Kimenyedde SC;</p> <p>Renovation of Nakifuma Health Centre III; and</p> <p>Construction of a two classroom block at Namulaba Primary school in Nagojje SC.</p>	2
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>There was evidence that the project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP. The 3 sampled projects below were reviewed in the TPC meeting of 28/3/2020 min 43/18/2020:-</p> <p>Phase Construction of Seed Secondary school in Kimenyedde SC;</p> <p>Renovation of Nakifuma Health Centre III; and</p> <p>Construction of a two classroom block at Namulaba Primary school in Nagojje SC.</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>There was evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening.</p> <p>There was only one DDEG project. This was construction of a two classroom block with an office, store and furniture at Kayanja P/S. The Screening Report was dated 25 October 2019, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ampaire Christine, District Community Development Officer.</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan Score 1 or else score 0	There is evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. The projects in include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of 2 daily market bocks with a 5-stance water borne toilet at Kabembe TC (Pg.8); 2. Renovation of Namayiba HC (Pg. 11), 3. Renovation of the Nakisunga sub county offices (Pg.11); 4. Renovation of Nakifuma-Naggalama sub county offices (Pg. 11); 5. Construction of abattoir in Nakifuma-Naggalama sub county (Pg. 11); 6. Completion of fencing Katosi landing site (Pg. 12); 7. Renovation of Katosi CAIIP market (Pg. 12); 8. phased construction of office block for Namataba TC (Pg. 13); and 9. Installation of Solar street lights in Namataba/Namagunga wards (Pg. 13). 	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	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: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of approval of DDEG infrastructure projects and the respective bidding documents under minute 006/2020 of the meeting held on July 12, 2020. The projects include: the Renovation of Namaiba H/C, the renovation of Nakisunga S/C offices; the construction of Seeta Namagunga S/C administration offices; construction of 2 daily markets bocks with 5 stance water born toilet at Kabember TC.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of the establishment of a project implementaion team.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	The only infrastructure project executed under DDEG was the Construction of a Two classroom block at Kayanja Community Primary school and it followed the technical designs provided by the LG Engineer. The classes had dimensions 8.8m x 9.6 M as per the design drawings. The classrooms had 4 rear widows and 3 front windows each 1.2m x 1.5m. The floor was of cement sand screed.	1

13	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	There is no evidence that the requisite technical officers have held site meetings with the contractor prior to verification and certification of works.	0
13	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	There is evidence that the LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract. The sampled payments are:	1
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine in Seeta Nazigo Primary school (Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00010), where The vendor's invoice was received on 16/4/2020, certificate prepared on 17/4/2020, approved by the DEO and Internal Auditor on 27/4/2020 and payment made on 4/5/2020; 2. The renovation of Nakifuma health centre IV (Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00003), where invoice for certificate No. 1 was received on 5/5/2020, the certificate prepared and approved by the LG Engineer, the DHO and auditor on 13/5/2020, and payment made on 21/5/2020; and 3. The renovation works for Ntenjeru Najja Health centre Iv (Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00003), where the vendor's invoice was received on 5/5/2020, certificate prepared on 13/5/2020, approved by the DEO and Internal Auditor on 13/5/2020 and payment made on 21/5/202 	

Procurement, contract management/execution
 Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure
 g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:
 Score 1 or else 0

There is evidence that each of the projects has a separate file having the requisite records as per the PPDA law. There in there are records regarding: of the procurement requests; the approval of the procurement methods, procurement committee and Bid document; the advertisement/invitation to bid; the evaluation details; notice of award; the award; the signed contract and payment details. The sampled projects include:

1. The construction of a 2-class room block at Kayanja (**Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00004**), where the procurement request was received from DEO on 23/8/2020 and certified by CAO on 30/8/2019, the approval of the procurement method, procurement committee and bid document was done on 6/9/2019, the advert made on 17/9/2020, evaluation report accepted on 5/11/2019, award and contract signing done on 11/12/ 2019; and
2. The Renovation works at Nakifuma HC II and Materinty shelter at Ntenjeru HC VI (**Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00003**), where the procurement request was received from DEO on 2/9/2020 and certified by CAO on 3/9/2019, the approval of the procurement method, procurement committee and bid document was done on 6/9/2019, the advert made on 17/9/2020, evaluation report accepted on 15/11/2019, award and contract signing done on 11/12/ 2019

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.
 Maximum 5 points on this performance measure
 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.
 Score: 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the District had designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and had established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.

A letter dated November 2, 2020 indicated the appointment of Mr. Mukasa Stephen Mabira, District Agricultural officer as Grievance/Complaints Coordinator. The letter was signed by Mr. Kizito Mugerwa Robert, for Chief Administrative Officer.

There was, however, no evidence produced to show that the GRC had been established and was in place.

0

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	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. If so: Score 2 or else 0	There was no such system in place.	0
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0	Mukono DLG had not publicized anything to do with the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	0
15	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	Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets. Page 310 of the LG Development plan had budgeted for UGX29,432,000 on page 112 of the 2019/20 Annual Workplan.	1
15	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	There was evidence that the enhanced DDEG guidelines were disseminated to LLGs , the LLGs picked them and signed for them in the TPC of 28/3/2020 at the district head quarter.	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>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:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were NO projects financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation. In fact, DDEG financed only the education project and nothing was implemented beyond that for the previous FY.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were NO projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all 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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence produced in this regard.</p> <p>It was said that Land titles available were under Lock & Key, and the lady who keeps the key was down with Covid-19 and could not come to office. The CAO who could be able to access the key lost a relative and was not available on the 2nd day of the assessment.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs. But rather than monthly, they prepared quarterly reports. Those found on file were "Report on Monitoring Implementation of Social and environmental Mitigation Measures and Environmental Audit of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Seeta-Nazigo primary school in Nakisunga S/County for QTR 3 FY 2019-20, dated 27/01/2020; 2) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Koome C/U primary school in Koome S/county for QTR 1 FY 2020-21, dated 21/9/2020; 3) Construction of a two classroom block with an office, store and supply of furniture at Kayanja P/S in Nagijje S/County for QTR 3 FY 2019-20, dated 12/12/19; 4) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Kayini C/U primary school in Namagunga S/County for QTR 3 FY 2019-20, dated 18/12/19; and 5) Renovation of Maternity Ward at Nakifuma HC III in Nagalama-Nakifuma TC for QTR 4 FY 2019-20. 	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. Those sampled included "Environment and Social Impact Certificate for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rehabilitation of Nakifuma HC III that was signed by both officers but not dated; 2) Construction of a 4-stance VIP pit latrine at Namulaba primary school in Nagojje sub county FY 2019/20 dated 23/06/20; 3) Construction of a 5-stance VIP pit latrine at Seeta Nazigo C/U P/S FY 2019/20, signed by both officers but not dated; 4) Completion of a 3 classroom block and furniture at Kisoga Mumyuka Ps FY 2016/2017 dated 11/9/2020; and <p>Construction and operation of a 3 classroom block and furniture at Kasaayi RC P/s, dated 21/9/2020.</p>	1

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>All the bank accounts sampled had their monthly reconciliations done up to October 31, 2020. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MUWRP ; 2. TSA; and 3. General fund. 	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>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 4 quarterly internal audit reports in the FY 2019/20 as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 report was prepared on 3/12/2019;</p> <p>Quarter 2 report was prepared on 24/3/2020;</p> <p>Quarter 3 report was prepared 29/7/2020; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 report was prepared on 2/10/20.</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 had provided status of implementation of internal audit findings to the LG PAC for all the 4 quarters:</p> <p>Quarter 1 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 3/12/2019;</p> <p>Quarter 2 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 26/3/2020 ;</p> <p>Quarter 3 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 7/8/2020; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 status of implementation of internal audit findings provided to LG PAC on 2/10/2020 .</p>	1
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>There was no evidence that all the 4 quarterly audit reports were discussed by the LG PAC.</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 actual/budget local revenue collection ratio for the FY 2018/19 was 51.2% (UGX1,194,375,778 /2,165,188,000). This was budget variance of -44.9%% which is lower than than - 10%. Therefore scoring 0.</p> <p>(Source: LG draft final accounts for FY 2019/20 page 26 and Budget Estimates for 2019/20 page 1).</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"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The LG OSR increased by 123 % from UGX 534,072,893 in the FY 2018/19 to UGX 1,194,375,778 in the FY 2019/20. (Source: LG audited accounts for Financial Year 2018/19 page 13 and draft accounts for the year 2019/20 page 26).</p>	2

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

There was evidence that the mandatory share of sharable local revenues of Ugx 974,327,327 was remitted to LLGs at 65 % (Ugx 434,807,242) for the 11 sub counties (SC) and at 100% (Ugx 305,473,109) to 5 town councils (TC) as follows:

1. Kasawo SC disbursement of Ugx 2,209,221;
2. Kimenyedde SC disbursement of Ugx 1,766,822;
3. Koome SC disbursement of Ugx 23,425,753;
4. Kyampisi SC disbursement of Ugx 72,900,817;
5. Nagojje SC disbursement of Ugx 3,767,290;
6. Nakisunga SC disbursement of Ugx 88,130,151;
7. Nama SC disbursement of Ugx 226,495,047;
8. Mpata SC disbursement of Ugx 8,938,851;
9. Mpunge SC disbursement of Ugx 4,790,051;
10. Ntunda SC disbursement of Ugx 1,104,611;
11. Seeta SC disbursement of Ugx 2,441,341;
12. Katosi TC disbursement of Ugx 62,071,388;
13. Kasawo TC disbursement of Ugx 63,234,101;
14. Namataba TC disbursement of Ugx 118,960,819;
15. Nabbale TC disbursement of Ugx 28,603,399; and
16. Ntenjeru TC disbursement of Ugx 31,440,689.

Transparency and Accountability

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

There is evidence that the LG maintains a notice board where all contracts and awards publicised for at least 2 weeks, thereafter the information is stored in a specially opened file. The board permanently has the procurement plan for the LG. The notices are thereafter filed in a special file. The LG also posts on its website www.mukono.go.ug/default/files all the awarded contracts

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>There was evidence that the LG performance assessment results for the year 2018/19 together with the implications were available on the LG notice board at the time of the assessment.</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>There was evidence that the LG conducted discussions with the public on service delivery and got feed back. Evidence was a report dated 30/10/2020 with photographs attached covering the year 2019/20.</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>Information on tax rates , collection procedures and appeals were on the notice board at the time of the assessment.</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared an IGG report 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>There was evidence that the LG prepared an IGG report on 23/7/2019 which will included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non payment of hard to reach allowance to a teacher that was transferred from Kayunga to Mukono. The allowance was later paid to the teacher. 2. Fraudulent Irregular recruitment of a teacher, case was still ongoing; 3. Mismanagement of health Buntaba Centre II, case was still ongoing; and 4. Victimization of teacher of Nakapinyi Primary school, case was still ongoing. 	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The LG experienced a 0.2% decline in PLE results between the previous school year but one and the previous year as shown below:</p> <p>2018: Div. one was 2124, Div two was 5285, and Div. three was 2219. The total pass, therefore, was 9628 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 11843.</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2018 was, therefore, $9628/11843 \times 100 = 81.2\%$</p> <p>2019: Div. one was 1702, Div two was 6182, and Div. three was 2228. The total pass, therefore, was 10112 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 12520</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was, therefore, $10112/12520 \times 100 = 81\%$</p> <p>Therefore $81\% - 81.2\% = -0.2\%$ percentage decline.</p>	0
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The LG UCE pass rate had improved by 29% between the previous school year but one and the previous year as shown below:</p> <p>2018: Div. one was 241; Div two was 172 and Div. three was 358. The total pass, therefore, was 771 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 1795.</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2018 was, therefore, $771/1795 \times 100 = 43\%$</p> <p>2019: Div. one was 285, Div two was 155, and Div. three was 280. The total pass, therefore, was 720 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 997</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was, therefore, $720/997 \times 100 = 72\%$</p> <p>Therefore $72\% - 43\% = 29\%$ percentage improvement.</p>	3
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 	<p>This performance measure was not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	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 received an education development grant of 1,200,845,000 UGX which was used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines as follows:	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of 2 classroom block with an office and store at Namulaba P/S in Nagojje sub-county. 2)Construction of a VIP line latrine with 4 stances at Namulaba P/S in Nagojje sub-county. 3)Construction of 5 stances toilet at Koome C/U and Koome R/C in Koome Islands 4) Construction of seed school in Kimenyedde sub-county. 6) Procument of furniture for Namulaba P/S in Nagojje sub-county. 	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	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 DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the year 2019/20 before the LG made payments to the contractors:-	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Works on the construction of a seed school at Kimenyedde Primary school by HASO Engineering Services ltd worth Ugx 1,951,651,714 were certified by the Engineer, CDO and the DEO on 16/6/2020 before payment on 24/6/2020; 2. Works on the construction of a pit latrine Primary school by Nali contractors ltd worth Ugx 97,873,567 were certified by the Engineer and the DEO on 29/4/2020 before payment on 30/6/2020; and 3. Works on the construction of a 2 classroom block and store at Nabulaba Primary school by Restoration ltd worth Ugx 193,010,467 were certified by the Engineer and the DEO on 10/6/20 before payment on 22/6/20. 	

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	There is evidence that the variations in the contract prices were within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates. The sampled contracts included:	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The construction of a 2 class room block with office at Namulaba CU primary school. The estimate was Shs 200,583,840, the Contract was 193,010,467 and hence the variation was 3.77%. 2. The construction of a VIP latrine at Nazigo CU Primary school. The estimate was Shs 30,967,450, the Contract was 29,850,450 and hence the variation was 4.47% 3. The construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Kayini CU Primary school. The estimate was Shs 30,967,450, the Contract was 29,996,181 and hence the variation was 3.1% 	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	There is evidence that all the education projects as listed in the procurement plan approved as submitted to PPDA on August 2, 2019 were completed as per work plan in the previous FY 2019-20. All project have completion certificates. The sampled contracts include:	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Classroom block at Namulaba Primary school, where contract was signed on December 11, 2019 and completion invoice made on 5/6/2010; and 2. Construction of Classroom block at Kayanja Community Primary school, where contract was signed on 12/12/ 2019 and completion invoice made on 16/6/2010 T 3. Construction of 5 stances toilet at Koome C/U and Koome R/C in Koome Islands 4. Construction of seed school in Kimenyedde sub-county 	
			The projects are 4 out of 4 giving percentage Of 100%.	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	From the Human resource office, staff structure, and teacher list, indicated that the LG had recruited a total of 1758 Primary teachers (100%) , as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines. The total LG staff ceiling for UPE is 1758 teachers.	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 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>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>It was evident from the list of registered schools and the consolidated schools' asset register for both UPE and USE schools from the previous two FYs that 159 (85%) out of 187 schools in LG meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines.</p>	3
---	---	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>From the three sampled schools which were Namawojolo C/U in Naama sub-county, it had 17 teachers; Kayanja community P/s in Namataba town council had 08 teachers and Namakwa P/s in nakisunga sub-county had 11 teachers. The information on the deployment list was in line with what was found on the school noticeboard of the sampled schools.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>The LG had an updated school asset register dated June 2020 accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools, for example, Kayanja community P/s in Namataba town council had 168 desks;5 toilet stances; no teacher house, and 08 classrooms while Namakwa P/s in nakisunga sub-county had 11 classrooms; 89 desks,12 toilet stances and 5 teachers' houses whereas Namawojolo C/U had 132 desks;14 classrooms;14 toilet stances and 12 teachers' houses.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<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>	<p>From the three sampled schools which were: Namawojolo C/U; Kayanja community P/S; and Namakwa P/S none of them (0%) had complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and had submitted reports.</p>	0
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 		
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p>	<p>There was no evidence from the sampled schools which were: Namawojolo C/U; Kayanja community P/S; and Namakwa P/S that they had been supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations.</p>	0
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 		
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p>	<p>The LG had collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools (100%) from the previous FY year with a total enrollment of 66,995 pupils.</p>	4
	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 		

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>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: Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the performance contracts, staff list, and list of schools that the LG had budgeted 11,728,591,000 UGX to cater for a headteacher 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>	4
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>From the three sampled schools, it was evident that the teachers that had been indicated in the staff lists are deployed in those schools as shown below: Kayanja had 08 teachers, Namawojolo had 17 teachers, and Namakwa had 11 teachers.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the three sampled schools mentioned before that teacher deployment data had been disseminated or publicized on school notice boards.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

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>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p>	<p>The district had one hundred, eighty seven (187) primary schools and therefore 187 Head Teachers. However, there were no appraisal reports available for verification of the dates of their appraisal</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
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>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM</p>	<p>The district had eighteen (18) secondary schools and therefore 18 Head Teachers. However, there were no appraisal reports available for verification of the dates of their appraisal</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
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>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p>	<p>The department had six (6) members of staff. However, there were no appraisal reports available for verification of the dates of their appraisal</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>		

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,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

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.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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 LG allocated 70,164,000 UGX under vote no: 227001 to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

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>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 did not submit warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrant was on 22/7/2019, release date was 9/7/2019; 13 days</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was on 8/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019; 6 days and</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was on 15/1/2020 , release date was 8/1/2020;7 days.</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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Much as capitation releases where available as follows: Quarter 1 released on 9/7/2019; Quarter 2 released on 2/10/2019; and Quarter 3 release on 8/1/2020, there was no evidence to show that the DEO communicated/publicized within three working days of the release.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>It was evident that 10/07/2019 LG education department prepared an inspection plan and conducted meetings to plan for school inspections.</p>	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"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>On average 54% of all the 187 registered UPE schools had been inspected at least once per term and reports produced as follows: Term 11(2019): 155 out of 187 (83%). Term 111(2019) :162 out of 187 (87%) were inspected. Term 1(2020): 125 out of 187 (67%)</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up, Score: 2 or else, score: 0	There was no evidence in form of minutes from departmental meetings to show that School inspection reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	The LG 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) as seen on the acknowledgments below: 26/7/2019, for term two 2019;18/10/2019 for term three 2019 and 19/3/2020 for term one 2020.	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings and performance assessment results as below: 1. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 15/7/2019 ; 2. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 25/9/2019 ; and 3. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 22/11/2019 .	2
11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence that the LG Education department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school.	0

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, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG has an assets register which was updated in July 2020. The facilities and equipment indicated on the assets register are consistent with those from the sampled schools as shown below: Kayanja Community; Classrooms 08; latrine stances 5; desks 168, teacher houses none; Namawojolo C/U: desks 132; classrooms 14; latrine stances 14 and Namakwa P/S; Classrooms 11; latrine stances 12; desks 89, teacher houses 5.</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; (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, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG conducted desk appraisals and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the reports dated 22/10/2019. The following projects were appraised:-</p> <p>Phase Construction of Seed Secondary school in Kimenyedde SC; and</p> <p>Construction of a two classroom block at Namulaba Primary school in Nagojje SC.</p>	1
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, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG conducted field appraisals and scrutiny for technical feasibility environmental and socially acceptability and designs customized for the investment project was done as indicated in the feasibility report dated 20 March 2019).</p> <p>The following projects were sampled and found to have been appraised and scrutinized:-</p> <p>Phase Construction of Seed Secondary school in Kimenyedde SC; and</p> <p>Construction of a two classroom block at Namulaba Primary school in Nagojje SC.</p>	1
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, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the education sector infrastructure projects have been incorporated in the procurement plan on Pg. 6. The project included: the Construction of 8 in 1 Staff house; and 4 stance latrine and bathroom at Nakaswa LC P.S.</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 that the school infrastructure procurement approved by the Contracts Committee on July10, 2020 under minute 006/2020.</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. *score: 1, else score: 0*

There was no evidence that the requisite project implementation teams were formed.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES

Score: 1, else, score: 0

There was evidence that the MoES standard technical designs were followed in the implementation of the Seed Secondary School. The assessor visited Kimenyende, Mayangayanga S/C Seed Secondary School and the details of site visits are detailed below;

1. Structures found on ground were: an administration block with a 2-stance pit latrine; 2 No 2 in 1 classrooms; 2 No. 5-stance pit latrines; 2 in 1 Science Laboratory; Multipurpose building; 2 staff house blocks with each having a kitchen and 2 Dormitory blocks. The structures had been laid as per designs; The details are as per the laid out drawings.

- The Classroom blocks were laid as per classroom block drawing. Each block had 2 classrooms as specified in the drawings,

- The teacher's units were laid as per staff house block drawing. Each block had 2 staff houses each with a dining, 2 bedrooms, store and bathroom as specified on the drawings. In addition, each block had 2-unit staff kitchen and 2 stance pit latrine. The doors and windows type used were those specified in the drawings, with standard casement windows

Sampled Measurements were for Sample measurements were done on ICT-Library. The measured dimension was 11900 X 7900, this augured well with the design size of 12000 x 8000mm. The room had 5 windows each of 1200x 1500mm. This was as per the drawings.

b) 5 stance pit latrine for girls:

The entire length of the toilet was 3050x7910mm whereas actual size on the 5 stance VIP drawing was 3020x7800mm,

- The circulation floor size of the 4 stances was 1200X6520mm whereas actual size was

Visual checks on the entire structures:

a) The roof used was corrugated iron roofing sheets as seen on the typical wall/roof detail for different structures laid on steel trusses

b) The floor had been finished with cement screed as seen on the drawings;

c) No cracks were seen in the walls or floor;

c) The contractor was planning the painting of the structures and the playing field.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was evidence of a site meeting held on during the project implementation. The meeting was held on July 2, 2020 and was chaired by the CAO.	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 a joint technical supervision during stages of construction the education sector infrastructure project involving the Environment officers and CDO.	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>	There was evidence that Education infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract as below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Contract for the construction of a seed school at Kimenyedde Primary school by HASO Engineering Services ltd worth Ugx 1,951,651,714 was properly executed:, a suppliers request of Ugx 946,564,585 was approved by the Engineer and the DEO on 16/6/2020 and paid on 24/6/2020 leaving a balance as retention payable after 6 months as per contract. 2. A Contract for the construction of a pit latrine Primary school by Nali contractors ltd worth Ugx 97,873,567 was properly executed:, a suppliers request of Ugx 97,873,567 was approved by the Engineer and the DEO on 29/4/2020 and paid on 30/6/2020. 3. A Contract for the construction of a 2 classroom block and store at Nabulaba Primary school by Restoration ltd worth Ugx 193,010,467 was properly executed:, a suppliers request of Ugx 193,010,467 was approved by the Engineer and the DEO on 10/6/20 and paid on 22/6/20 as per the contract. 	1

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>	There was evidence that the files/ records on all sector infrastructure projects implemented in the previous FY were compliant. The plan was submitted on April 23, 2019. They had all the requisite documentation and were approved timely and by the responsible personnel. The procurement were subsequently incorporated in the consolidated work plan and approved by the contracts committee meeting that sat on July 13, 20.	1
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 is evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The sampled contracts were: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 2 classroom block with office, store and furniture at Kayanja Community P/s in Nagojje S/C (Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00004). The procurement request was made by the DEO and certified by the CFO and C.AO on 23/8/2019; the approval of the procurement method, appointment of a procurement committee and approval of bid documents was made on 6/9/2019; the advertisement was made on 17/9/2019; the evaluation was concluded on 15/11/2019; the approval of award made on 11/12/2019; the agreement signed on 11/12/2019. The file also has details of payments. 2. The construction of a classroom block with Latrine at Namayuba (Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00006). The procurement request was made by the DEO and certified by the CFO and C.AO on 23/8/2019; the approval of the procurement method, appointment of a procurement committee and approval of bid documents was made on 6/9/2019; the advertisement was made on 17/9/2019; the evaluation was concluded on 15/11/2019; the approval of award made on 11/12/2019; the agreement signed on 11/12/2019. The file also has details of payments. 	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was nothing about GRM that was displayed on the Education department noticeboard.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>From the sampled schools, there was no evidence that LG had disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG had in place costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents. This was in BoQs prepared for :</p> <p>1) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Koome C/U primary school in Koome S/county costed at UGX225,000/-;</p> <p>2) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Koome Buyana RC primary school in Koome S/county, also costed at UGX225,000/-; and</p> <p>3) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Seeta-Nazigo C/U primary school in Nakisunga S/county costed at UGX258,000/-.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>It was mentioned that titles and MoUs are kept by the Founding bodies like Church of Uganda, UMEA or Roman Catholic Missions and the District and Schools do not have any.</p>	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>	There was evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs. But rather than monthly, they prepared quarterly reports. Those found on file were "Report on Monitoring Implementation of Social and environmental Mitigation Measures and Environmental Audit of: 1) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Seeta-Nazigo primary school in Nakisunga S/County for QTR 3 FY 2019-20, dated 27/01/2020; 2) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Koome C/U primary school in Koome S/county for QTR 1 FY 2020-21, dated 21/9/2020; 3) Construction of a two classroom block with an office, store and supply of furniture at Kayanja P/S in Nagijje S/County for QTR 3 FY 2019-20, dated 12/12/19; and 4) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Kayini C/U primary school in Namagunga S/County for QTR 3 FY 2019-20, dated 18/12/19.	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. Those sampled included "Environment and Social Impact Certificate for: 1) Construction of a 4-stance VIP pit latrine at Namulaba primary school in Nagojje sub county FY 2019/20 dated 23/06/20; 2) Construction of a 5-stance VIP pit latrine at Seeta Nazigo C/U P/S FY 2019/20, signed by both officers but not dated; 3) Completion of a 3 classroom block and furniture at Kisoga Mumyuka Ps FY 2016/2017 dated 11/9/2020; and 4) Construction and operation of a 3 classroom block and furniture at Kasaayi RC P/s, dated 21/9/2020.	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>The percentage increases are calculated from the records in the DHIS2 of 2018/19 and 2019/20 for the three sampled health facilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kojja HC4: Deliveries: 2018/19 – 1092; 2019/20 – 1089 (0.3% decrease); OPD: 2018/19 – 19,469; 2019/20 – 12365 – (36.5% decrease); 2. Kasawo HC3 : Deliveries: 2018/19 – 938; 2019/20 – 883 – (5.9% decrease); OPD: 2018/19 – 9782; 2019/20 – 14604 – (49.3 % increase); and 3. Mpoma HC2; OPD: 2018/19 – 4999; 2019/20 – 5053 – (1.1% increase). 	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 2 • 50 – 69% score 1 • Below 50%; score 0 	<p>This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC Ills and IVs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 75%; score 2 • 65 – 74%; score 1 • Below 65% ; score 0 	<p>The average score obtained was 87.4% from the 18 participating facilities listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeta Nazigo HC3 – 92.1%; 2. Namuganga HC3 – 86.1%; 3. Kyetume HC3 – 68.8%; 4. Koome HC3 – 93.4%; 5. Goma HC3 – 83.7%; 6. Nagojje HC3 – 93.5%; 7. Nabalanga HC3 – 94.3%; 8. Noah’s Ark HC3 – 81.2%; 9. Katoogo HC3– 88.5%; 10. Nakifuma HC3 – 92.2%; 11. Kyabazaala HC3 88.8%; 12. Kyampiisi HC3 85.9%; 13. Mpuunge HC3 89.5%; 14. Kasawo HC3 – 85.6%; 15. Kabanga HC3 – 77.5%; 16. Mukono TC HC4 – 91.9%; 17. Mukono COU HC4 – 90.8%; and 18. Kojja HC4 – 89.2%. 	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>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.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant Ugx 655,869,000 for the year 2019/20 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines. The projects included were :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lower local government health facilities Ugx 582,277,000; 2. LG Health office Ugx 37,860,000; and 3. Promotion activities 35,732,000. 	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>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified work on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors. A report dated 11/12/2019 by the CDO and Environmental officer listed and approved the following projects before payment was made:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of Nakifuma health Centre II; and 2. The construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Seeta-Nazigo. 	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>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>There was evidence that the the contract price of the sampled health infrastructure investments were within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates. The sampled projects were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Seeta-Nazigo whose estimate was Shs. 30,967,218 and contract amount 29,850,450 hence the variation was 3.6%; and 2. Completion of phased of OPD and latrine at Nakifuma health Centre III whose estimate was Ugx 117,231,00, while the contract amount was Ugx 121,516,00 hence the variation was 3.56%. 	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"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>There is evidence that all health projects where contracts were signed were completed whose contracts were signed were completed. The sampled contracts include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Seeta-Nazigo, whose contract was signed on 15/1/2020 and final payment certificate done on may 21, 2020; and 2. The Renovation works at Nakifuma HC, whose contract was signed on 11/12/2019 and final payment certificate done on June 22, 2020 	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>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIII's and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>The average percentage of positions filled at HC3 and HC4 is 91%. The performance at the individual health facilities is in the list below: 1. Nakifuma HC3 – 19/19 (100%); 2. Namuganga HC3 – 15/19 (79%); 3. Nabalanga HC3 – 17/19 (89%); 4. Kyampisi HC3 – 18/19 (95%); 5. Nagojje HC3 – 18/19 (95%); 6. Kasawo HC3 – 16/19 (79%); 7. Koome HC3 – 15/19 (79%); 8. Kyabazaala HC3 – 18/19 (95%); 9. Katoogo HC3 – 16/19 (84%); 10. Seeta Nazigo HC3 – 17/19 (89%); 11. Mpuunge HC3 – 13/19 (68%); 12. Kabanga HC3 – 15/19 (79%); 13. Bbaale HC4 – 39/48 (81%); and 14. Kojja HC4 – 47/49 (95.9%)</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Mukono District LG did not have a project for upgrading Health Centre II to Health centre III.</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>The health worker staff list on the noticeboard matched that at DHO at the sampled health facilities: 1) Kojja HC4 2) Kasawo HC3 3) Mpoma HC2 . These staff had also documented their presence in the daily attendance register and were included in the duty rosters.</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 were no HC2 that needed upgrading in the previous FY.</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>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>By March 31st 2020, none of the sampled HC had submitted their annual work-plans and budgets to the DHO. The submission dates are in the list below. The work plans complied with the prescribed formats.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kojja HC4 – 13/07/2020 2. Kasawo HC3 – 24/07/2020 3. Mpoma HC2 – 07/07/2020 	0
<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>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>Annual budget performance reports were available for only 1/3 of the sampled health facilities and submitted on the following dates: 1. Kojja HC4 – not submitted; 2. Kasawo HC3 – 02/07/2020; 3. Mpoma HC2 – not submitted.</p>	0
<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>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"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There were health facility improvement plans on file at the DHO office that had incorporated the issues identified during monitoring and assessment. Evidence for having included performance issues identified in the DHMT monitoring and assessment reports was available for Kasawo HC3 e.g. The PIP for 2020/21 has included procurement of additional medication. This gap was identified during the support supervision of 28/03/2019 by the DHMT.</p> <p>No evidence was provided for Kojja HC4 and Mpoma HC2.</p>	0
<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%, • score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Some but not all reports were submitted on or before the 7th of the subsequent month as per details below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kojja HC4: HMIS 105: All HMIS 105 reports were submitted on or before 7th of the subsequent month except from January – June 2020. HMIS 106a (Quarterly): Q1 – 13/10/2019; Q2: 15/01/2020 Q3 – 08/4/2020; Q4: 15/7/2020; 2. Kasawo HC3: All HMIS 105 monthly reports were submitted on or before the 7th September of the subsequent month except the one of October & December 2019 on 8th; March & May 2020 on 8th; January and February 2020 on 10th. HMIS 106a (Quarterly): Q1 -10/10/2020; Q2 – 15/1/2020; Q3 – 18/04/2020; Q4 – 14/7/2020; and 3. Mpoma HC2: Only 50% (6/12) HMIS monthly reports were submitted on or before the 7th of the subsequent month. HMIS 106a (Quarterly): HMIS 106a (Quarterly): Not applicable. 	0
<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>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 Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>2/3 of the sampled health facilities submitted invoices before the 15th of the month following the end of the quarter as per the following list: 1. Kojja HC4 – 17/10/2020; 2. Kasawo HC3 – 7/10/2020 (in time); and 3. Goma HC3 – 7/10/2020 (in time).</p>	0
<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>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</p>	<p>The dates for submission of Q1, Q2, Q3 were extracted from the letter submitted to the CHS (P) that had a stamped receipt. Copies of the invoices were attached. Q4 was submitted via email. Only Q4 was timely .</p> <p>Q1: 6/1/2020 Q2: 13/04/2020 Q3: 22/07/2020 Q4: 19/08/2020</p>	0
<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>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</p>	<p>The LG only submitted quarter 1 and 2 on 18/10/2019 and 10/1/2020 respectively.</p>	0
<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>h) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no plan for the weakest performing health facilities.</p>	0
<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>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no plan for the weakest performing health facilities.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

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</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 Mukono LG budget for the 382 health workers salaries is 3,584,551,000. This budget is included in the PBS contract of the current FY.</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</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>HC2 %=74%; HC3=86%; HC4 – 96%; Average =85.3% however some have less than 75% as follows: 1. Kimenyedde HC2 – 7/9 (78%); 2. Kiyola HC2 – 7/9 (78%); 3. Kigogola HC2 – 7/9 (78%); 4. Buntaba HC2 – 7/9 (78%); 5. Katente HC2 – 9/9 (100%); 6. Kasana HC2 – 8/9 (89%); 7. Kansambwe HC2 – 6+3/9 (67%/100%); 8. Mbaliga HC2 7/9 (78%); 9. Seeta-Kasawo 8/9 (89%); 10. Bulikka HC2 6/9 (68%); 11. Mpoma HC2 7/9 (78%); 12. Kateete HC2 9/9 (100%); 13. Kyabalogo HC2 8/9 (89%); 14. Namasumbi HC2 7/9 (78%); 15. Damba HC2 – 5+2/9 (56%/78%); 16. Bugoye HC2 – 7/9 (78%); 17. Wagala HC2 – 7/9 (78%); 18. Mwanyanjiri HC2 – 7/9 (78%); 19. Kasenge HC2 – 4/9 (44%); 20. Myende HC2 – 3/9 +2(33% - 56%); 8. Nakifuma HC3 – 19+1/19 (100%/105%); 9. Namuganga HC3 – 15/19 (79%); 10. Nabalanga HC3 – 17/19 (89%); 11. Kyampisi HC3 – 18/19 (95%); 12. Nagojje HC3 – 18/19 (95%); 13. Kasawo HC3 – 16/19 (79%); 14. Koome HC3 – 15+2/19 (79%/89%); 14. Kyabazaala HC3 – 18+1/19 (95%/100%); 15. Katoogo HC3 – 16/19 (84%); 16. Seeta Nazigo HC3 – 17/19 (89%); 17. Mpuunge HC3 – 13+1/19 (68%/74%); 18. Kabanga HC3 – 15/19 (79%); 19. Bbaale HC4 – 39/48 (81%); 20. Kojja HC4 – 47+3/49 (95.9%/102%)</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</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 at the following health facilities match the staff on duty roster, the attendance register:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mpoma HC2 2. Kasawo HC3 3. Kojja HC4 	3

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</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>The health worker list for the current FY was pinned on the notice board at the following sampled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mpoma HC2 2. Kasawo HC3 3. Kojja HC4 	2
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>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>There were no appraisal reports availed for verification of the dates of the appraisal of Officers in Charge of health facilities</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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>There were no appraisal reports availed for verification of the dates of the appraisal of health workers by the Officers in Charge</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence of any corrective action taken, based on results from performance appraisal</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> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There is a training plan and data base at the DHO office for the previous FY 2019/20). This training plan is organized by quarter and it includes the training for COVID-19.</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>There are training reports that support the activities that were conducted.</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>There is a letter from the CAO confirming the list of health facilities dated 2nd September 2019 ref: HEA/MKN/354/01.</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>There was no evidence that the LG made 15% allocation towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines, the PHC NWR grant budget was Ugx 655,869,000 , only Ugx 37,860,000 which was 5.7% was allocated to the health office .</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 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>	<p>The LG did not warrant direct grant transfers for the FY 2019/20 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release:</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrant was on 22/7/2019, release date was 9/7/2019; 13 days</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was on 8/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019; 6 days and</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was on 15/1/2020, release date was 8/1/2020;7 days.</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 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 funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not warrant to all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the FY 2019/20 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release:</p> <p>Quarter 1 invoicing was on 22/7/2019, release date was 9/7/2019; 13 days</p> <p>Quarter 2 invoicing was on 8/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019; 6 days and</p> <p>Quarter 3 invoicing was on 15/1/2020, release date was 8/1/2020;7 days.</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 9 points on this performance measure</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>Mukono District: Publishing dates for Q1: 27/07/2019 (Q2: 11/10/2019; Q3- 17/01/2020; Q4 – 24/04/2020 compared to the release dates by dates of receipt of the expenditure limits for the 4 quarters, Q1: 09/09/19; Q2: 02/10/19; Q3: 08/01/20; Q4: 28/04/2020 shows that Q1, Q2 and Q3 were publicized beyond 5 working days of their receipt.</p>	0
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>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>DHMT quarterly performance review reports were dated as follows: Q3: 07/02/2020 and Q4: 04/06/2020. The reports showed the level of implementation of the quarterly performance recommendations. However, since there were only 2/4 reports, the score is 0.</p>	0

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>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>Attendance lists were available for only the meeting of Q4 on 4/6/2020 and this was specifically for TB focal persons only. Therefore the mark is 0.</p>	0
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>Supervision dates for HC4 in the district were as follows: Kojja HC4 - Q1 – 2nd-6th September 2019; Q2: 6th-10th January 2020;, Q3: 13th -17th January 2020; and Q4 – 29th -30th June 2020. Mukono CoU: TBD</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>There are three HSDs in Mukono district: 1. Mukono South supervised as follows - During Q1 supervised 7/16 including PNFP); Q2; supervised 8/16; Q3 – HSD supervised 8/16; Q4 supervised 10/16. Each report provides feedback of the previous recommendations; 2. The sampled health facility - Mpoma was supervised on 31st July 2020; 3. Nakifuma HSD supervised Kasawo on 12/02/2020 on Assisted partner notification. Therefore the mark is 1.</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>At the sampled health facilities: 1) Kojja HC4 2) Kasawo HC3 3) Mpoma HC3</p> <p>1. Each report in Kojja and Kasawo provides feedback on the status of implementation,</p> <p>2. Mpoma HC2 (31/07/2019) – recommended that there be regular monitoring of the EPI – for the current and previous month</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>There is a medicines management supervisors report for all health facilities during the previous FY 2019/20 and dated 06/07/2020</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities. The office budget was Ugx 37,860,000 and Ugx 17,866,000 was allocated to promotion activities which was 46% way above the required 30%.</p>	2
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Evidence of follow-up for the selected activities is as follows: MAPD on 10/12/2019 recommended that the district strengthens community engagement and mobilization in health. On 10-11 June 2020 had training for VHTS supported by BRAC Uganda.</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Evidence of follow-up for the selected activities is as follows: MAPD on 10/12/2019 recommended that the district strengthens community engagement and mobilization in health. On 10-11 June 2020 had training for VHTS supported by BRAC Uganda.</p>	1
----	---	--	--	---

Investment Management

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>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</p>	<p>There are no asset registers for all 38 GoU health facilities.</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>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)): score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG conducted desk appraisals for the renovation of Nakifuma Health project and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the feasibility report dated 20 March 2019.</p>	1
----	--	---	---	---

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 conducted field appraisals for the renovation of Nakifuma Health project and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the feasibility report dated 22 October 2019.</p>	1
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>There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Health projects for FY 2019/2020. There were only two Health projects implemented by the District, and they were as follows:</p> <p>1) Construction of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine, bathroom and urinal at Kimenyedde HC II. The Screening Report was dated 14 September 2020, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ntege James, District Community Development Officer.</p> <p>2) Construction of an in-patients ward block, 8-stance latrine and 6 bathrooms and a urinal at Katoogo HC III. The Screening Report was dated 11 September 2020, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ntege James, District Community Development Officer.</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>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 and other procurement requests to PDU on March 11, 2020. The plan included Construction of an inpatient ward block with paediatric wing and bathrooms at Katoogo H/C III; and the construction o a 5 stance VIP latrine at Kimenyedde H/C II.</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 PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Health department submitted procurement to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY and the requests were approved by the PDU on July 10, 2020.</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>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 evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee requests. The investments were discussed and approved as a consolidated procurement plan for the LG on July 10, 2020 under minute 006/2020.</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 no evidence of the establishment of a project implementation team</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>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>The Mukono District LG did not have a project for upgrade of health centre II to Health Centre III. The works executed were for: Renovation of Nakifuma HCIII Maternity ward; and construction of a maternity shelter at Kojja HCIV in Ntenjeru S/c.</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 records that had to be consolidated weekly to the District Engineer.</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 evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site.</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>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 the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects.</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>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</p>	<p>The DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframe,</p> <p>1. Works by Island Breeze logistics ltd worth Shs 40 million for renovation of Nakifuma health center III requested on 5/5/2020 was certified by the DHO on 11/5/20, (6 days) and payment was done on 27/5/2020;</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>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</p>	<p>There is Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA. The sampled contracts were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Renovation civil works for Ntenjeru kojja HC IV (Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00003). The procurement request; was submitted by the DHO on 20/8/2019. It was confirmed by the DFO on 2/9/2019 and CAO on 3/9/2019; the procurement method, evaluation committee and bid documents were approved on 6/9/2020; the advert was placed on 17/9/2019; Evaluation was concluded on 15/11/ 2019; the letter of ward was award was made on 11/12/2019; contract signed on 11/12/2019. The file also has the payment details; and 2. The Renovation civil works for Nakifuma HC IVb(Muko542/Wrks/19-20/00003). The procurement request; was submitted by the DHO on 20/8/2019. It was confirmed by the DFO on 2/9/2019 and CAO on 3/9/2019; the procurement method, evaluation committee and bid documents were approved on 6/9/2020; the advert was placed on 17/9/2019; Evaluation was concluded on 15/11/ 2019; the letter of ward was award was made on 11/12/2019; contract signed on 11/12/2019. The file also has the payment details; and 	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was nothing about Grievance Redress Mechanism that was displayed on the Health department noticeboard.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence produced to show that Mukono LG had disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management and central infrastructures for managing medical waste. Evidence was that:</p> <p>1) Mukono General Hospital has got an incinerator for burning medical waste; and</p> <p>2) Green Label investments has been contracted to collect and dispose of waste from the medical facilities.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence produced to show that the LG has conducted training or created awareness in healthcare waste management.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for the health infrastructure project of the previous FY. The only health project implemented by the District was Renovation and civil works for Nakifuma HC III and construction of a maternal shelter at Ntenjeru Kojja HC IV. Both of these activities were lumped together as one project that had the environment section costed at UGX2,590,800;</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence produced in this regard. Available Land Titles were under Lock & Key, and the lady who kept the key was down with Covid-19 and could not come to office. The CAO who would have been able to access the key had lost a relative and was not available on the 2nd day of the assessment.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs. But rather than monthly, they prepared quarterly reports. Those found on file were "Report on Monitoring Implementation of Social and environmental Mitigation Measures and Environmental Audit of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Renovation of Maternity Ward at Nakifuma HC III in Nagalama-Nakifuma TC for QTR 4 FY 2019-20. 2) Construction of OPD at Kasawo HC III, pit latrine (2-stance urinal and bathroom) in Kasawo Town Council; 3) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Seeta-Nazigo primary school in Nakisunga S/County for QTR 3 FY 2019-20, dated 27/01/2020; 4) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Koome C/U primary school in Koome S/county for QTR 1 FY 2020-21, dated 21/9/2020; and 5) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Kayini C/U primary school in Namagunga S/County for QTR 3 FY 2019-20, dated 18/12/19. 	2

<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. Those sampled included "Environment and Social Impact Certificate for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Rehabilitation of Nakifuma HC III that was signed by both officers but not dated; 2) Construction of a 4-stance VIP pit latrine at Namulaba primary school in Nagojje sub county FY 2019/20 dated 23/06/20; and 3) Construction of a 5-stance VIP pit latrine at Seeta Nazigo C/U P/S FY 2019/20, signed by both officers but not dated.
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the MIS data (water summary 2019-2020), Mukono has 87% rural water sources that are functional which include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 593 out of 650 protected springs, • 247 out of 302 shallow wells, • 365 out of 419 deep boreholes, • 158 out of 172 rainwater harvesting tanks, • 3 out of 3 dams, • and 99 out of 138 piped water systems. <p>This implies that only 1465 water sources out of 1684 sources are functional giving 87%.</p>	1
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From MIS data (water and sanitation committees 2019-2020), there are 1766 sources in analysis out of which 895 have functional WCS in place which implies only 51% of the water sources have WSCs</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>This Performance Measure is not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below</p>	<p>The district water coverage is 70%. According to the MIS of the</p>	2

score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Ministry of Water and Environment, the following sub-counties have water coverage below the district average as shown:

1. Seeta Namuganga (68%),
2. Kyampisi (68%),
3. Nama (38%), and
4. Mpatta (39%).

As per the reviewed annual progress reports 2019-2020 that include

1. 1st quarter dated 15/10/2019,
2. 2nd quarter dated 12/10/2019 ,
3. 3rd quarter dated 03/04/2020, and
4. 4th quarter dated 04/08/2020,

all the budgeted projects in these sub-counties were implemented as follows:

1. Seeta Namuganga (2 new boreholes drilled),
2. Kyampisi (9 boreholes rehabilitated),
3. Nama (3 boreholes rehabilitated), and
4. Mpatta (3 boreholes rehabilitated).

According to the DWO, the coverage shown in the National MIS for three sub-counties of Kimenyedde, Koome, and Mpunge is outdated and represents the bigger sub-counties from which the above sub counties were formed. Their updated coverage is less than the district average as follows:

1. Kiminyedde 63.4% (1 piped water system),
2. Koome 20.9% (1 gravity water scheme project),
3. Mpunge 24.6% (2 new boreholes).

The budgeted water projects for these sub-counties were all implemented as follows:

1. Kiminyedde (1 piped water system),
2. Koome (1 gravity water scheme),
3. Mpunge (2 new boreholes).

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

All the projects budgeted for the
above sub-counties were
implemented, representing 100%
of the projects planned projects.

The following are the sampled
project contracts indicating their
contract prices and engineer's
estimates:

Construction of Koome Gravity
Flow water scheme, contract ref:
MUKO542/WRKS/19-20/00010
signed 08/06/2020

- Contract price:
UGX492,645,318;
- Engineer's estimate:
UGX492,645,318.
- Variation : 0%

Construction of Mayangayanga
RGC piped water supply system,
contract agreement between
Mukono LG and M/S Victoria
pumps Ltd signed 17/05/2018

- Contract price:
UGX1,146,980,449;
- Engineer's estimate:
UGX1,158,940,290.
- Variation: 1.03%.

Borehole siting and drilling
supervision of 5 boreholes
(Framework Contract), contract
ref: MUKO542/SRVCS/19-20/008
signed 03/07/2020

- Rate per borehole in the
contract: UGX15,000,000;
- Rate estimated by the
engineer: UGX15,000,000
- Variation: 0%

Therefore the variations for the
sampled contracts are within+-
20%.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.

- o If 100% projects completed: score 2
- o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1
- o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

From the annual budget performance report of the 4th quarter dated July 3, 2020, all the WSS infrastructure projects including Mayangayanga piped water system, drilling of new bore holes and rehabilitation of the old ones were completed as per the annual workplan by June 2020.

Koome is a vast project stretching between multiple financial year periods but the planned and budgeted phase 4 of the project slated for FY 2019/2020 was completed by June 2020.

Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning

o If there is an increase: score 2

o If no increase: score 0.

From the MIS data (water summary 2018-2019 and 2019-2020), the functional sources for FY 2019-2020 and 2018-2019 respectively are as follows:

For FY 2019-2020

593 out of 650 protected springs

247 out of 302 shallow wells

365 out of 419 deep boreholes

158 out of 172 rainwater harvesting tanks

3 out of 3 dams

99 out of 138 piped water systems

This implies that only 1465 water sources out of 1684 sources are functional giving 87%.

For FY 2018-2019

593 out of 650 protected springs

247 out of 303 shallow wells

365 out of 417 deep boreholes

158 out of 172 rainwater harvesting tanks

3 out of 3 dams

99 out of 140 piped water systems

This implies that only 1462 water sources out of 1685 sources are functional giving 86.77%.

Therefore there was an increase of 0.23% in functionality

Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).

- o If increase is more than 5%: score 2
- o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1
- o If there is no increase: score 0.

From MIS data (water and sanitation committees FY 2018-2019 and 2019-2020),

For FY 2019-2020, there are 1766 sources in analysis out of which 895 have functional WCS in place which implies only 50.68% of the water sources have WSCs

For FY 2018-2019, there are 1763 sources in analysis out of which 893 have functional WCS in place which implies only 50.65% of the water sources have WSCs

There was therefore an increase of 0.03% in facilities with functional WSCs

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4

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

3

All the quarterly progress reports for FY 2019/2020 listed below were reviewed to identify the listed WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY:

- 1st quarter dated 15/10/2019,
- 2nd quarter dated 12/10/2019,
- 3rd quarter dated 03/04/2020,
- and 4th quarter dated 04/08/2020,

The following three WSS facilities were sampled:

1. Mayangayanga piped water supply system in Nabibuga village, Kimenyedde S/C,
2. New constructed borehole in Kasiiso Najja Village, Seeta Namuganga S/C, labelled DWD 54004 constructed on 29/03/2020, and
3. New constructed borehole in Kayini Village, Kasawo S/C, labelled DWD 54005 constructed 01/03/2020.

From the reports and the sampled facilities it was confirmed that the DWO accurately reported on the WSS facilities.

5

Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

2

The following quarterly progress reports for FY 2019/2020 were availed and reviewed:

1. 1st quarter dated 15/10/2019,
2. 2nd quarter dated 12/10/2019,
3. 3rd quarter dated 03/04/2020, and
4. 4th quarter dated 04/08/2020.

From the reports and advocacy meeting minutes it was confirmed that the DWO collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county WSS, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage, and community involvement.

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>From the filled hardcopy of Form 4 sheet, Source, functionality, management and gender for each-sub county, the DWO updates the MIS through extension support staff at sub county level. It was last updated as of September 2, 2020</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>No LLG assessment yet</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & 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 & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>No evidence was availed for verification whether the DWO budgeted for Water and Sanitation staff:</p>	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & 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 & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>No evidence was availed for verification whether the Natural Resources Officer budgeted for the Environment and Natural Resources staff</p>	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>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>No evidence was availed for verification whether the DWO appraised water office staff</p>	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 DWO carries out capacity assessment through appraisal of staff as documented in the appraisal forms submitted. The appraisal form dated 16/06/2020 points out; conducting of refresher courses, siting and drilling training, Design skills among other issues and the appraisal was carried out by the DW Engineer.</p> <p>The other appraisals were for the DW Engineer and Head of drilling crew signed on 13/08/2020 and 12/10/2020 respectively.</p>	3

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<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><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>From the AWP 2020-2021, the DWO has planned for the following projects in the respective sub counties;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a central reservoir and expansion of Koome GFS in Koome S/C, 2. Rehabilitation of 30 boreholes in sub-counties of Nabbale, Nama, Ntunda, Kyampisi, Nakisunga, Mpaata, Seeta-Namuganga and Kasawo, 3. Drilling of 10 hand pumps in remote water scarce areas in sub-counties of Nagojje, Kasawo, Mpunge, Nakisunga, Mpatta, and Seeta-Namuganga, 4. Construction for Mayangayanga phase 2 in Kimenyedde Sub-County. <p>The sub-counties with water coverage below that of the LG (71%) are listed below with their respective coverage (from MIS) and budget allocations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeta-Namuganga (68%) 	2
---	---	---	---	---

- UGX48,000,000 for new boreholes,
2. Mpatta (39%)
UGX48,000,000 for new boreholes and
UGX20,000,000 for rehabilitation,
 3. Mpunge (24.6%)
UGX48,000,000 for new boreholes,
 4. Kyampisi (68%)
UGX40,000,000 for rehabilitation,
 5. Nama (38%)
UGX40,000,000 for rehabilitation,
 6. Mpatta (39%)
UGX20,000,000 for rehabilitation,
 7. Koome (20.9%)
UGX259,358,209 for central reservoir and expansion of Koome GFS, and
 8. Kimenyedde (63.4%)
UGX248,086,527 for Mayangayanga phase 2.

The total budget for WSS infrastructure is UGX867,444,736 out of which UGX771,444,736 was allocated to projects in targeted sub-counties with water coverage below the district average, representing 88.9% of the budget.

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 following quarterly progress reports for FY 2019/2020 were availed and reviewed:

- 1st quarter dated 15/10/2019,
- 2nd quarter dated 12/10/2019,
- 3rd quarter dated 03/04/2020,
- and 4th quarter dated 04/08/2020,

From the reports, the DWO carried out advocacy meetings. From minutes of the meetings, and the report on planning and advocacy meetings dated 28/12/2019 for sub-counties of Mpunge, Seta-Namuganga, and Koome, among others, each sub-county was informed about their respective allocations for FY 2020/2021.

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 more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

From the filled hardcopy of Form 4, source, functionality, management, and gender for each sub-county was last updated on September 2, 2020 and the progress reports include;

- 1st quarter dated 15/10/2019,
- 2nd quarter dated 12/10/2019,
- 3rd quarter dated 03/04/2020,
- and 4th quarter dated 04/08/2020,

The DWO updates the MIS through extension support staff at sub county level. The office reports on functionality of the facilities, WCSs and social safeguards. From the 2nd quarter progress reports of FY 2019-2020 dated February 12, 2020 in the software report, the DWO carried out DWSCC meetings and the meeting minutes were included in the reports.

The meeting held on September 30, 2020, issues discussed include need for procurement of a water quality testing kit and shift of the RGC Water Project from Kisoga to Nagojje.

The meeting held on November 15, 2019 stressed the need for a sanitation facility at the premises of the DWO and it was incorporated in the AWP of 2020-2021.

The other meetings were held on June 25, 2020, March 12, 2020, December 28, 2019 and September 15, 2019.

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</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>From the 2nd quarter progress reports of FY 2019-2020 dated February 12, 2020 in the software report, the DWO held DWSCC meetings and the meeting minutes are included in the report.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>For the meeting held on September 30, 2020, issues discussed include need for procurement of a water quality testing kit and shift of the RGC Water Pproject from Kisoga to Nagojje</p>	
			<p>The other meeting was held on November 15, 2019 and stressed the need for a sanitation facility at the premises of the DWO, which was incorporated in the AWP of 2020-2021.</p>	
			<p>The other meetings were held on June 25, 2020, March 12, 2020, December 28, 2019 and September 15, 2019.</p>	
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</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 allocations for the current FY on the notice board of the DWO as well as from the advocacy meetings held at the sub-county level whose minutes were availed.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p>	<p>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:</p>	<p>From the AWP of FY 2020-2021, the total budget for NWR rural water and sanitation budget is UGX35,523,530. Out of that, UGX15,028,080 was spent on mobilization activities, which represents 42%. The mobilization activities included community mobilization, establishment of water user committees, and conducting of advocacy meetings.</p>	3
	<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 		

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>From the quarterly reports availed by the DWO and the facilities sampled which include;</p> <p>Mayangayanga piped water supply system in Nabibuga village, Kimenyedde S/C;</p> <p>Mewly constructed Borehole in kasiiso Najja Village, Seeta Namuganga S/C, labelled DWD 54004 constructed on 29/03/2020; and</p> <p>newly constructed borehole in Kayini Village, Kasawo S/C labelled DWD 54005 constructed 01/03/2020,</p> <p>the respective WSCs for the above facilities were interviewed and confirmed about their establishment, training and functionality, the facilities were well cared for, and there was evidence of the user fees collected.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	---

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There is no asset register that contains all the WSS facilities. However, the District had an up-to date Form 4 which lists all the WSS facilities with all details including location. The form was contained in the annual progress reports of FY 2019-2020 dated 4/8/2020.</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>b. 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 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 conducted desk appraisals and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the reports dated 23/3/2018. The following projects were appraised:-</p> <p>1.Piped water to kimenyedde subcounty worth Ugx 136,916,996; and</p> <p>2. Piped water in Kome subcounty worth Ugx 429,964,000.</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>There are documented request letters from the LLG indicating need for new facilities or rehabilitation where the new facilities are first discussed in meetings before they are approved for implementation in the annual work plan. The requests that were seen include;</p> <p>Nakisunga S/C (4 sources) requested through CAO on 14/1/2020,</p> <p>Request for rehabilitation in Katosi (4 sources) on 06/01/2020,</p> <p>Mpata S/C (4 sources) on 14/01/2020,</p> <p>And Kyampisi S/C (17 sources) on 25/01/2020.</p> <p>All the above are part of the 12 new boreholes, 4 production wells and 30 boreholes under rehabilitation plans in the new FY according to the AWP 2020-2021.</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>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>The LG conducted field appraisals and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the reports dated 23/3/2018. The following projects were appraised:-</p> <p>1.Piped water to kimenyedde subcounty worth Ugx 136,916,996; and</p> <p>2. Piped water in Kome subcounty worth Ugx 429,964,000.</p>	2

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</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>There was evidence that screening was conducted for all WSS projects for the current FY, and ESIA/costed ESMPs prepared (where required) and mitigation measures were put in place. This was done for the following projects:</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>1) Drilling of 16 deep boreholes in Nakisunga, Nagojje, Mpatta, Kasawo, Mpunge & Namagunga sub counties. The Report was dated 17/06/2020, signed by Kalule J, DWO and Mutalya Joseph, Senior Environmental Officer;</p> <p>2) Drilling of 5 hand pump boreholes in Seeta-Namagunga, Kasawo and Mpatta sub counties. The Report was dated 22/05/2019, signed by Kalule J, DWO and verified by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources; and</p> <p>3) Rehabilitation of 30 boreholes under major repair in Nakisunga, Nagojje, Mpatta, Katosi Town council, Kyampisi and Nama sub counties. The Report was dated 17/06/2020, signed by Kalule J, DWO, Mutalya Joseph, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, DCDO.</p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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 that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. The details are on Page 3 of the procurement plan.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

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>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:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction as per the minute 006/2020 of the DPU meeting held on July 10, 2019.</p>	2
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>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The LG carried established the project implementation team as seen from the letter addressed to the CAO informing the office on the establishment of the District Water and Sanitation Infrastructural Management team. The team comprises of the CAO: the District Water office: District CDO: The Sanitation Officer and District Engineer.</p>	2
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>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>From the Design report dated June 2017 prepared by the consultant (International Project Management Ltd) on behalf of the DWO, the As Built report dated 16/9/2020, field visit and completion report dated 31/11/2020, Mayangayanga piped water supply system was implemented as per the standard technical design.</p> <p>From the standard design obtained from the ministry website (Augered well option 1), the field visit and the progress reports stated in the subsequent sections, the boreholes were also constructed as per the standard designs provided by the DWO</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2

There was evidence that the technical officers carried out a technical supervision of WSS Infrastructure projects There were three projects in this sector but these were supervised at quarterly, rather than monthly intervals and reports produced as follows:

1) Drilling of 16 deep boreholes in Nakisunga, Nagojje, Mpatta, Kasawo, Mpunge & Namagunga sub counties. The Report was dated 17/06/2020, signed by Kalule J, DWO and Mutalya Joseph, Senior Environmental Officer.

2) Drilling of 5 hand pump boreholes in Seeta-Namagunga, Kasawo and Mpatta sub counties. The Report was dated 22/05/2019, signed by Kalule J, DWO and verified by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources.

3) Rehabilitation of 30 boreholes under major repair in Nakisunga, Nagojje, Mpatta, Katosi Town council, Kyampisi and Nama sub counties. The Report was dated 17/06/2020, signed by Kalule J, DWO, Mutalya Joseph, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, DCDO.

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>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</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts as below;</p> <p>1. A contract by Victoria camps ltd for extension of piped water to Kimenyedde subcounty worth Ugx 136,916,996 was certified and initiated by the DWO on 20/11/2019 and full payment was made on 22/6/2020 in accordance with the contract; and</p> <p>2. A contract by Kanah Technical services for extension of piped water to Kome subcounty worth Ugx 429,964,000 was certified and initiated by the DWO on 26/5/2020 and payment was made on 29/6/2020.</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

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>There is evidence that complete procurement files for water infrastructure investments are in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The files have records from procurement request, details of evaluation, the awardd, the contract signing and payments.</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>There was no evidence that the DWO in Liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded grievances as per LG Grievance redress frame work. There was no grievance log in place.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

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 & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence produced to prove that the DWO and the Environment Officer had disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs.</p>	0
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 & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that water source protection plans and Natural resource management plans for WSS Facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The projects were implemented on land where the LG has consent. This includes all the boreholes that were constructed on land donated by the beneficiaries of the project but not documented consent agreements have been processed.</p> <p>The available agreements include that of Mayangayanga piped water scheme where the reservoir sits and it was given out to Kimenyedde S/C from Ddungu Iserayiri who is a resident of Girinya in the same sub county signed on 03/10/2018.</p>	3

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

c. Evidence that E&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:

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence that the LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified work on water projects before the LG made payments to the contractors. A report dated 11/12/2019 by the CDO and Environmental officer listed and approved the water projects below before payment was made.

1. A contract by Victoria camps ltd for extension of piped water to Kimenyedde subcounty worth Ugx 136,916,996 was certified and initiated by the DWO on 20/11/2019 and full payment was made on 22/6/2020 in accordance with the contract; and

2. A contract by Kanah Technical services for extension of piped water to Kome subcounty worth Ugx 429,964,000 was certified and initiated by the DWO on 26/5/2020 and payment was made on 29/6/2020.

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs There were three projects in this sector but these were supervised at quarterly, rather than monthly intervals and reports produced as follows:

1) Drilling of 16 deep boreholes in Nakisunga, Nagojje, Mpatta, Kasawo, Mpunge & Namagunga sub counties. The Report was dated 17/06/2020, signed by Kalule J, DWO and Mutalya Joseph, Senior Environmental Officer.

2) Drilling of 5 hand pump boreholes in Seeta-Namagunga, Kasawo and Mpatta sub counties. The Report was dated 22/05/2019, signed by Kalule J, DWO and verified by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources.

3) Rehabilitation of 30 boreholes under major repair in Nakisunga, Nagojje, Mpatta, Katosi Town council, Kyampisi and Nama sub counties. The Report was dated 17/06/2020, signed by Kalule J, DWO, Mutalya Joseph, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, DCDO.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
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>LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated as follows:</p> <p>0 Ha for the micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries.</p> <p>22 acres (8.8 Ha) for FY 2018/2019</p> <p>127 acres (50.8 Ha) for FY 2019/2020</p>	2
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"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>There was an increase in acreage of newly irrigated land by 427% in FY 2019/2020 as compared to 2018/2019.</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 4 • 60 – 69%; score 2 • Below 60%; score 0 <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>This Performance Measure was not applicable until the LLGs are assessed</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	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	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	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	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.	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	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.	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	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.	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	LG has recruited almost all LLG extension workers as per staffing structure as evidenced from the staffing list.	1

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	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.	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	Micro-scale irrigation systems installed during last FY 2019/2020 for non-beneficiaries are functional as evidenced from farmer visit to Nama Sub County on 16.11.2020. The installed system was a Sprinkler System on 2 acres (Drag and Hose system).	2
---	---	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The information was accurate and the extension workers were in place as per the staffing structure, staff lists and attendance registers examined at three sampled LLGs 1. Nakisunga SC -10 extension workers, 2. Kyampisi SC – 7 extension workers and Kasawo TC 5 extension workers	2
---	---	---	---	---

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale irrigation system have not been installed yet.	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	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	There was no evidence of quarterly supervision and monitoring reports.	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	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS as evidenced by the irritrack app . Dte of last update was 15.11.2020.	1
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	LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS as evidenced by the report on EOI in the UGIFT Project on 13.11.2020 and Report on awareness raising activities under UGIFT micro-scale program on 13.11.2020.	1
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	LG has not developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs	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	LG has not implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs	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 assessor did not have access to the LG performance contract.	0
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	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	LG has deployed extension workers as per guidelines. Staffing is close to 90% as evidenced by the staffing list.	1
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	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	The LG recruited LLGs extension workers as per the staffing structure, staff lists and attendance registers examined at three sampled LLGs 1. Nakisunga SC -10 extension workers, 2. Kyampisi SC – 7 extension workers and Kasawo TC 5 extension workers	2
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	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	The lists of extension workers were posted on the noticeboard at all the three sampled LLGs	2

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>There were no appraisal reports availed for verification of the dates of the appraisal of extension workers</p>	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>There was no evidence of any corrective action taken, based on results from performance appraisal</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>Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level as evidenced by report on training in preparation for the farm visits under small-scale irrigation program held on 13.11.2020.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a training database.</p>	0

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 score 10</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Micro irrigation project in initial stages of implementation.</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>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</p>	<p>Micro irrigation project in initial stages of implementation.</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>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro irrigation project in initial stages of implementation.</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>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>Micro irrigation project in initial stages of implementation.</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>LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding as evidenced by a report by the Ag. Senior Agricultural Engineer on the awareness raising activities under the UGIFT microscale irrigation program dated 13.11.2020</p>	2
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"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment. Micro irrigation program in initial stages of implementation.</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 & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There are no approved farmers yet. The process of farmer selection is on ongoing.</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>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services as evidenced by the report on planning meeting and training report (13.11.2020) and report on the awareness raising activities under UGIFT microscale irrigation Program (13.11.2020).</p>	2

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Farmer Field Schools have not been established.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines as evidenced by report on the awareness raising activities under UGIFT microscale irrigation Program (13.11.2020). The number of people reached was 639.	2
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	The District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG level as evidenced by report on the awareness raising activities under UGIFT microscale irrigation Program (13.11.2020).However, the report does not indicate the number of political leaders trained.	2
Investment Management				
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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	Micro-scale irrigation equipment not yet supplied to farmers	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale irrigation equipment not yet supplied to farmers	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>District has not carried out farm visits to farmer. This activity is in preparatory statge.</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>Farmers have not been approved yet.</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 no evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY 2020/2021.</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>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 evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries.</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>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Procurement of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.</p>	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 was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Procurement of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
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	Procurement of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
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	Procurement of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.	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 Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers	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	Procurement and installation of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Procurement and installation of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
----	--	--	--	----------

Maximum score 18

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Procurement of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
----	--	---	---	----------

Maximum score 18

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Procurement of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
----	--	--	---	----------

Maximum score 18

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	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	There was no evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas	0
----	---	--	---	----------

Maximum score 6

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	There was no evidence of any form of recording of grievances. There was even no grievance log in place.	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: 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	There was no evidence of any form of investigating of grievances.	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: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of any form of responding to grievances.	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: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of any form of reporting of grievances.	0

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	LGs has not disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines.	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	The designs for this project are not yet out done. Costing will be done when the designs will have been produced.	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	Not yet done. The project is at a stage of expression of interest for those who want to participate.	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	This is not yet done. The project is still in its initial stages and has not gone this far.	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	This is not yet done. The project is still in its initial stages and has not gone this far.	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation Maximum score is 70	If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.	The District Water Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN/160/01 dated 4th March 2014	70
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	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. Maximum score is 30	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.	The micro-scale irrigation projects were in inception stages and screening had not yet been done by the time of this assessment. However, a letter dated 11th Nov. 2020 was available, written by the Senior Environmental Officer to the CAO requesting for funds amounting to UGX2,865,000 meant to support screening of IGIFT Irrigation beneficiaries' project areas before projects could be started.	15
2	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. Maximum score is 30	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.	The ESIAs will be done (if found necessary) after the screening exercise.	15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The Civil Engineer (water) was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN/160/01 dated 4th March 2014	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The personal file of the Assistant Water Officer for mobilization was not availed for verification of the appointment	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The personal file of the Borehole Maintenance Technician was not availed for verification of the appointment	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	The personal file of the Natural Resources Officer was not availed for verification of the appointment	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The personal file of the Environment Officer was not availed for verification of the appointment	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The personal file of the Forest Officer was not availed for verification of the appointment	0

Environment and Social Requirements

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.

There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for Water and Environment projects. There were three projects in this sector and these were screened as follows:

1) Drilling of 16 deep boreholes in Nakisunga, Nagojje, Mpatta, Kasawo, Mpunge & Namagunga sub counties. The Screening Report was dated 17/06/2020, signed by Kalule J, DWO and Mutalya Joseph, Senior Environmental Officer.

2) Drilling of 5 hand pump boreholes in Seeta - Namagunga, Kasawo and Mpatta sub counties. The Screening Report was dated 22/05/2019, signed by Kalule J, DWO and verified by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources.

3) Rehabilitation of 30 boreholes under major repair in Nakisunga, Nagojje, Mpatta, Katosi Town council, Kyampisi and Nama sub counties. The Screening Report was dated 17/06/2020, signed by Kalule J, DWO, Mutalya Joseph, Senior Environmental Officer and Ntege James, DCDO.

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.

The Screening reports showed that Environment and Social Impact Assessments were not necessary for all Water and Environment projects.

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 contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

There were no abstraction permits issued. It was reported that the Contractors complained that abstraction permits were expensive (circa UGX500,000/-) and yet the contract arrangements did not include provision for such permits.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District Health Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter PER/10572 dated 5th March 2002</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The Assistant District Health Officer - Maternal, Child Health and Nursing was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN/156/02 dated 18th February 2014</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Assistant District Health Officer - Environmental Health was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN/156/02 dated 18th March 2014</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Principal Health Inspector was not substantively appointed, duties were performed by the Senior Health Inspector as per the appointment letter as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN156/02 dated 23rd April 2015</p>	0

1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The district customized staff structure provided for an Assistant Health Educator, who was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 17th June 2011	10
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	The Biostatistician was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 13th June 2011	10
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	The District Cold Chain Technician was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter MKN/P. 13154 dated 6th November 2015	10
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Health Educator, score 20 or else 0.</p>
---	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>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)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Health projects for FY 2019/2020. There were only two Health projects implemented by the District, and they were as follows:</p> <p>1) Construction of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine, bathroom and urinal at Kimenyedde HC II. The Screening Report was dated 14 September 2020, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ntege James, District Community Development Officer.</p> <p>2) Construction of an in-patients ward block, 8-stance latrine and 6 bathrooms and a urinal at Katoogo HC III. The Screening Report was dated 11 September 2020, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ntege James, District Community Development Officer.</p>	15
2	<p>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)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Screening reports showed that Environment and Social Impact Assessments were not necessary for all Health projects.</p>	15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely: <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The District Education Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN/156/02 dated 23rd June 2020	30
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely: <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The district had three Inspectors of Schools, they were all substantively appointed as per their appointment letter examined as follows; 1. Senior Inspector of Schools – HRM/P.13464 dated 16th April 2019 2. Inspector of Schools – HRM/MKN/160/01 – 9th March 2020 3. Inspector of Schools – HRM/MKN/156/01 10th April 2019	40

Environment and Social Requirements

2

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)

If the LG carried out:
a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for education projects for FY 2019/2020. Those sampled were as follows:

- 1) Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Koome Buyana RC P/S. The Screening Report was dated 21 October 2019, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ampaire Christine, District Community Development Officer;
- 2) Construction of a two classroom block with an office, store and furniture at Kayanja P/S. The Screening Report was dated 25 October 2019, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ampaire Christine, District Community Development Officer; and
- 3) Construction of an eight (8) in one staff house, kitchen, 2 stance latrine and two bathrooms at Nakiswa R/C Primary School. The Screening Report was dated 10 September 2020, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ntege James, District Community Development Officer

The Maximum score is 30

15

2

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)

If the LG carried out:
b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.

The Screening showed that Environment and Social Impact Assessments were not necessary for all projects except Kimenyedde Seed School. For this school, the assessment was carried out and a report produced dated 14 April 2020. It was signed by the Senior Environmental Officer, Mukono.

The Maximum score is 30

15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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	The CFO was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN/160/01 dated 13th December 2019.	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The District Planner was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/P. 13043 dated 30th March 2020	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 District Engineer r was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/10847 dated 25th July 2011	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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	The District Natural Resources Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/12863 dated 30th June 2010	3

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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	The District Production Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter PER/11156 dated 3rd May 2005	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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	The District Community Development Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter PER/11336 dated 5th November 2004	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District Commercial Officer was not substantively appointed, duties were performed by the Principal Community Development Officer as per the appointment letter HRM/P. 11325 dated 3rd December 2019	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer) score 2 or else 0.	The Senior Procurement Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/12904 dated 23rd February 2019	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer), score 2 or else 0	The Procurement Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN/156/02 dated 31st December 2019	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Principal Human Resource Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/P. 13022 dated 23rd December 2018	2
Maximum score is 37.				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Environment Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter HRM/MKN/156/02 dated 3rd December 2019	2
Maximum score is 37.				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Land Management Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR?D12636 dated 14th September 2012	2
Maximum score is 37.				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Accountant was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/12390 dated 15th December 2010	2
Maximum score is 37.				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	The Principal Internal Auditor was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter PER/10563 dated 1st October 2009	2
Maximum score is 37.				

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The Principal Human Resource Officer (DSC) was substantively appointed as per appointment letter HRM/MKN/156/02 dated 19th April 2013	2
Maximum score is 37.				
2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:	The district had thirteen (13) LLGs. All the 13 Senior Assistant Secretaries were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters examined;	5
Maximum score is 15				
a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0				
1.Namataba TC – CR/156/2 Dated 3rd August 2009, 2. Katosi SC MKN/P. 13044 dated 16th June 2020, 3. Nakifuma TC – HRM/MKN/160/01 dated 9th March 2020, 4. Nagojje SC – HRM/MKN/ 160/01 dated 22nd May 2015, 5. Mpatta SC – CR/156/2 30th August 2009, 6. Nakusuga SC – DR/12028 dated 5th July 2011, 7. Kyampisi – CR/12090 dated 15th July 2011, 8. Ntunda SC – CR/156/2 dated 3rd March 2008, 9. Kasawo SC – CR/156/2 dated 10th March 2008, 10. Namuganga SC – HRM/MKN/15602 dated 22nd May 2015, 11. Nama SC – HRM/P. 13140 dated 10th April 2019, 12. Kasawo TC – HRM?MKN/160/01 dated 4th March 2014 and 13. Kisoga TC – HRM/MKN/160/01 dated 2nd February 2015				
2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:	Out of the thirteen (13) Community Development Officers deployed at sub counties, only eight (8) appointment letters were availed for verification as follows;	0
Maximum score is 15				
b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS score 5 or else 0.				
1. Ntunda SC – CR/156/2 dated 13th June 2011, 2. Nakisungs SC – CR/156/2 dated 13th June 2011, 3. Nkokonjeru-Kisoga TC MKN/P. 12632 dated 3rd July 2019, 4. Nama SC – CR/156/2 dated 22nd December 22011, 5. Nagoje TC – CR/156/2 dated 19th September 2011, 6. Kyampisi SC – HRM/MKN/156/2 dated 13th December 2018, 7. Kasawo SC – HRM/MKN/156/2 dated 13th July 2019 and Namuganga SC – MKN/P. 13455 dated 3rd March 2020				

2

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,

score 5 or else 0.

All the 13 Senior Accounts Assistants were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters examined n as follows;

1. Ntunda SC – CR/D/12464 dated 16th March 2011, 2. Kasawo TC CR/12203 dated 29th July 2011, 3. Kasawo SC – CR/2029 dated 16th March 2011, 4. Kisoga – CR/10491 dated 16th March 2011, 5. Nakifuma TC – CR?10535 dated 16th March 2011, 6. Nagojje TC – HRM/MKN/156/02 dars 20th September 1013, 7. Kyampisi SC – HRM/MKN/156/02 dated 20th September 2013, 8. Nakisunga SC – PER/10546 dated 14th January 2004, 9. Nama SC – CR/156/1 dated 1st August 1005, 10. Katosi TC – PER/12077 dated 24th February 2006, 11. Namuganga SC – HRM/MKN/156/02 ndated 4th March 2014, 12. Nagojje SC – PER/12577 dated 16th December 2005 and 13. Namataba TCHRM/MKN/156/02 dated 28th August 2014

5

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

There was no evidence that the LG released 100% of funds allocated in the year 2019/20 to Natural Resources department. The LG budgeted Ugx 233,794,027(LG Budget Estimates 2019/20 page 51) and only Ugx 186,105,415 (80%) was spent (LG Financial statements for the year 2019/20 page 6).

0

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:

b. Community Based Services department.

score 2 or else 0.

There was no evidence that the LG released 100% of funds allocated in the year 2019/20 to Community Based Services department. The LG budgeted Ugx 312,905,000(LG Budget Estimates 2019/20 page 53) and only Ugx 300,796,929(96%) was spent (LG Financial statements for the year 2019/20 page 6).

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, score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening.</p> <p>There was only one DDEG project. This was construction of a two classroom block with an office, store and furniture at Kayanja P/S. The Screening Report was dated 25 October 2019, signed by Mujuni W, Director of Natural Resources and Ampaire Christine, District Community Development Officer.</p>	4
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>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</p>	<p>The Screening showed that Environment and Social Impact Assessments were not necessary.</p>	4
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>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG costed ESMPs for the only project implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) i.e., construction of a two classroom block with an office, store and furniture at Kayanja P/S.</p> <p>Under the section for disposal of excavated materials, there was a part titled "Return, fill and ram selected excavated materials around foundation in 200 mm layers compacted to 95% MDD" and this was costed at UGX212,500/-</p>	4

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The LG will be scored in January 2021 when the Auditor General report for the year 2019/20 is issued.</p>	0
6	<p>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).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>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),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted status of implementation of Internal Auditor General issues for the year 2018/19 on 12 December 2019 and Auditor General audit issues for the year 2018/19 on 13 January 2020 to PS/ST, before the February 2020 deadline. Auditor General audit issues included, shortfall of revenue collection, Under absorption of Ugx 921million and non implementation of activities due to non release of the road funds to the LG.</p> <p>Internal audit issues included spending without authorization at source of Ugx 254,169,219 by the LLGs, Irregular expenditure of Ugx 19,367,861 and doubtful expenditure of Ugx 4,090,990.</p>	10
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 submitted an annual performance contract of 2020/21 on 8 June 2020 before the deadline of August 31st, 2020.</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 submitted the Annual Performance Report for the year 2019/20 on 21/8/2020 before the deadline of August 2020.</p>	4

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

Maximum score is 4

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,

score 4 or else 0.

The LG submitted all the quarterly budget Performance Reports for the year 2019/20 by the deadline of August 2020 as below:

Q1 was submitted on 5/12/2019 ;

Q2 was submitted on 31/1/2020 ;

Q3 was submitted on 30/4/2020 ; and

Q4 was submitted on 21/8/2020.