



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kiryandongo District

(Vote Code: 592)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	39%
Education Minimum Conditions	85%
Health Minimum Conditions	65%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	55%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	41%
Educational Performance Measures	50%
Health Performance Measures	51%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	42%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

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 infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project as illustrated below.</p> <p>The sampled projects done using DDEG were</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of offices for internal Audit Production Staff on the third level of the Administration block 2. Installation of a 3 phase Transformer at the District Head Quarters 3. Rehabilitation of borehole at Jeeja Primary School <p>All these were physically inspected by the Assessment Team and found functioning very well.</p>	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>The Performance Assessment for LLGS had not introduced hence this area is not applicable</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 documentary evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed 100% as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY 2018/2020 The following DDEG funded investment projects were completed 100%.

The Following were the Completed projects
Construction of Offices of the Internal and Production Staff the District Head Quarters completed as reflected on page 40 of the Annual performance FY2019/2020 report Procured and installed 3phase Transformer at the District headquarters reflected on 93 of the Annual Performance reportFY2019/2020

Procurement of ICT equipment

2

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.

The LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY 2019/2020 on eligible expenditure . The LG budgeted for Shs 357,987,000 and the expenditure stood as follows arising from verified Payment vouchers 15, Shs 149,893.130 was spent on Construction of Administration offices and fixing Guard rails along the Stairs of the Administration block against a budget of Shs 167,010,000 ,

Procurement of Chairs a and tables at accost of Shs 17,116,440 against a budget of Shs 17,150,000
Procurement of Transformer at accost of Shs 57,992,836 against a budget of Shs 65,750,000,

Rehabilitation of bore holes at Kiruuli ,Jeeja Primary School and Nyakatiti Procurement of ICT equipment for Political Leaders at a cost of Shs 16,000,00 against budget of Shs 32,500,000

Market stall budgeted at UGX 30,000,000: the work plan provided by the Planner did not include the market stalls at the time of the assessment. As per the District DDEG work plan authenticated by the District Planner and confirmed by the Chief Administrative Officer on 25th July, 2019.

2

Investment
Performance

Maximum 4 points on
this performance
measure

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

score 2 or else score 0

Three sampled DDEG funded projects:

Construction of Administration block; procurement reference no: KIRY 592/WRKS/2019-20/00074, was estimated by the District Engineer at UGX 167,009,570 as per AWP pg. 9, against the contract price of UGX 167,037,850 as per contract approved by the CC under Min:016/06/CC/WRKS/19-20

Variance = UGX 28,280

%age variance = 0%

Installation of 100 kVA transformer for three phase power in the District HQRS.

Engineer's estimates UGX: 64,999,568

Contract price UGX 64,999,000

Variance = UGX 568

Variance %age= 0%

Health

Construction of a fence at Kiigya HC III with chain link.

Engineer's estimates UGX: 21,731,800

Contract price UGX 21,731,800

Variation %age: 0 %

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported
information

Maximum 4 points on
this Performance
Measure

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

score 2 or else score 0

The visited LLGs of Kigumba S/C, Kigumba T/C and Masindi port S/C and the attendance books verified and the staff lists seen show that positions filled are accurate.

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 documentary evidence that infrastructure constructed using DDEG was in place as per reports produced by the LG as follows:: Office Construction was reflected on page 40 of the generated performance report FY2019/20. under Administration</p> <p>The 3 phase Transformer was installed at the District Head Quarters was reflected on Page 93 of the Annual Performance report</p> <p>FY2019/2020</p> <p>Procurement of tables and Chairs were reflected on page 93 of the Annual Performance report for FY2019/2020</p> <p>Rehabilitation of boreholes at Kiruuli ,Jeeja Primary School and Nyakatiti was reflected on page 99 of the Annual Performance report FY2019/2020</p> <p>Procurement of ICT equipment 10 IPADS, 2Laptops,2printers were reflected on page 18 of the Annual Performance report FY 2019/2020</p> <p>A physical verification by the Assessment Team confirmed that the Infrastructure was in place and functioning.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>Applicable when the system of LLG assessments had been introduced</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>This Performance area will be applicable when the Performance Assessment of LLGs was introduced..</p>	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 area will be applicable when the Performance Assessment of LLGS was introduced	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	A document was provided showing the staffing requirements for the next FY but wasn't signed or dated and neither was there proof for submission and receipt.	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	Much as there was a Staff Attendance List Book, there was no evidence of any tracking reports or analysis of staff attendance	0
---	--	--	---	---

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

From the Personnel Files reviewed,

Not All HoDs were appraised in the last FY.

HoDs appraised in the last FY were;

-Mutyaba Imaam the DHO was appraised on the 14th/July/2019.

Obwona Richard the CFO was appraised on the 11th/July/2019.

-Muhumuza Samuel the District Engineer was appraised on the 12th, August,2019

-Bemya Issa Hassan the District Production Officer was appraised on the 12th,august,2019

-Kakumba Sam the DCO was appraised on the 12th/ August/2019

HoDs that were not appraised in the last FY;

-Balikagira Julius the District Planner was last appraised on the 5th/ July/2018

-Dabanja Geoffrey the DCDO was last appraised on the 10th/August/2017

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

The Rewards and Sanctions Committee was there and functional, constituted five people;

Ahabwe Samuel Chairperson
Murungi Violet Secretary
Ayigi Roseline Member
Kwizera Zephania Member
Katusabe Johnson Member.

The committee sat on the 11th,June,2020 at 12:48pm with Bogere Edwards (Biostatistician) Minute no.12/2020 clearly spells out Bogere's misconduct.

Minute No.13/2020 spells out the Resolutions which included Bogere had no respect for the planner for the extent of pointing fingers at him for non-payment of salary, on Departmental Meetings which he had ever called for but the members didn't turn up, he doesn't delegate office attendants but he instead delegates to trainee statisticians.

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 Consultative Committee was not in place	0
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	No recruitment was carried out in the previous Financial Year	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.	Two staffs retired in the previous FY and didn't access the payroll within the two months. Katusabe Elizebeth a Senior Nursing Officer retired on the 29th/January/2020 Onyai Achen Miriam the Nursing Assistant retired on the 31st/March/2010 There was no readily available information on when they accessed the payroll.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

Effective Planning,
Budgeting and
Transfer of Funds for
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on
this Performance
Measure

a. If direct transfers
(DDEG) to LLGs were
executed in accordance
with the requirements of
the budget in previous FY:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was documentary evidence that DDEG were transferred to LLGs in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as per transfer forms.

In quarter 1

A total of Shs. 234,865,341 was transferred to the following LLGs on 07th August, 2019

Kigumba Sub County Shs. 47,298,829,
Kiryandongo Sub County Shs. 75,814,895, Masindi
Port Sub County 19,808,521, Mutunda Sub County
Shs. 62,411,660

Town Councils

Bweyale Town Council 16,997,718, Kigumba
Town Council Shs. 8,339,220, Kiryandongo Town
Council 4,194,496

Quarter 2 FY 2019/20

A total of Shs. 234,865,341 was transferred to LLGs on 19th Nov, 2019

Sub Counties

Kigumba Sub County Shs. 47,298,829,
Kiryandongo Sub County Sh. 75,814,895, Masindi
port SUB county 62,411,666

Town Councils

Bweyale Town Council 16,997,718, Kigumba Town
Council Sh. 8,339,220, Kiryandongo Town Council
Sh. 4,194,496

Quarter 3

A total of Sh. 497,120,675 was remitted to LLGs on 07th Feb, 2020 as follows;

Sub Counties

Masindi port Sub County Sh. 39,617,045, Kigumba
Sub County Sh. 94,597,659, Kirwandong Sub
county Sh. 179,019,788, Mutunda Sub county Shs
124,823,308

The following information was not available to the performance assessment Team for verification. Dates of receipts of funds from Ministry of finance, planning and Economic Development

Effective Planning,
Budgeting and
Transfer of Funds for
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on
this Performance
Measure

b. If the LG did timely
warranting/ verification of
direct DDEG transfers to
LLGs for the last FY, in
accordance to the
requirements of the
budget:

Score: 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence provided at the time of Assessment

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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: Score 2 or else score 0	There was no documentary evidence that 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.	0
----	--	--	--	---

11	Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0	No information was provided at the time of Assessment	0
----	--	---	---	---

11	Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up: Score 2 or else score 0	No information was provided at the time of Assessment	0
----	--	--	---	---

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: Score 2 or else score 0 Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0	The Local Government had made an attempt to develop an Assets Register but not conclusively because it was devoid of the prescribed formats outlined on pages 167 to 168 of the Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007. The Local Government had one single Assets register where all Assets were listed against the requirement of 3 categories of Assets register exhibited in the Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007. The Assesses were taken through the dynamics of preparing the following categories of Assets register namely the Assets register General Assets register for Motor Vehicles Heavy Plants and Assets register for Land and Buildings	0
----	--	--	---	---

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 documentary evidence that the District had used the Board of survey report of the previous FY 2019/2020 to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets maintenance of existing assets and disposal of Assets. For instance the recommendations of the Board of Survey report FY2018/19 and FY2019/20 were not discussed in TPC or acted upon.</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>There was documentary evidence that the District had a functional Physical Planning Committee in place. These included the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kyandiru Doreen- Physical Planner 2. Chandia Joseph- Ass. Engineering Officer 3. Rev. Edward Kiirya- District Education Officer 4. Ongii Ronny- Staff Surveyor 5. Karungi Enid- Senior Agricultural Officer 6. Okwi Samuel- Town Clerk Bweyale TC 7. Busingye Zarithar- Environmental Officer 8. Okori Leonard- District Health Inspector <p>The team had submitted 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development. 4 sets of meetings were held and minutes were submitted to MoLUD on the following dates</p> <p>1st Quarter set for the meeting held on 13th September 2019.</p> <p>2ND Quarter set for the meeting held on 20th December 2019.</p> <p>3rd Quarter set for the meeting held on 8th March 2020</p> <p>4th Quarter set for the meeting held on 25th June 2020</p> <p>The local Government had submitted all the four sets of minutes to the Ministry of Lands housing Urban Development</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>There was no documentary evidence that the Local Government had conducted desk appraisal for all projects in the budget however all the Projects were derived from the Local Government Development LGDP For instance a project of construction of Offices and fixing Guard rails along the stairs at the Administration block was derived from the Local Government Development Plan as reflected on page 153 of the Development Plan</p> <p>Formulation of the 3rd District Development Plan for the FY 2020/2021- 2024/2025 appeared on 204 of the District Development Plan, All the DDEG projects were eligible for Expenditure and funding Source guidelines i.e. DDEG.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that LG conducted field appraisal, technical feasibility</p> <p>Environmental and social acceptability for the 3 sampled projects namely Rehabilitation of borehole at Jeeja Primary School in Kiruuli Village, Construction of Offices at the Headquarters Administration block. Purchasing and installation of 3phase ,Transformer at the District Head Quarters</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that project profiles with costing had been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the o Annual work plan for the current FY as per LG Planning guidelines and DDEG guidelines For instance there was a project profile of completion of the Administration block with planned expenditure of Shs 2,000 000 000</p> <p>Another example that can be cited was in the Education sector where 20 classroom blocks were planned to be constructed at various Schools in the District at a Cost of Shs 859,500,000 The project profiles were discussed by the TPC under minute number 08/TPC/JUL/2020 in a meeting held in July 13 2020 in the Council Hall</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>Under DDEG, Kiryandongo LG had six (6) projects implemented during the FY 2019/2020 as mentioned below;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of five (5) boreholes. Out of five Boreholes, the assessor was availed with Four 4 screening forms. Screening was done on 25th October, 2019 that is Wakisanyi-Myeba,Nyakatiti,Jeeja II kinyara p/s borehole</p> <p>Construction for fencing of Mutunda sub county Administration block Screening forms were not available at the time of assessment</p> <p>Mitigation Measures were not incorporated at the time of Screening</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The approved procurement plan for current FY received at PPDA Hoima on 25/9/2020 signed by CAO on 10/9/2020 contained projects like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Market Stall construction at Gaspa Market 2. District stores construction 3. Council regalia 4. Laptops and motorcycle for administration 5 Latrines, community hall renovation . 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>All infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. The following projects were approved as per the Contracts Committee meeting held on 1st September,2020 under Minute No: 032/02/CC/KDLG/2021</p> <p>For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Administration Block. 2. Fencing of Administration at Mutunda S/C 3. Fencing of Kijjya HCII 	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 to show that the LG Established PITs across all sectors at the LG	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	<p>The was evidence that the infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>Administration</p> <p>Phase 5 Construction of administration block at the District Headquarters under: KIRY 592/WRKS/2019/00026. The fabrication and fixation of guard rails, stair cases and overhead tanks, done as per standard technical designs and functional. Access ladders to overhead tanks, bat-exclusion parapet, ceiling, plastering, floor finishes, installation of windows and lock systems, installation of water closets, plumbing, fire extinguishers, electrical installation were all confirming to the Engineer's standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer</p> <p>Installation of 100 kVA transformer for three phase power in the District HQRS.The transformer was in place and functional.</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Construction of a fence at Kiigya HC III with chain link. The fence is in conformity with the Engineer's technical designs. For example; angle posts are coated with red oxide as undercoat.</p> <p>All the above projects were in place as per the field visits by the Assessment Team</p>	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	<p>There was evidence that the LG had provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY.</p> <p>Three infrastructure projects were sampled in the following sectors:</p> <p>Education</p> <p>A site meeting for the construction of Kitwara Seed Secondary School was held on September,2019 and</p> <p>attended among others by:</p>	2

Chief administrative Officer
 Resident District Commissioner
 District Chair Person
 Acting District Engineer (Project Manager)
 Clerk to works
 Contractor
 District Education Officer (Project Supervisor)
 District Community Development Officer
 Physical Planner
 MIN.3 /Kitwara /17092020: Site inspection

The monitoring report dated 8th June, 2020 prepared by Assistant Engineer and addressed to CAO, under ref: WAT, indicated that inspection of the 7 borehole rehabilitation sites and 1 Ecosan /Guard house, were carried out.

Team included: Senior CDO, Environment Officer, representative of the District Water Engineer.

Some key highlights:

- Need to correct snags at the rehabilitated well at Kinyara primary school.
- The contractor to change the direction of the water heater structure at Apodorwa Water pump system
- Lock down affected the work between April and May

Engineering Works

Report submitted to the CAO on 3rd December, 2019 under ref ENV/550 showed that construction projects were inspected and monitored. For example: Mechanized maintenance of Kaduku road project. Some of the issues addressed included: Personal protective equipment (PPE), grievance redress register and monthly reporting on environment and social issues

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

The was evidence that the LG had verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract
 Three sampled projects were as follows:
 Education sector:
 Construction of a two classroom block at Masindi Port primary school (KIRY592/WRKS/19-20/00022.

1

Certificate 1

Work certified by:

Acting Engineer on 8th April, 2020.

Recommended by DEO on 15th April, 2020.

Certified by CFO on 14th April, 2020.

Certified by District Environment Officer on 14th April, 2020.

Approved by CAO on 16th April, 2020.

Payment made on 5th May, 2020.

VR No: 29305085.

Receipt No: 671.

Time Frame: 1 Month.

Water: Payment for drilling and installation of seven deep boreholes in the district.

KIRY592/WRKS/19-20/000031

Certificate of completion/payment

Work certified by:

Project Supervisor on 8th June,2020

District Water Engineer on 8th June, 2020

Approved by CAO on 12th June,2020

Payment made on 26th June,2020

VR No: 30415412

Receipt No: 2902

Time Frame: 18 Days

Health

Construction of phase 5 of administration office block at the district Headquarters

Certificate of substantial completion

Work certified by:

District Engineer on 13th May,2020.

Approved by CAO on 13th May,2020

Tax invoice No 001

Payment of UGX 149,893,130, made on 5th May,2020

VR No: 30415422

All the three sampled projects were paid within the stipulated timeframes.

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had complete Procurement files that contained the approved evaluation reports, works contracts and record of contract committee meetings.</p> <p>Three sampled contracts were:</p> <p>Phase 5 construction of administration block at the District Headquarters under</p> <p>Procurement ref: KIRY 592/WRKS/2019-20/000074</p> <p>Evaluation Committee members:</p> <p>Muhumuza Samuel .Ag.District Engineer)</p> <p>Candia Joseph (Asst Engineer)</p> <p>Kyamanywa Stephen (District Accountant)</p> <p>Balikagira Julius (District Planner)</p> <p>Dacan Dennis (Principal Administrative Secretary)</p> <p>Works contract approved on 2nd December,2019</p> <p>Min 016/06/CC/KDLG/WRKS/19-20/00036.</p> <p>Sample of three procurement contracts under:</p> <p>Production</p> <p>Construction of 5 Stance latrines at Keganywa market</p> <p>Procurement ref: KIRY 592/WRKS/19-20/00020</p> <p>Contract price UGX 19,000,000</p> <p>Evaluation report was available on PP form 47 dated 18th October,2020 approved by contracts Committee on 26th November,2019</p> <p>Works contract signed on 2nd December,2019</p> <p>Min No:009/06/CC/KDLG/19/20</p> <p>Water</p> <p>Seven borehole siting and drilling supervision</p> <p>Procurement ref: KIRY 592/WRKS/19-20/00028</p> <p>Contract price UGX 21,000,000</p> <p>Evaluation report was available on PP form 47 dated 18th October,2020 approved by contracts Committee on 26th November,2019</p> <p>Works contract signed on 17th January, 2020.</p> <p>Min No: 005/06/CC/KDLG/19/20.</p> <p>Administration</p> <p>Fencing of the administration block at Mutunda Sub-County</p>
---	--	---

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	As per the letter signed by CAO on 7th November, 2018, Murungi Emmanuel was assigned as Feedback and Response Officer under Minute DTPC 03/11/2018 The was no grievance redress committee at the time of assessment	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	The LG had no specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievance at the time of assessment.	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	There was no evidence of publicized the grievance redress mechanisms at the time of assessment.	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No Evidence at the time of Assessment</p>	<p>0</p>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No Evidence at the time of Assessment</p>	<p>0</p>
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): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that only the rehabilitation of 4No. Boreholes, 7No Boreholes that were drilled and construction of two classroom block at St. Livingstone p/s had screening forms and costed ESMP The rest of the Projects had no screening forms and costed ESMP</p>	<p>0</p>
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. Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no additional costing impact from climate change at the time of assessment</p>	<p>3</p>

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>The Assessment Team was availed the following Land Agreements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreement Between Kimeze Godfrey of Kitongozi Village, Kitwara Parish and Kiryandongo Local Government to put a borehole at Kitongozi Village. It was signed on 19th December 2019 2. Agreement between Yoweri Embuzi of Kaduku Parish and Kiryandongo Local Government to put a borehole at Kaduku. It was signed on 15th January 2010. 3. Agreement between Pascal Ocegolak of Mombi Village and Kiryandongo Local Government to put a borehole at Mombi Village. It was signed on 28th December 2019 	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>The environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance.</p> <p>A report dated December 03rd 2009 REF:ENV/550 showed the social and environment monitoring of construction projects including schools and borehole rehabilitation. These included.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of two classroom blocks at Kankoba Primary School where they recommended that site hording should be done and PPE for workers should be availed. 2. Rehabilitation of Jeeja PS borehole where they recommended that the concrete slab should be maintained clean and fruit trees should be planted at the school. 3. Rehabilitaion of Nyakatiiti Trading Centre Borehole where they recommended that all broken materials of the old drainage channel should be disposed off. <p>Another report dated 3rd July 2020 showed the monitoring activities of projects in the month of June 2020 where they recommended the construction of a fence at 2ft from the drainage channel at Labokehanga deep borehole.</p>	1

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

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

Score 1 or else score 0

All the sampled projects had E&S compliance Certification Forms completed and signed by the Environmental Officer only prior to payments of Contractors' Invoices/certificates at Interim and final stages

of projects:

1. Construction of two classroom block at Masindi Port. Certification Form No. 002/2019-2020 dated 21st May 2020. signed by Environmental Officer only.
2. Construction of 5 Stance Latrine at Dyang Village. Certification Form No. 004/2019-2020 dated 25st May 2020 signed by Environmental Officer only.
3. Construction of two classroom block at LivingStone P/S. Certification Form No. 003/2019-2020 dated 21st May 2020. signed by Environmental Officer only.

Financial management

16

LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

There was documentary evidence that the LG carried out monthly bank reconciliations for FT2019/2020 as at 30TH June 2020 and up to date at the time of the assessment The 3 sampled Bank Accounts had been reconciled to date namely Kiryandongo DLG Uganda Women Enterprises Program Bank Account Currency UGX at Stanbic bank Kigumba Branch had been reconciled to date as of 30th October 2020. Youth Livelihood recovery Bank Account No 1630045000070 at Post bank Bweyale branch had been reconciled up to date as of 31st October 2020. Kiryandongo Treasury Single Account 0059 at Bank of Uganda. Had been reconciled up to date as of 31st October 2020.

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that the LG had produced all the quarterly internal audit reports for FY2019/2020 as follows;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarterly internal audit report unreferenced was submitted to the District Speaker on t 8th August 2020 • 2nd Quarterly report was submitted to the District Speaker on 8th September 2020. • 3th Quarterly internal audit report was submitted to the District Speaker on 8th September S2020 • 4th Quarterly internal audit report was submitted to the District Speaker on 30th October 2020. 	
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</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>There was no documentary 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>However, LG Public Accounts Committee had produced and submitted to the District chairperson two reports indicating implementation of audit findings from 1st and 2nd internal audit reports on 30th October 2020.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>		
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</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>There was documentary evidence that Internal Audit Reports for the previous FY 2019/2020 were submitted to Accounting Officer as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarterly internal audit report on 24th June 2020 as per records in the delivery book • 2nd Quarterly internal audit report submitted on 2nd July 2020. • 3rd Quarterly internal audit report submitted on 27th July 2020. • 4th Quarterly internal audit report was submitted on 30th September 2029 	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>		

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>Local revenue Collected FY 2019/20was Shs 316,513,490</p> <p>Original budget for Local revenue FY2019/2020 was Shs 539,494,000</p> <p>The percentage of Local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY 2019/2020 = $316,513,490 \times 100$</p> <p>539,494,000</p> <p>= 58,6% =59% This constituted a deficit of 41% which was beyond f the minimum deficit of 10%</p>	0
			<p>The following are factors that affected the Budget outturn fort Local revenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COVID 19 significantly affected the Business activities where the LGB usually gets Local revenue • There was Closure of animal markets a situation that affected Collection of livestock feesThe District anticipated to get land fees but it was not remitted from Masindi Land Office. 	
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>Local revenue increased from Shs 282,002,055 FY 2018/2019 to Shs 316,513,490. In FY 2019/2020 ie 316,513,490 minus 282,002,055 resulting into resulting into an increase of shs 34,511,435</p> <p>Percentage increase was $\frac{34,511,435}{282,002,055} \times 100$</p> <p>12.2%</p> <p>The following are the factors that contributed to increase in Local revenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was joint monitoring of Local revenue sources by political leaders led by Finance committee members. There was joint mobilization in Lower Local Governments LLGS All Staff worked as a team • The tenderers were paying upfront to avoid defaulting • There were regular revenue meetings with sub county staff and other Stakeholders • The LG instituted good Accountability practices that yielded dividends <p>There was extensive sensitization of tax payers</p>	2

20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not remit the mandatory LLGs share of local revenues during the previous FY as required.</p> <p>Shs. 94,058,254 was subject to sharing as reflected on page 44 of the Draft Final Accounts FY 2019/20. The LG remitted only shs 20,00,000 to the following Town councils Kiryandongo Town Council Shs 6,970,750 Kigumba Town Council Shs 6,924,250 and Bweyale Town council Shs 6,105,000</p> <p>Percentage of what was remitted was calculated as follows</p> <p>Amount remitted to LLGS divide by the amount that was subjected to Sharing</p> $\frac{\text{Shs } 20,000,000}{\text{Shs } 94,058,254} \times 100$ <p>= 21.2% This was contrary to the requirement of 65% stipulated in section 85 (4) of the Local Governments Act CAP 243</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had displayed the Procurement Plan and awarded contracts for the FY 2019/20. For example, the fencing of Mutunda Sub-County administration block worth UGX 58,694,552 was awarded to Budometa Investments Ltd as the Best Evaluated Bidder and Teb Technical Services and Contractors Limited as the 2nd Best Bidder.</p> <p>Date of display: 8th December,2019</p> <p>Date of removal:31st December,2019.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence at the time of Assessment</p>	0

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 no evidence at the time of Assessment</p>	0
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>There was no evidence at the time of Assessment</p>	0
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>The LG didn't have any issue with the IGG at the time of Assessment</p>	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>There was evidence that the LG PLE pass rate improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year by 4.3% as illustrated below</p> <p>PLE 2018</p> <p>G1+G2+G3</p> <p>476+2321+1222= 4019</p> <p>Total number of Pupils in 2018 = 5133</p> <p>%age = (4019/5133)*100= 78.2%</p> <p>2019</p> <p>360+2863+1203=4426</p> <p>Total number of Pupils in 2019 = 5365</p> <p>%age = 82.5%</p> <p>%age Increment = 4.3%</p>	2
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 	No Evidence at the time of Assessment	0
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 	N/A	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The education development grant was used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>The FY 2019/2020 budget showed;</p> <p>2 classroom blocks at St Livingstone and Masindi Port where each got 2</p> <p>4 pit latrines at Kifuta, Nyakatamba, Nyinga and Masindi Port</p> <p>Seed school at Kitwala seed secondary school</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>According to the the three sampled Vouchers from the CFO, to show that the CDO and Environment Officer certified works on Education Construction Projects as shown below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment Certificate for Construction of 2 Classroom Blocks at Masindi Port dated on 4th April 2020. 2. Payment Certificate for Construction of 5 Stance Lined VIP Latrine at Kiigya dated 26th June 2020 3. Payment Certificate for Construction of 5 Stance Lined VIP Latrine at Kifuruta PS dated 20th May 2020 	2
---	--	--	---	---

Investment
Performance: The LG
has managed
education projects as
per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

c) If the variations in the contract
price are within +/-20% of the
MoWT estimates score 2 or else
score 0

There was evidence that the variations in the
contract price were within +/-20% of the
MoWT estimates as per the consolidated
procurement plan for FY2019/2020.

All the sampled projects were within +/-20%
of the Estimates as illustrated below.

1. Construction of 2 Class room blocks at
Masindi Port P/S and St. Livingstone.

The Annual Procurement Plan for FY
2019/2020, the Estimated cost was UGX
177,900,000

Final Contract Price was UGX 163,072,208

Variance %age = 8%

2. Construction of 5 Stance Latrine at Kiigya
P/S.

Estimate cost as per Procurement Plan was
UGX 21,000,000

Final Contract Price was UGX 22,419,980

Variance %age = 6.7%

3. Construction of 5 Stance Lined VIP
Latrine at Kifuruta P/S.

Estimate cost as per Procurement Plan was
UGX 21,000,000

Final Contract Price was UGX 23,518,634

Variance %age = 11.9%

All the sampled projects above, fell within
the variation limit +/-20%

Investment
Performance: The LG
has managed
education projects as
per guidelines

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

d) Evidence that education
projects were completed as per
the work plan in the previous FY

- If 100% score 2
- Between 80 – 99% score 1
- Below 80% score 0

There was evidence that education projects
were completed as per work plan in the
previous FY as per the Engineer's
Supervision Report, Ref: WKS/213/19 ,
dated 29th June 2020, All the 7 Projects
were completed.

The completed projects were : St.
Livingstone P/S, Masindi Port P/S,
Nyakatama P/S, Kifuruta, Dyang P/S and
Masindi Port P/S. However the 8th Project
was a seed School at Kitwara Parish-
Kiryandongo S/C that is still Ongoing .
However, by the time of the assessment, the
phase of the construction for the FY 2019/20
was completed

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	As per the Letter dated 25th March 2020 from the DEO to the CAO showing the staff gaps, It showed that	2
	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 	<p>Expected staff =897</p> <p>Existing Staff =832</p>	
			$(832/897)*100\% =92.7536\%$	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	There was no evidence availed at the time of the Assessment	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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 		

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The LG did not accurately report on teachers and where they were deployed.

Out of the three sampled primary schools in different Sub Counties namely Kiryandongo COU P/S, Kigumba COU P/S, Masindi Port P/S, Kigumba and Masindi Port, the numbers didn't match.

Kiryandongo COU PS had 13 teachers on ground and 13 at the DEO's office

Kigumba COU 19 teachers on ground and 21 at the DEO's office

Masindi Port PS had 9 teachers on ground and 10 at the centre

The explanation was that when teachers are transferred or change schools the list is not updated at the DEO's office and that is why the list at the center usually has more names

0

5

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The LG did not have a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.

0

6	School compliance and performance improvement:	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:	No Evidence was provided at the time of Assessment	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:	b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:	Among the sampled schools, only School improvement plan was available only in Kigumba COU. Kiryandongo COU PS and Masindi Port PS did not have. The Education department didn't help any school to prepare SIPs	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 	Covid19 interfered with the plan of the district rolling out the training of teachers on SIPs	
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:	The LG collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year. This was evidenced by a letter from the CAO to the Permanent Secretary on submission of enrolment figures from Kiryandongo, dated 11th September, 2019, Ref. CR/350	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

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The LG Education Department had a final approved work plan for FY 2020/21 with a wage bill of UGX 5,859,894,000 for 832 teachers on ground as per the staff list as at June 2020, and the Kiryandongo District Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2020/21, Vote: 592, Page 27, dated 26th June, 2020. This was for 73 schools in the current financial year as per the staff list.

832/73=11.397 teachers per school

4

7

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,

Score 3 else score: 0

The LG deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY.

This was evidenced in the sampled schools which all had more than 7 teachers.

Kiryandongo COU PS had 13 teachers on ground and 13 at the DEO's office

Kigumba COU 19 teachers on ground and 21 at the DEO's office

Masindi Port PS had 9 teachers on ground and 10 at the centre

3

Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0

Teacher deployment data was disseminated or publicized on school notice boards on manila papers written by the school Heads.

This was evidenced as seen below;

Kiryandongo COU PS had 13 teachers on ground and 13 at the DEO's office

Kigumba COU 19 teachers on ground and 21 at the DEO's office

Masindi Port PS had 9 teachers on ground and 10 at the centre

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

Not All the Primary school head teachers were appraised in the Previous School Year.

Those that were appraised were as below:

-Oryem Smon Peter was appraised on the 20th, March, 2019.

-Anyeri Alex was appraised on the 20th, April, 2019.

-Nyamwiza Racheal was appraised on the 2nd, Feb, 2019

-Nantongo Hellen was appraised on the 8th, Jan 2019

-Bakyetaho Elizabeth was appraised on the 13th, February, 2019.

-Karungi Florence was appraised on the 4th, February, 2019.

-Akugizibwe Annet was appraised on the 8th, February, 2019.

-Kyaligonza Joyce was appraised on the 8th, Feb, 2019.

Those that were not appraised in the Previous School Year were as below;

-Baguma Sabiiti Alex was appraised on the 7th, January, 2020.

-Sabiiti Richard was appraised on the 20th, April, 2020

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The ministry of Public Service controls the information and not disseminated to the Districts.

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>No Evidence was provided at the time of Assessment</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG did not prepare 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 at the time of the Assessment</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

9

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

b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.

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

The LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.

This was evidenced in the Education sector workplan for 3rd Quarter 2019/2020 and the items included inspection (4,700,000) and monitoring (4,600,000) by the DIS and DEO.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

2

9

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

c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters

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

Evidence not availed at the time of Assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

0

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence that that the LG invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated! publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.

Q3 2019/2020 on 17th September 2019 for 3rd term

Q4 2019/2020 on 5th May 2020 for 2nd Term

Q 1 2020/2021 on 20th October 2020

From the sampled schools the Assessment Team was not able to see any publicized capitation grant releases and reason was that when they are released, they are posted on their whatusp platform or communicated verbally by the DEO in teachers meetings

2

10

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence that the LG Education Department prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections as seen below;

Inspection programme plan for Term 1 2020

Attendance sheet for inspection meeting to plan for inspection held on 17th March 2020.

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>All registered UPE schools were inspected and monitored in FY 2019/2020 as per the reports submitted on the dates below;</p> <p>Term 1- 73 schools on 17th July 2019</p> <p>Term 2- 73 on 7th August 2020</p> <p>Term 3- 73 schools on 18th February 2020</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up as shown below;</p> <p>Minutes of the Education Department meeting held on 11th September 2019 under minute 29/8/2019 were the DIS discussed submission of inspection reports for Term 2 2019.</p> <p>Minutes of the Education Department meeting held on 4th July 2019 under minute 4/07/2019 where different sector heads gave reports. The District Inspector of schools gave his submission on inspection for Term 2 2019.</p>	2

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DIS and DEO 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)

Term 1 submitted to DES MoES Kampala Office 17th July 2019

Term 2 submitted to DES MoES Kampala Office 7th August 2020

Term 3 submitted to DES MoES Kampala Office 18th February 2020

From the sampled schools the following evidence was seen;

Kiryandongo COU PS inspected on 14th November 2019 by Ms Kusiima Juliet. On 23rd July 2019 by Mr Katushabe Johnson

Kigumba COU inspected on 19th November 2019 by Mr Ndooli David.

Masindi Port PS inspected on 13th November 2019 by Mr Angullu Patrick Emmanuel.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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 documentary evidence that the Council committee responsible for Education met and discussed service delivery issues For instance the Standing Committee responsible for Education during its meeting of 2020 in the Office of District planner

Under minute no 4/KDLG/COMTEC/FEB/2020 The Committee discussed issues of service delivery in the Education sector which included Staffing in Government Aide secondary School called Mboi and construction work I at Kitwara Seed School.

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues as shown below;</p> <p>Report to DEO on menstrual hygiene management training held on 8th August 2019, dated 27th August 2019.</p> <p>The training was attended by Head Teachers, senior women and men teachers and the topics included understanding puberty body languages, challenges faced during puberty to mention but a few.</p> <p>6th February 2020 letter to all Head Teachers on training of senior women teachers to be held on 20th February and special needs teachers to be held on 27th February 2020</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of an assets register at the DEO's office.</p> <p>From the sampled schools there was no assets register seen</p>	0
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>There was no evidence availed at the time of Assessment</p>	0

12	Planning and budgeting for investments	c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0	There was no evidence availed at the time of Assessment	0
	<i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution	a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, score: 1, else score: 0	There was evidence that the LG Education department had budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan As per the Annual Procurement Plan for FY 2020/2021.	1
	<i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>		This was evidenced by the approved annual procurement plan dated 10th September , 2020, signed by the CAO, under Ref: CR/223/56	
			Examples of the sector infrastructure projects included:	
			1. 2 Classroom block with an Office at Kyamugenyi COU P/S. page 3	
			2. Two Classroom block at Mpumwe Primary School. Page 3	
			Construction of 5 Stance Lined VIP Latrine at Nyiga P/S and Kisekura P/S	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution	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, score: 1, else score: 0	All the infrastructure projects implemented by education department were approved and were within the thresholds that did not require the clearance of the Solicitor General.	1
	<i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>		All the infrastructure projects were approved by the Contracts Committee on 2nd December, 2019. For example Construction of a 5 stance latrine at Kiigya primary school under MIN: KIRY 592/ Wrks/19-20/00020	

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the LG established a PIT for School Construction Projects within the last FY as per the guidelines.</p> <p>The PIT was appointed on 14th January 2020 Under Ref: CR/109/1 by the CAO.</p> <p>There was evidence of a Project Management Plan Dated 4th May 2020 under Ref: WKS/207 and signed by the Projects Supervisor.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES. For example: a two-classroom block at St Livingstone primary which were constructed by Teb Technical Services & Contractors, the physical structure was in conformity with the technical standards. Roofing was done using green colour coded irons sheets of gauge E 26, it had a rough cast wall, cemented verandah with no cracks, metallic doors and windows, a ramp and a provision for a chalk and a pin board</p> <p>The project has not yet been handed to the school though it is complete.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that site meetings were conducted in the Education Sector.</p> <p>A site meeting to launch Kitwara Seed Secondary School on 25th November,2019 according to the invitation letter written to the Commissioner MoES and copied to the Resident District Commissioner, District Chair Person.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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></p>	<p>There was 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, was conducted.</p> <p>In education sector, a launch and ground breaking meeting was held at Kitwara Seed secondary School on the 25th November, 2019 as per the report addressed to the CAO by the DEO on 26th November, 2020.</p> <p>The Meeting was attended by the CAO, District Engineer, CDO, RDC, Environment Officer and Clerk to Works.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the payment requests for sector infrastructure projects were initiated and executed as per contract and implementation results.</p> <p>Sampled projects:</p> <p>Construction of a 5-stance latrine at Kiigya primary school</p> <p>Ref: KIRY 592/WRKS/19-20/00020</p> <p>Completion certificate prepared on 20th June, 2020</p> <p>Signed by:</p> <p>Project Supervisor on 24th June, 2020</p> <p>Contractor on 24th June, 2020</p> <p>District engineer on 24th June, 2020</p> <p>Sub-accountant Kigumba S/C on 29th June, 2020</p> <p>Senior assistant CAO Kigumba S/C on 29th June, 2020</p> <p>Payment request submitted on 23rd June, 2020.</p> <p>First payment certificate</p> <p>Certified by Project Supervisor on 20th June, 2020</p> <p>Acting district Engineer on 26th June, 2020</p> <p>Sub-Accountant on 29th June, 2020</p> <p>Approved by SACO on 29th June, 2020.</p> <p>Payment made on 30th June, 2020</p>	1

VR no: 20116/2020

Time Frame: 1 Day

Construction of a two-classroom block at Masindi Port primary school

Ref: KIRY 592/WRKS/19-20/00022

Certificate 1

Certified by: Project Supervisor on 6th April,2020

Ag. District Engineer on 8th April, 2020

Recommended by: DEO on 15th April,2020

Certified by: CFO on 14th April,2020

Approved by CAO on 16th April,2020

Payment made on 24th July,2020

VR No: 29305085

Receipt No:671

Time Frame: 8 Days

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There was no evidence that the LG Education Department timely submitted a Procurement Plan in accordance with PPDA requirements to the PDU by April 30th 2020. The Submission was done on 30th May 2020	0
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>	The LG had school infrastructure contracts with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The Files contained approved Evaluation Reports, Works Contracts and Minutes of the Contract Committee. For example; Construction of a 5-stance latrine at Keganywa primary school under procurement ref: KIRY 592/WRKS/19-20/000022 Had evaluation report approved by the Contracts Committee on 2nd December,2019 under MIN: 009/06/CC/KDLG/19-20.	1

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>The was no grievance redress framework at the time of assessment</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>There was no evidence of dissemination of education guidelines to provide for access to land at the tie of assessment</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, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>All Costed ESMP was incorporated within the BOQ and contractual framework as mentioned;</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance lined V.I.P latrines Kiry592/2019-20///00023, Environmental and social safe guards were under preliminaries.</p> <p>Construction of a two class room block at st. Livingstone and Masindi Port primary school.</p> <p>Kiry592/wrks/2019-20/00022 Environmental action plan from (item 6 -9 under bill no. preliminaries)</p> <p>There was no screening and costed ESMP for the construction of 5 stance lined V.I.P latrines however they are incorporated in the BoQ.</p>	0
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, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence on proof of land ownership availed to Assessment Team at the time of assessment.However, on the LG approved Budget estimates generated on 26th June, 2020 at 11:30 on pay 25. The LG budgeted for real estate services – land titles – 1518 amounting 34, 654, 000 for the FY 2020/21</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>	The environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance. The EO and CDO had three monthly reports stamped and signed except report for March, 2020.	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>	All E & S certifications were not approved and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to executing the project contract payments . The Environmental and social certification form. No 004/2019-2020 dated 25/may, 2020 were signed by only the Environmental Officer.	0

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>Health Unit Annual Reports for FY 2018/2019 and FY 2019/2020 of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Panyadoli HC III - Diima HC III - Kiryandongo Hospital <p>OPD total attendance and deliveries in the FY 2019/2020 were compared with FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>Sampled 3 Health unit's HMIS 107 Reports for FY 2018/19 compared with FY 2019/2020 for total OPD attendance and Deliveries.</p> <p>OPD attendance increased by 25.38% from 111,015 in 2018/19 to 139,193 in 2019/2020, while Deliveries decreased by 2.37% in the same period from 5,614 to 5,283.</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>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>Not Applicable because LLG Assessment hadn't been done</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 IIIs and IVs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 75%; score 2 • 65 – 74%; score 1 • Below 65% ; score 0 	<p>Review of RBF Facility Assessment records established an average score of 84.32% from the nine (9)</p> <p>These Facilities were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kigumba HC III = 91.19 - Katulikire HC III = 73.37 - Masindi Port HC III =93.69 - Karungu HC III = 79.94 - St. Mary’s Kigumba HC III = 86.31 - Panyadoli HC III = 82.1 - Mutunda HC III = 90 - Diima HC III = 93.3 - Kiryandongo HSD = 69 <p>Health Facilities participating in RBF. 8 Facilities were HC IIIs and one HSD.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 for the previous FY 2019/20 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines eg. The budget stood at Shs. 12,396,000 (page 74 of the annual performance report)</p> <p>The expenditure was Shs. 12, 396,000 constituting 100% (page 74 of the LG performance report)</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 no evidence that the CDO and Environment Officer certified works on health projects before payments were made for example;</p> <p>As per the Interim Payment Certificate for the Fencing of Kiigya HC II with Chain Link Fence Phase 1, Prepared on 12th June 2020, the CDO and Environment Officer didn’t certify on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors</p>	0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The only Project that was done in the Health Sector was Fencing project at Kiigya HC III contract price UGX 21,731,800</p> <p>Engineer's estimates as per the Procurement Plan for FY 2019/2020 was UGX 21,731,800. Thus there were No variances.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The only infrastructure project involved the fencing of Kiigya HCII was completed as per work plan.</p> <p>This was evidenced as per the Engineer's Inspection Report of Kiigya HC II, Ref: ENG/213. The report clearly shows that the project was successfully completed.</p> <p>The Certification of Works was done by the District Engineer, DHO and Approved by CAO.</p> <p>All the Projects were completed 100%.</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>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs 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 LG had no HCIVs.</p> <p>The availed document wasn't dated, stamped and no reference.</p> <p>As per the un authenticated Staff Audit availed, the number of Approved staff was 95 in all HCIIIs, However the filled positions were 76; So the Percentage was 80%.</p>	1
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>As per the designs availed by MoH, Fencing wasn't included. However, the Fence was constructed based on the Engineer's Designs</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

From the Staff list obtained at the District, Kicwabugingo HC II, Kigumba HC III, and Kiigya HC II were sampled and each facility reported staffing for current FY assessed. Much as staff lists reviewed at all the 3 Health facilities had issues, but evidence that health workers were available at the facilities was accurate.

Both Kicwabugingo HC II and Kiigya II had 5 staffs each, only that one (1) staff from each of these two Health Facilities had their names duplicated on the Staff list from the LG (Manderu Lucy an Enrolled Nurse from Kicwabugingo, and Chagwaya E. Mevis – Incharge Kiigya HC II).

Kigumba HC III had 14 staffs, and all that were on staff list from LG were at Kigumba HC III, but the facility list had 3 (three extra staffs not on the district list yet they had file numbers and receiving salary. These were:

Kicwabugingo, and Chagwaya E. Mevis – Incharge Kiigya HC II).

Kigumba HC III had 14 staffs, and all that were on staff list from LG were at Kigumba HC III, but the facility list had 3 (three extra staffs not on the district list yet they had file numbers and receiving salary. These were:

- Piloya Eunice, file No.10398, a laboratory Assistant,

- Kaahwa Mustapher file No. 16234, an Askari

- Kajura Godfrey, file No.10444, a cleaner

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

No facility was upgraded or constructed

6

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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:

- Score 2 or else 0

All Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Work Plans and budgets to the DHO, but some after March 31st of the previous FY and some were not dated

Karungu St.Jude HC III Annual Work Plan FY 2019/2020 prepared as PIP for RBF was submitted on 27/July/2020.

St, Mary's and Diima HC IIIs both presented their Annual Work Plan and budgets late and as PIP for RBF with budgets included.

0

6

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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 :

- Score 2 or else 0

Health facilities sampled submitted on time: These Included:

- Masindi Port HC III, FY 2020/2021, the Annual Budget Performance Reports was submitted on 14/July/2020.

- Kigumba HC III, FY 2020/2021 the Annual Budget Performance Reports was submitted on 14/July/2020.

- St. Mary's Kigumba HC III, FY 2020/2021, the Annual Budget Performance Reports was submitted on 15/July/2020

2

6

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports

• Score 2 or else 0

Masindi Port CH III, Kigumba HC III, and St. Mary's Kigumba HC III, all developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports by DHMT

For Masindi Port HC III issue was about "Tri-Cycle" and exists in both DHMT report and Health Facility Implementation plan.

For Kigumba HC III, the performance issue incorporated was "Community Dialogues".

For St. Mary's Kigumba, the issues incorporated were "Annual Medicine and Health Supplies Procurement Plan" and "Means of Transport for Emergency Referrals"

2

6

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

HMIS 104 does not exist, HMIS 105 and 106 were used for this indicator.

There was evidence that HMIS 105 and 106 from Panyadoli HC III, St. Mary's HC III, and Kigumba HC III were timely submitted. There was a transient disturbance in reporting in January 2020 when MOH made change in HMIS system and reporting.

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>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</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was timely submission of Health Facility RBF invoices as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MUTUNDA HC III, 5/7/2020. - KARUNGU ST. JUDE 14/7/2020. - KATULIKIRE HC, 2/7/2020. 	2
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>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>No information was available at the time of Assessment.</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>There was evidence that the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st quarterly budget performance report was submitted on 31st October 2019 2nd quarterly budget performance report was submitted on 16th January 2020 3rd quarterly budget performance report was submitted on 14th May 2020 4th quarterly budget performance report was submitted on 4th August 2020 	1
<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 Approved Performance Improvement Plans and Reports for the Weakest Performing Facilities. However, the DHO provided Minutes of the District CQI Meeting Held on 9/9/2020, and CQI Plan and Budget 2019/2020 where Weakest Performing Health facilities improvements are handled.</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>No Evidence was provided at the time of Assessment</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>a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of Health workers' recruitment and deployment. The LG Performance Form was available in place of a Contract, LG had Approved Structures, but no deployment list.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:
 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

Kiryandongo Hospital had 130 staffs out of required 190 making it 68% staffed.

Panyadoli HC III had 13 staffs out of required 19 staffs for a health center III by staffing norms making it 68.4% staffed.

Diima HC III was well staffed at 84.2% from 16 staffs out of 19 recommended by staffing norms

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0

The 3 visited Health facilities of: Kicwabugingo HC II, Kigumba HC III, and Kiigya HC II, all had their staff lists displayed on the notice board with details of cardership, job title, file numbers and contacts. And all the names matched the staff list from DHO's office. Therefore, there was publicizing of health workers on the noticeboard. Two names from both visited health centre IIs were duplicated on the staff list from the district namely; Manderu Lucy an Enrolled Nurse from Kicwabugingo HC II, and Chagwaya E. Mevis the incharge Kiigya HC II.

Kicwabugingo Hc II

1. Manderu Lucy- E/N
2. Masikala Sylvia- E/Mw
3. Alinaitwe Assumpta- N/A
4. Nyakoojo Nobert- Askali
5. Basirika Aisha – Porter

Kigumba HC III

It had 14 staffs displayed on the noticeboard at the facility, but the staff

list from the district had 11 staffs for Kigumba HC III, the extra 3 had file numbers and receive salaries. There were: -

1. Piloyab Eunice – L/A, file number 10398
2. Kaahwa Mustapher- Askali, file number 16234.
3. Kajura Godfrey- Cleaner, file number 10444.

Kiigya HC II

1. Chagwaya E. Mevis – ECN, File 10391.
 2. Olotabu Okwi James- E/N, 10489.
 3. Aboce Hellen- N/A, 10534.
 4. Businge Alice- Porter, 16562.
- Kyeyune Moses- Askali, 16576.

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The 3 visited Health facilities of: Kicwabugingo HC II, Kigumba HC III, and Kiigya HC II, all had their staff lists displayed on the notice board with details of cardership, job title, file numbers and contacts. And all the names matched the staff list from DHO's office. Therefore, there was publicizing of health workers on the noticeboard. Two names from both visited health centre IIs were duplicated on the staff list from the district namely; Manderu Lucy an Enrolled Nurse from Kicwabugingo HC II, and Chagwaya E. Mevis the incharge Kiigya HC II.

Kicwabugingo Hc II

1. Manderu Lucy- E/N
2. Masikala Sylvia- E/Mw
3. Alinaitwe Assumpta- N/A
4. Nyakoojo Nobert- Askali
5. Basirika Aisha – Porter

Kigumba HC III

It had 14 staffs displayed on the noticeboard at the facility, but the staff

list from the district had 11 staffs for Kigumba HC III, the extra 3 had file numbers and receive salaries. There were: -

1. Piloyab Eunice – L/A, file number 10398
2. Kaahwa Mustapher- Askali, file number 16234.
3. Kajura Godfrey- Cleaner, file number 10444.

Kiigya HC II

1. Chagwaya E. Mevis – ECN, File 10391.
 2. Olotabu Okwi James- E/N, 10489.
 3. Aboce Hellen- N/A, 10534.
 4. Businge Alice- Porter, 16562.
- Kyeyune Moses- Askali, 16576.

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> <p>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>	<p>Not All facility Incharges were appraised in the previous FY;</p> <p>Appraised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kabaranga Priscilla was appraised on the 30th,October,2019 <p>Unappraised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alinaitwe Deo was appraised on the 29th,june 2019 - Okello Denish was appraised on the20th,june,2019 - Chagwaya E.Mevis was appraiswed on the29th,june,2019 - Muhumuza Ronald was appraised on the 30th,june,2019 - Awino Lovis was appraised on the 30th,june,2019 - Nakakooza Salai was appraised on the 30th,june,2019 - Kusiima Enid was appraiswd on the 28th,june,2019. - Bahemuka Ronald was appraised on the 26th,june,2019 <p>Ngonzebwoha Prisca was appraised on the 30th, june,2019.</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>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No Evidence was availed at the time of Assessment</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>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence was availed at the time of Assessment</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>Four of the several Trainings were conducted in the previous FY include: - training on Pre-eclampsia held on 8th to 11th June 2020 in the Youth Resource Centre Kiryandongo District, Post Abortal Care Training sponsored by UNFPA, target group were Midwives and took place 21-24 June 2020, Report on HMIS tools Training on 19th June 2020, and Data Compilation, Collection and Entry into DHIS – 22nd June 2020.</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>No CPD Data base although there was a Capacity Building Plan for the Period of July 2019 to June 2020, Health was allocated 2,000,000/= for induction and training of new staff.</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 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>No Evidence availed at the time of Assessment</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>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>PHC Non-Wage to LLHF was UGX196, 144,000 Page 74 of the Annual Performance report, and allocation to Monitoring was UGX1,480,000 (Page 79) and Health Care Management services UGX10,368,000/= (Page 70) altogether representing 6% of the Non-Wage to LLHFs. This is lower than the mandatory 15%.</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>No information was availed at the time of Assessment</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>There was no documentary evidence that the LG invoiced and Communicated all PHCNWR Grant transfers for the previous FY 2019/2020</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>There was Evidence on notice boards that the LG had publicized quarterly financial releases to health facilities but the publication date was not indicated on the notice.</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>There was evidence that LG Health Department implemented activities recommended by the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meetings held during previous FY.</p> <p>There was a Report on Performance Review Meeting dated 10th March 2020 that contained areas discussed and highlighted in the Minutes for DHMT Meeting held on 29th June 2020 in ANC Hall.</p>	2

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>The LG quarterly performance review meetings held on 29th June 2020 in ANC Hall Kiryandongo Hospital, involve all health facilities in charges, sub county chiefs, DHMTs, and other stake holders.</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>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>The LG supervised 100% of the only one HC IV in the District that is also the General hospitals, at least once every quarter in the previous FY. PNFPs were also supervised as per the reports here quoted.</p> <p>QUARTER.1, 27th September 2019.</p> <p>QUARTER.2, 20th December 2019.</p> <p>QUARTER.3, 19th March 2020.</p> <p>QUARTER.4, 2nd May 2020.</p> <p>DGHT Meeting held 24th June 2020</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 was Evidence that DHT ensured that Kiryandongo Hospital which is also Health Sub Districts (HSD), carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY.</p> <p>There were three support supervision reports for previous FY indicating including HSD support supervision activities for lower centers. The reports are dated; 08/June/2020, 23rd/3/2020, 05/09/2019.</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>There was Evidence that the LG used results and or 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 financial Year.</p> <p>Activity report – EPI AND CHILD DAYS ACTIVITES IN THE QTR OF OCT-DEC 2019/2020/FY.</p> <p>KIGUMBA HC III – Dealt with facility participation in Community Dialogues as indicated during supervision.</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 was Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY.</p> <p>Information to facility in-charges on medicines and health supplies at the Health facilities</p> <p>matched the information in the quarterly medicine management and supervision summery reports.</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 no evidence that the LG allocated more than 30% of the District health office budget to health promotion and prevention activities as shown below;</p> <p>Non-wage UGX 744,511,000</p> <p>Less</p> <p>532, 144,000 which was transferred to Kiryandongo Hospital and LLHFs respectively, leaving a balance of UGX 215,756,000 for Health promotion and prevention</p> <p>Hence</p> <p>$215,756,000/744,511,000*100 = 28.97$</p> <p>Approximately 29%</p>	0

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	There was Evidence that DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities during the previous Financial Year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WASH Activity Report 28/04/2020. • Water Quality Assessment Report 30th/June/2020 Progress Report dated 24th /Feb/2020	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	Minutes for EDHMT Meeting Held on 29th June 2020 in ANC Hall Kiryandongo Hospital provided evidence of follow-up actions taken. MIN.8/6/2020, ADHO/EH, Latrine Coverage, Handwashing Coverage, sanitation coverage.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0	There was no Health Facilities Asset Register in the DHOs office although the 3 visited facilities all had Assets inventories written in counter books	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the 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>There was documentary evidence that the prioritized investments were derived from the LG development Plan For instance the project of fencing of Kigya health centre 11 appeared in the Development plan on page 179 Additionally, the health project of fencing Kigya health Centre 11 was discussed in the District Technical Planning Committee (TPC)meeting of 20th March 2020 in the District water Board room The Kigya project was discussed under minute no 06/TPC/March /2019 where the work plan for Kigya Health Centre 11 was discussed Shs 12,396,000 (page 74) of the Annual performance report was spent on fencing of Kigya Health Centre 11, Certainly this was an eligible expenditure under sector guidelines.</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 was no documentary evidence that the LG had conducted field appraisals to check technical feasibility environment and social acceptability and customized designs to site conditions.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Phase I Fencing of Kiigye Health Centre II KIRY592/WRKS/19-20/00057</p> <p>There was no evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks at the time of assessment.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG health department submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved annual work plan. budget and procurement plans, for the current FY, on 7th May 2020 instead of the stipulated deadline of April 30th.</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>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>The LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY. The requests were submitted on 6th August,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. The department had only one infrastructure project i.e. fencing of Kiigya HC II, which was approved by the CC on 28th May, 2020 under Minute: MIN 006/09/CC/KDLG 19-20.</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 PIT</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 department implemented only one infrastructure project ie fencing of Kiigya HC III which was built using the LG Engineer's design.</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 project that required the appointment of Clerk of Works</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>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 major project that required monthly site meetings by project site committee. The only infrastructure project was the fencing of Kiigya HC II with ChainLink.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no major project technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers. The only infrastructure project was the fencing of Kiigya HC II with ChainLink</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>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>There was no evidence at the time of assessment</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>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 was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law.</p> <p>The contents included Evaluation Report, Works Contract and Minutes of the Contracts Committee.</p> <p>The Evaluation report was dated 27th May 2020.</p> <p>The CC Minute No for Approval was 006/09/CC/KDLG/19-20</p> <p>The contract was signed 29th May 2020.</p>	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>The was no grievance redress framework at the time of assessment</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 that 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>At Kichwabugino HCII,</p> <p>there was no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on waste management.</p> <p>There was evidence of wastes management system in place as shown below; existence of color coded waste lined bins with the following colors representing</p> <p>Red- high infectious waste (swabs from the lab)</p> <p>Yellow – infectious wastes</p> <p>Black -Noninfectious waste (paper)</p> <p>Brown – expired drugs</p> <p>Placenta pit</p> <p>Waste burning area</p> <p>Expired drugs are disposed through the district health office.</p> <p>Masindi Port HCII</p> <p>The Facility had a copy of the Uganda National Infection prevention and control guidelines published in 2013</p> <p>There was evidence of a placenta pit in place which was fenced with a wall and the burn pit.</p>	0

Coding of bins with lines inside as follows :

Black – noninfectious wastes

Red – highly infectious waste

Yellow – Infectious waste

Brown – pharmaceutical wastes

Safety box for sharps

Kigumba HCII

Guidelines available: Uganda national infection prevention and control, 2013.

Bins were coded as follows:

Red – highly infectious waste

Yellow- infectious waste

Black - Noninfectious waste

Brown – expired drugs which are disposed through the health department at the District.

Placenta pit was available and the burn pit plus paraffin for burn were available too.

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 availed at the time 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>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 no costed ESMP incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects.</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>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 proof for land ownership where the LG implemented project for the previous year. Certificate of Title Kiryandongo District Local Government (Kiigye Health Center II) of P.O.Box 137, Kigumba generated on 2nd October 2020 at 2:37 MAS-00003768</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>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>Monthly report on environmental and social monitoring activities of projects in the month of June 2020 made on 3rd July, 2020 did not show any issue on the Kiigye HCII. There was no evidence on environmental monitoring and supervision of health project at the time of 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>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 no evidence the CDO and Environment Officer signed the Environment and Social Certification Forms prior to payments of the Contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	From MIS Report from MoWE, the District Rural Water Source Functionality was 86%	1
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	Information from MWE MIS District Software Report showed that - SPR: 2020 (FY/2019/2020) - [Data as of:2020-08-28]: Total No. of water sources = 786 Sources with functional WSCs = 407 % of facilities with functional WSCs = $(100*407)/786 = 51.8\%$	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	Not Applicable because the LLG Assessment hasn't started	0

<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p>	<p>As per the Annual Work Plan for FY 2019/2020 dated July2, 2019 Ref: CR/158/1 and received by the MoWE on 16th July 20219, The District had planned to Drill 7 Boreholes and Rehabilitate 7No. Boreholes. The District Safe Water Coverage was 67.8%.</p>
<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99%: Score 1</p> <p>o If below 80 %: Score 0</p>	<p>The boreholes were drilled in Kiryandongo (71.9%)-(2no), Masindi Port 149.9%-(2no.), and Mutunda 55.5% (3no)</p>
		<p>Meaning that only 3 Boreholes were drilled in areas below the Safe Water Coverage of 67.8%.</p>
		<p>The Rehabilitated Boreholes Kigumba 61.4 %- (5No.), Masindi Port 149.9% (1no) and Kiryandongo 71.9% (1No)</p>
		<p>Meaning 5No. Boreholes were rehabilitated in areas below the Safe Water Coverage of 67.8%</p>
		<p>Therefore 8No. Boreholes out of the 14No. Boreholes were implemented in Sub Counties below the District Safe Water Coverage.</p>
		<p>Percentage = $(8/14)*100 = 57\%$</p>

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

As per the Annual Work Plan for FY
2019/2020 dated July2, 2019 Ref:
CR/158/1 and received by the MoWE
on 16th July 20219.

The Budgeted Projects were as
follows:

Drilling of 7No. Boreholes was
budgeted at UGX 193,760,000
(Excluding UGX 21 Million For Siting.

The Final Amount Paid to KLR (U) Ltd
for Drilling the 7 Boreholes as per
Certificated of Completion Dated 04th
June 2020 was UGX 176,471,593.

Variation = 193,760,000 -
176,471,593 = UGX 17,288,407

%age variance =
(17,288,407/193,760,000)*100
= 8.9%

Rehabilitation of Boreholes

As per the Budget, the Engineer's
Estimate was UGX 63,541,525

Final Amount paid as per Contract
with Hand Pump Mechanics was
UGX 63,541,525

Variance = UGX 0

%age Variance = 0%

Construction of Guard House at a
Pumping Station

As per the Budget, the Engineers
Estimate was UGX 41,798,000

Total Contract Price as per Payment
Certificate dated 01st June 2020 was
UGX 33,799,999

Variance was UGX 7,998,001

%age Variance =
(7,998,001/41,798,000)*100= 19.1%

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>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>As per the Annual Performance report dated 8th July 2020, Ref: CR/213/11, signed by CAO on 15th August 2020 and received by MoWE on 2nd November 2020. All the Projects that were planned in the FY2019/2020 were completed.</p> <p>Drilling of 7No. Boreholes- Completed</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 7No. Boreholes- Completed</p> <p>Construction of Guard House - Completed</p>	2
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>From the MoWE MIS report,</p> <p>% of Water supply facilities that are functioning for FY2018/2020 was 86%</p> <p>From the MoWE MIS report,</p> <p>% of Water supply facilities that are functioning for FY2019/2020 was 86%</p> <p>So the Increment in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning was 0% (86%-86%)</p>	0
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>From MWE MIS District Software Report - SPR: 2019 (FY/2018/2019) - [Data as of:2019-08-27], % of facilities with functional WSCs for FY 2018/19 was $(100 \times 407/786) = 51.8\%$</p> <p>From MWE MIS District Software Report - SPR: 2020 (FY/2019/2020) - [Data as of:2020-08-28], % of facilities with functional WSCs for FY 2019/20 was $(100 \times 407/786) = 51.8\%$.</p> <p>Therefore, there was no increase in % of facilities with functional WSCs</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

The Annual Performance report dated 8th July 2020 Ref: CR/213/11, signed by the CAO on 15th August 2020, it showed all the facilities constructed in FY2019/2020. This included Drilling of 7No. Boreholes, Rehabilitation of No. Boreholes and Construction of Guard House.

Three Facilities were visited in different sub counties as follows.

UKEBU Borehole in Mutunda Sub County in Laboke Village begun operations June 2020. Its numbered 78212. Its well protected in a Fence with a soak pit, grass planted around the borehole. Its functioning well.

Namilyango p/S Borehole in Masindi Port Sub County in Kitukuza Village begun operations in June 2020. Its numbered 78209. Its well protected in a Fence with a soak pit, grass planted around the borehole. Its functioning well.

Abongo Ward Borehole in Kiryandongo Sub County Mombi Village begun Operations in June 2020. Its numbered 78211. Its well protected in a Live Fence with a soak pit, grass planted around the borehole. It's functioning well.

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

The LG Submitted Quarterly reports as follows.

Q1 Report: Ref: CR/213/11 Dated 2nd October 2019, Received by MoWE on 19th December 2019 and signed by the CAO on 15th December 2019.

Q2 Report: Ref: CR/213/11 dated 6th January 2020 AND SIGNED BY CAO on 26th February 2020 and received by MoWE on 3rd March 2020.

Q3 Report: Ref: CR/213/11 Dated 15th April 2020 and received by MoWE on 02nd November 2020 and Signed by CAO on 04th June 2020

Q4 Report: Ref: CR/213/11

Dated 58th July 2020. Received by MoWE on 2nd /11/2020 and signed by CAO on 15th August 2020.

2

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

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

The Local Government submitted Quarterly reports with Water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities and that information is used for planning.

Q1 Report: Ref: CR/213/11 Dated 2nd October 2019, Received by MoWE on 19th December 2019 and signed by the CAO on 15th December 2019.

Q2 Report: Ref: CR/213/11 dated 6th January 2020 AND SIGNED BY CAO on 26th February 2020 and received by MoWE on 3rd March 2020.

Q3 Report: Ref: CR/213/11 Dated 15th April 2020 and received by MoWE on 02nd November 2020 and Signed by CAO on 04th June 2020

Q4 Report: Ref: CR/213/11

Dated 58th July 2020. Received by MoWE on 2nd /11/2020 and signed by CAO on 15th August 2020.

3

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Not Applicable since there is no LLG Assessment done</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 provided at the time of Assessment</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 provided at the time of Assessment</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 provided at the time of Assessment</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was no Evidence that the DWO had identified Capacity Needs Of Staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities had been conducted in adherence to the training plans at the district level and documented in the training database

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

From the Annual Work Plan for FY2020/2021, Ref: CR/158/1 Received by MoWE on 2/11/2020 and Signed by CAO on 15th August 2020.

It should be noted that the District Safe Water Coverage was 69.4% with Kigumba S/C at 84.3%, Kiryandogo at 71.6%, Masindi Port 95% and Mutunda 63.3%

The Development Budget was UGX 675,183,024

The projects to be done are as follows:

Drilling of 17 Boreholes in Kiryandongo (6No), Mutunda (5No), Masindi Port(3no) and Kigumba (3No)

This implied that only 5No. Boreholes will be constructed in the area with the below district water coverage.

Extension of Piped Water in Kigumba at UGX 30,000,000

Rehabilitation of 5No Boreholes in Kiryanadongo (2No), Kigumba (1No), Masindi (1no) and Mutunda (1no)

Budget for Rehabilitation was UGX 49,955,000

Since only one Borehole was to be done in the SubCounty below the District Safe Water Coverage, the Amount considered was (UGX 49,955,000)/5 = UGX 9,991,000

Therefore the Amount invested in areas below the District Safe Water Coverage Average = 9,991,000+ (5/17)*549,304,000= 9,991,000+161,560,000= UGX 171,551,000

%age = (171,551,000/675,183,024)*100= 25.4%

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

There was evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations.

Letter dated September 07th 2020 to Senior Assistant Secretary, Masindi Port Sub County, The Assistant Engineering Officer communicated the Allocation/Budget for Water Facilities for FY2020/2021. The Allocation showed the drilling of 3No. Boreholes and Rehabilitation of 1no Borehole.

Letter dated 12/08/2020 to Senior Assistant Secretary, Kiryandongo Sub County, The Assistant Engineering Officer communicated the Allocation/Budget for Water Facilities for FY2020/2021. The Allocation showed the drilling of 6No. Boreholes and Rehabilitation off 2no Borehole.

Letter dated 07/09/2020 to Senior Assistant Secretary, Mutunda Sub County, The Assistant Engineering Officer communicated the Allocation/Budget for Water Facilities for FY2020/2021. The Allocation showed the drilling of 5No. Boreholes and Rehabilitation of 1no Borehole.

Letter dated 12/08/2020 to Senior Assistant Secretary, Kigumba Sub County, The Assistant Engineering Officer communicated the Allocation/Budget for Water Facilities for FY2020/2021. The Allocation showed the drilling of 3No. Boreholes and Rehabilitation off 1no Borehole.

Notice Boards for Kiryandongo, Masindi Port and Mutunda showed that the Allocations were pinned on the Notice Boards.

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>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.)</p>	<p>The LG monitored the WSS Facilities and this was included in the Quarterly reports sent to MoWE. The reports included the Form4s and Fom1s that showed the monitoring of the facilities. The LG had 765 sources and all were monitored.</p>	4
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 		
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>The LG had planned to carry out two DWSCC Meetings but due to Covid Constraints, they ended up carrying out only one meeting on 19th March 2020.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></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>There was evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average for the current FY their respective allocations.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>Letter dated 07/09/2020 to Senior Assistant Secretary, Mutunda Sub County, The Assistant Engineering Officer communicated the Allocation/Budget for Water Facilities for FY2020/2021. The Allocation showed the drilling of 5No. Boreholes and Rehabilitation of 1no Borehole.</p> <p>This is the only Sub County with safe water coverage below the District average at 63.3%.</p> <p>The District Safe Water Coverage is at 69.4%</p>	

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>From the AWP for last Financial Year, Dated July 2nd 2019, Ref: CR/158/1 Submitted to the MoWE on 16th July 2019 and signed by the CAO on 15th July 2019, the Budget shows that Non Recurrent Budget was UGX 37,365,379</p> <p>Funds allocated to mobilization were UGX 20,468,000</p> <p>Thus percentage = $(20,468,000/37,365,3791)*100=54.9\%$</p>	3
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>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities.</p> <p>Letter dated 20th July 2020 to the CAO, from the Senior CDO, shows the program for training for WUCs across the district.</p> <p>A total of 13 WUCs was to be trained in roles and responsibilities of the WUCs care takers, Borehole Maintenance, Financing Mechanisms for O&M, simple Accounting and book keeping, Sanitation at Source and safe water chain.</p> <p>Report dated 4th August 2020 showed that the training was carried out on 27th to 31st July 2020 in 13 Water points and the training covered the following areas:</p> <p>Roles and Responsibilities of the WUCs care takers, Borehole Maintenance, Financing Mechanisms for O&M, Simple Accounting and Book Keeping, Sanitation at Source and Safe Water Chain.</p> <p>The Training was carried out by the SCDO assigned to Water Department, Sub County CDOs, Members of Hand Pump Mechanics Association, Sub County Health Assistants.</p> <p>The training was carried out in July 2020 because of Covid Issues but it was planned for FY2019/2020.</p>	3

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 was no evidence of an Asset Register at the time of Assessment</p>	0
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>There was no evidence that the desk appraisal was done at the time of the Assessment.</p>	0
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>At the time of Assessment, Only 10 Application Files out of 17 Boreholes to be drilled in the Current FY were availed</p>	0
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>At the time of the Assessment, there was no evidence that the LG conducted technical feasibility, environmental and1 social acceptability and customised designs for WSS Projects.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no screening for environment and social impact ESIA/ESMP prepared at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Sampled projects include;</p> <p>Abong ward borehole in kiryandongo Sub county there was soak pit, grass planted around and also well protected.</p> <p>Namilyango P/S borehole in Masindi port sub county.it has soak pit, protected and grass planted around it.</p> <p>Ukeba in Mutundu sub county the grass ,soak pit and banana plantations planted as an environmental safeguards.</p> <p>There was a request for 2,640,000 for environment and social screening of 22 boreholes in Kiryandongo District made on 3rd September, 2020 by the District Environmental Officer and it waits approval from CAO</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan pg.</p> <p>The Procurement Plan was prepared on September 10, 2020 and Signed by the CAO. Received by the PPDA on September 25,2020.</p> <p>The Projects included Borehole Drilling and Installation, Borehole Exploration, Siting and Drilling, Water Supply Extension at Apodorwa</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>.</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>The water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction. For example, MIN: 014/06/CC/KDLG/19-20 approved the Drilling and Installation of seven deep boreholes in the district</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>.</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>Whereas there were appointment letters for two Project Managers for Guard House in Pondora water pump station and for the 7 boreholes drilling projects, there was no evidence of existence of PITs . There was no evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines</p> <p>However, there were contract implementation plans in place.</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO as follows:</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>For UKEBU Borehole in Mutunda Sub County, the Soak Pit was 1.2m Diameter as per the Technical designs. Also, the Drainage Channel was 6Metres as per designs and Fence posts are 1.5m High as pe designs.</p>	
			<p>In Namilyango primary school boreholes in Masindi Port S/C, the Soak Pit was 1.2m Diameter as per the Technical designs. In addition, the Drainage Channel was 6Metres as per designs and Fence posts are 1.5m High as pe designs.</p>	
			<p>In Abongo Ward bore holes in Kiryandongo Sub County, the Soak Pit was 1.2m Diameter as per the Technical designs. Also, the Drainage Channel was 6Metres as per designs and Fence posts are 1.5m High as pe designs</p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>The technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects as given below:</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>On 8th June 2020, a field monitoring report was prepared for Borehole drilling, Borehole Rehabilitation. The team comprised of the Assistant Engineering Officer, Environment Officer, Principle Internal Auditor, Senior CDO.</p>	
			<p>On June 01, 2020 a report was prepared by the Assistant Engineering Officer showing the implementation progress of on going works on the guard house, drilling of boreholes and rehabilitation of boreholes</p>	
			<p>Other Monitoring reports were prepared on 2nd April 2020 and 2nd March 2020.</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>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 had verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts.</p> <p>As per the Certificate of Payment signed by the Project Supervisor (Assistant Engineering Officer) on 2020 and certified by DWO on 8th June 2020 and approved by CAO on 12th June 2020. Payment was made on 26th June 2020. Voucher no. 30415412. The Receipt No. was 2902.</p> <p>The time Frame for Payment was 14 Days</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>A complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments was in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law.</p> <p>For example, The Drilling and Installation of seven deep boreholes in the district had an evaluation report, Works Contract and Minutes of the Contracts Committee.</p> <p>The Evaluation report was approved on Contracts Committee on 2nd December,2019 constituted by five members of the CC under MIN: 014/06/CC/KDLG/19-20</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 on grievance availed to assessment team at the time of assessment.</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 of dissemination of guidelines on water source and catchment protection and natural resource management.</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 availed to assessment team of water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for the WSS facilities prepared but borehole were fenced.</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>Not all projects were implemented on land where the LG has a proof of ownership Out of twelve (12) borehole ten (10) had agreement for offer of land for community water source for instance Jeeja II the agreement was made on 14th January, 2020 between Mr.Femines Ssemuddu and LC I of Jeeja II Me. Wanyama Martin</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Not all water projects had E & S certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and SCDO</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Monthly report on environmental and social monitoring activities in the month of June 2020 prepared on 3rd July, 2020 signed by both Environmental Officer and SCDO</p>	2

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>Not Applicable</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
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>Not Applicable</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	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	Not Applicable	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not Applicable	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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	Not Applicable	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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	Not Applicable	0
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	Not Applicable	0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable	0
---	---	---	----------------	---

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	Not Applicable	0
---	---	---	----------------	---

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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	0
---	--	--	----------------	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	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	Not Applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: 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	Not Applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 4			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicables	0
	Maximum score 4			

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	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	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 10			

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	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	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 10			

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>Not Applicable</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>Not Applicable</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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	Not Applicable	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	0
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	Not Applicable	0

Investment Management

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>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</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicables</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	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	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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 Applicable	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	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	0
----	--	---	----------------	---

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0

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 LG substantively appointed Muhumuza Samuel as the Water Officer on the 5th, March,2014 under the Ref:CR/D/12979	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.	No Evidence was provided at the time of Assessment	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 LG substantively appointed Joseph Chandia as the Assistant Engineering Officer on the 14th, March, 2003 under the Ref:CR/D/14816 and Minute no.32/2003 of 25th February 2003.	10
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.	No evidence was provided at the time of Assessment	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 LG substantively appointed Businge Zalfa as the Environment Officer on the 3rd, April, 2013 under Ref: CR/KD/2013 and minute no.DSC 029/2013	10

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 position of the Forestry was vacant and unadvertised due to the wage bill.

The LG appointed Fred Kasangaki as the As the Assistant Forest Officer.

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.

Not all water sector projects implemented in the previous FY 2019/20 were screened;

Drilling and installation of seven boreholes
Kiry592/wrks/2019-20/200031

(Namilango p/s, Kaduku II, Kitongozi – Kibeka, Mombi, Kimaguro, Diima and Laboka manga deep borehole) were all screened on 18th may 2020 .

Rehabilitation of 5 boreholes

Out of 5 borehole rehabilitated only four were screened that is Nyakatit, Kinyara p/s, Jeeja II and Wakisanyi – Myeba were all screened on 25th October, 2019

Construction of a guard house and ecosam toilet at Apodarwa water system
Kiry592/wrks/2019-20/00033 was not screened and no information was availed to assessors at the time of assessment.

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 projects implemented did not require ESIA hence there was no evidence of social impact assessment carried out at the time of assessment.

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.

The contractor had a drilling permit Licence holders for the period 1st July 2019 to 30th June 2020

No 28 KLR Uganda Ltd
DP10662/DW 2019
from Ministry of Water
Environment
Directorate of Water
Resource
Management.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Dr. Mutyaba Imaam as the District Health Officer on the 22nd, April 2013 under the Ref:CR/D/10626 and Minute No.DSC 42/2013.	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Ada Christine P'Moru as the Assistant District Health Officer Maternal,Child Health and Nursing on the 7th,4,2017 under Ref:CR/D/10938 and Minute no.32/2017	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	The position was vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Ochiba James as the Health Inspector on the 1st, April,2015 under the Ref: CR/KTC/018 and Minute No.392/2015	10

1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The position was vacant at the time of assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	The LG substantively recruited Kyomuhendo Goretty Abooki as the Biostatistician on the 17th, April, 2014 under Ref:CR/KD/10269 and DSC Minute No.127/2014.	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively recruited Ayo Allan Gideon as the District Cold Chain Technician on the 7th, April, 2017 under the Ref:CR/KD/10352 and minute no.41/2017	10
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	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.		
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		

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>Health implemented one project of Fencing of Kiigye Health Centre 11 Kiry592/ERKS/19-20/00057.</p> <p>There was no Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening forms availed to the Assessment Team at the time of assessment.</p>	0
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 project implemented did not require environmental and social impact assessment hence there was no environment and social impact assessment report at the time of assessment.</p>	15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>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:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Kiirya Edward the District Education Officer as per the Appointment Letter Dated 16th/ Feb/2015 under Ref: CR/D/10090 and Minute No. DSC 356/2015</p>	30
1	<p>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:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Katusabe Johnson as the Senior Inspector of Schools as per the Appointment Letter Dated 4th March 2014 under the Ref:CR/D/11847 and Minute No. DSC 001/2014.</p> <p>The position of the District Inspector Of Schools was vacant and had been advertised under the reference number KDSC/Educ/156/13.</p>	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.

The Assessment Team was availed with only screening forms and costed ESMP for construction of two classroom block at Livingstone primary school.

0

The Maximum score is 30

Not all projects (LG had two projects) implemented by education sector prior to commencement carried out screening and costed ESMP.

Construction of two classroom block at Livingston and Masindi port (Kirt592/wrks/2019-20/00022)

Construction of 5 stance lined V.I.P latrines at Kifuruta, Nyakatama, Dyang Primary school and Masindi Port secondary School (Kiry592/wrks/2019-20/00023)

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 was no ESIA report availed to assessment at the time of assessment.

15

The Maximum score is 30

All the projects implemented in the Financial Year 2019/2020 that did not require environmental social impact assessment.

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 LG substantively appointed Obwona Richard as the Chief Finance Officer as per the appointment letter dated 16th February, 2015 under Minute Number.DSC355/2015	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 LG appointed Balikagira Julius substantively as the District Planner on the 15th/May/2019 under the Ref:CR/KD/10463.	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 LG appointed Muhumuza Samuel who was the Water Officer as the Acting District Engineer on the 30th/Nov/2017 under the Ref:CR/D/1279 and Minute No.77/2017.	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.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG neither recruited nor wrote to MOPs for secondment of staff but however, the CAO assigned duties to Chandiru Doreen as the District Natural Resources Officer on the 2nd/ December/2019 under Ref:CR/KD/10181.	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.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Byenkya Issa Hassan as the District Production Officer on the 7th/ June/ 2018 under the Ref: CR/D/10307 and DSC Minute No.118/2018	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 LG substantively appointed Dabanja Godfrey as the District Community Development Officer on the 15th/May/2019 under the Ref:CR/KD/10123 and Minute no. 157/2019.	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.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively recruited Kakumba Sam as the District Commercial Officer on the 24th/May/2019 under Ref: CR/KD/10267 and DSC Minute No. 203/2019.	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.	other critical staff h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer) score 2 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Ndiroraho Milton as the Senior Procurement Officer on the 15th May 2019 under the Ref: CR/KD/10123 and Minute no. 157/2019.	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 position was advertised under External Advert 001/2020 and Ref:KDSC/PPDU/156/12	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.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Principal HR is Murungi susan whose appointment was not on file but there was an acceptance letter in this regard dated 25/5/2019 with ref. CR/KD/10221 Signed by Murungi accepting being offered the job of Principal HR.	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.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The position is vacant and not advertised due to the wage bill	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.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Kigoye Yassin as the Senior Land Management Officer on probation on 27th/ June/2014 under the Ref: CR/KD/20278 and Minute No.DSC163/2014	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.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	No proof of Advert for this position	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.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Biingi Elizabeth as the Principal Internal Auditor on the 24th/May/2019 under Ref:CR/KD/12983 and Minute No.202/2019	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.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The LG appointed Ondoa Jackline Matilda as the Acting Secretary District Commission on the 12th/November/2018 under Ref:CR/KD/10240 and Minute No.133/2018	0

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:

a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS,
score 5 or else 0

As per the customized Structure for Kiryandogo District issued on 2nd May 2011; Ref: ARC 135/306/01 issued by Ministry of Public Service, the LG was supposed to have 4No. Senior Assistant Secretaries, in the LLGs.

Two were substantively recruited;

-Kyategeka David was appointed on the 7th October, 2005 as the SAS of the District under Ref:CR/D/10917 and Minute no.375/2005.

-Ogwang Adar was appointed the SAS of Mutunda under Ref:22/April/2013 and Minute no.CR/KD/10166.

The other two positions were vacant.

0

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:

b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS

score 5 or else 0.

The SCDOs were Three according to the staff structure. However, only two were designated as follows;

-Kiwanuka Robert had been designated to the Senior Labour Officer

-Asaba Lydia had been designated as the Senior Assistant Town Clerk.

Achola Jackline was appointed to the position of the Senior CDO on the 7th February, 2018 under Ref: CR/BTC/10011 and Minute no.176/2018.

0

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.

As per the customized Structure for Kiryandogo District issued on 2nd May 2011; Ref: ARC 135/306/01 issued by Ministry of Public Service, the LG

had 7 LLGs and only Six had positions of Senior Accounts Assistants or Accounts Assistants were filled as below leaving one Vacant.

The LG appointed the following personnel as the Senior Accounts Assistant.

Town councils;

-Asaba Francis was appointed as the SAA of Bweyale Town Council on the 8th November,2015 under Ref:CR/KTC/024 and Minute No.424/2015.

-Muuganyizi Lydia May was appointed as the SAA of Kigumba Town Council on the 16th,January,2018 under Ref:KTC/160/1 and Minute No.180/2014.

Subcounties;

-Mwesigwa Henry was appointed as the SAA of Kiryandongo Sub County on the 7th February,2018 under Ref:CR/D/10473 and Minute no.165/2018.

-Kirya John was appointed as the SAA of Masindi Port Sub County on the 7th,February,2018 Under Ref:CR/KD/10217 and Minute No.169/2018.

-Kabuga Geoffrey was appointed SAA for Mutunda Sub County on the 7th,February,2018 under Ref:CR/KD/102773 and minute no.170/2018.

-Tibenda Langton was appointed as SAA of Kigumba Sub County on the 7th, february,2018 under the Ref:CR/D/103000 and minute number 16/2018.

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence by way of IFMS generated report that the LG had released 231,178,568 for Natural Resources against a budget of Shs 242,373,738 constituting 95%</p> <p>This was below the requirement of 100%</p>	0
3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided at the time of Assessment</p>	0
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>Under DDEG, Kiryandongo LG had six (6) projects implemented during the FY 2019/2020 as mentioned below;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of five (5) boreholes.</p> <p>Out of five Boreholes, the assessor was availed with Four 4 screening forms. Screening was done on 25th October, 2019 that is Wakisanyi-Myeba,Nyakatiti,Jeeja II kinyara p/s borehole</p> <p>Construction for fencing of Mutunda</p> <p>sub county Administration block</p> <p>Screening forms were not available at the time of assessment</p>	0

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>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),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was no project that required ESIA hence there was no ESIA documents availed to assessors at the time of assessment for the FY 2019/2020.</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);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There were costed ESMPs for only four boreholes out of five boreholes rehabilitated with in the LG however, the costed ESMP for Mutunda Administration block was not availed to Assessment team at the time of assessment</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

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>Pending Auditors reports</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 had submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Auditor General findings on 16th March 2020 as per acknowledgement date Stamp .</p> <p>The LG had submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General findings on 23rd March 2020 as per acknowledgement date Stamp. However, the responses were submitted late beyond the mandatory time frame of not later than end of February.</p>	0
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 the Annual Performance Contract for the Current FY to MoFPED on Monday 29th June 2020 at 1.28 PM.</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 Previous FY 2019/2020 on 10th August 2020 at 3.21 PM</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>1st Quarterly Budget Performance Report was submitted on Thursday 5th December 2019 at 4.57 PM</p> <p>The 2nd Quarterly Budget Performance Report submitted on Thursday 23rd January 2019</p> <p>The 3rd Quarterly Budget Performance Report was Submitted on Tuesday 26th May 2020. AT 2.36 PM</p> <p>The 4th Quarterly Budget Performance Report was Submitted on 10th August 2020 at 3.21 PM</p>	4