



**LGMSD 2021/22**

Kiryandongo District

(Vote Code: 592)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	61%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	100%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	55%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	67%
Educational Performance Measures	56%
Health Performance Measures	65%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	16%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There were three projects funded by DDEG in the district in FY 2021/2022; and the evidence from the Field reviews indicates that there was <b>only one (1) infrastructure project</b> implemented using DDEG funding - and it was functional, and utilized as per the purpose of the projects by the beneficiaries as follows:</p> <p>Routine Mechanized Maintenance of Laboke - Kololo Road (12.5Km) in Mutunda S/County; estimated (Budget) at UGX 80,374,000 as per page 73 of the District Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022; approved DDP page 422 and page 78 of the district AWP – and was the only infrastructure implemented under the District Engineering services048159. The project was implemented by the DE (Works Department) under FORCE ACCOUNT methodology at a Cost of UGX 80,000,000/= as per DE's completion Report dated 23/2/2022. The road was visited by Assessor and was indeed completed, and fully functional. We traversed through the said Road from Laboke, through to Kololo where it connects to the Tarmac - Gulu Highway. The road was passable and accessible to traffic vehicles transporting majorly agricultural produce, goods and general merchandise like mangoes, pineapples and other fruits.</p> <p>Therefore, the Road (after Completion) was functional and utilized for purpose intended as outlined above.</p> <p>The other two DDEG projects implemented were;</p> <p>(i) Tilting of land for 12 Government institutions at Area that included; District hospital, Hospital lagoon, land where the DSC and Agricultural Laboratory is situated, Schools (Karungu II P/S, Kisekura P/S, Mutunda Sec. School, Kigumba Sec. School, Bweyala Public P/S; Mboira Sec. School, and Nyama P/S) and Kaduku HC II under Land Management Services, 098310 under Natural Resources Management. All the properties acquired land titles as required</p> <p>(ii) Raising of 45,000 assorted trees (Musizi, Pines, Eucalyptus) by district force account. The project appears on page 52 of the district AWP, page 409 of the DDP and page 83 of the Budget Annual Performance Report. Budgeted at shs 6,557,000. under Tree planting and greening of public places including erosion protection No. 098303 under Water and Sanitation Tree planting was for protection of the environment</p> <p>All the DDEG projects undertaken were completed by closure of FY 2021/2022 as reflected in the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report for FY 2021/2022.</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"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Awaits outcome of LLGs IVA results for FY 2021/2022</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There were three projects funded by DDEG in the district in FY 2021/2022 as follows:</p> <p>(i) Mechanized maintenance of Laboke -Kololo Road 12.5 kms estimated at shs 80,374,000 as per page 73 of the District Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022; approved DDP page 422 and page 78 of the district AWP.</p> <p>(ii) Tilting of land for 12 Government institutions at district hospital, hospital lagoon, land and schools (Karugu II P/S), Kisekura P/S, Mutunda Senior Secondary School, Kigumba S.S.S, Bweyala Public P/S; Mboira S.S.S and Kaduku HC II. Estimated at shs 100,000,000 as per page 83 of the approved Annual Budget Performance Report, page 409 of the DDP and page 52 of the AWP.</p> <p>(iii) Raising of 45,000 assorted trees (Musizi, Pines, Eucalyptus) by district force account. The project appears on page 52 of the district AWP, page 409 of the DDP and page 83 of the Budget Annual Performance Report. Budgeted at shs 6,557,000.</p> <p>All the DDEG investments undertaken were completed 100% by closure of FY 2021/2022 as reflected in the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report for FY 2021/2022, page 68.</p>	3

Investment  
Performance

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0.

There were three projects were planned and budgeted for at UGX 186,931,000 by the DDEG fund in the district during the previous Financial Year as indicated below;

(i) Mechanized maintenance of Laboke -Kololo Road 12.5 kms estimated at shs 80,374,000 as per page 73 of the District Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022; approved DDP page 422 and page 78 of the district AWP.

Amount budgeted for the project was shs 80,374,000. Total amount spent was shs 80,374,000 as per QBPRs and financial statements for FY 2021/2022.

(ii) Tilting of land for 12 Government institutions at district hospital, hospital lagoon, land and schools (Karugu II P/S), Kisekura P/S, Mutunda Senior Secondary School, Kigumba S.S.S, Bweyala Public P/S; Mboira S.S.S and Kaduku HC II. Estimated at shs 100,000,000 as per page 83 of the approved Annual Budget Performance Report, page 409 of the DDP and page 52 of the AWP.

Amount budgeted for the project was shs 100,000,000. Total amount spent was shs 100,000,000 as per QBPRs , page 54 and financial statements for FY 2021/2022.

(iii) Raising of 45,000 assorted trees (Musizi, Pines, Eucalyptus) by district force account. The project appears on page 52 of the district AWP, page 409 of the DDP and page 83 of the Budget Annual Performance Report. Budgeted at shs 6,557,000.

Amount budgeted for the project was shs 6,557,000. Total amount spent was shs 6,557,000 as per QBPRs and financial statements for FY 2021/2022.

All the DDEG projects were eligible as per the DDEG grant, budget and implementaion guidelines; District Engineering services, 048104, community access roads maintenance and Natural Resources Management, 098310, land management services, titling.

Investment  
Performance

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  
score 2 or else score 0

The AWP and Budget for the FY 2021/22 indicated a number of projects funded under the DDEG and of those, the implemented infrastructure projects had contract amounts according to contract documents as follows:

1) Routine Mechanized Maintenance of .Laboke - Kololo Road (12.5Km) in Mutunda S/County; (using Force Account methodology). The Engineers Estimates (A) at UGX 80,374,000/= . The contract Sum (B) - expenditure was UGX 80,000,000/= . The **Variation**  $\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\%$  was at **0.47%**

The Variation was thus within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates

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

A review of the LLG staff lists for the current FY in three sampled LLGs during the assessment showed that the staffing was not in place as per minimum standards and staff list. The sampled LLGs were Kiryandongo Town Council where the structure provides for 24 with 21 filled positions. Nyamahasa Sub County where the structure provides for 13 staff but only 05 positions are filled. Four staff from the mother Sub County of Mutunda continue to caretake Nyamahasa in addition to their substantive posting in Mutunda SC. These are Mwesigwa Henry (Accountant); Kaija John Badura (Asst. Vet. Officer); Wandera Fred (CDO); and Sabiiti Benard (Asst. Agric. Officer). The position of Sub County Chief is held by a Parish Chief on assignment by the CAO. In Kiryandongo Sub County there are 10 staff out of the 13 on the structure.

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:

• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.

**Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0**

All the infrastructure constructed under DDEG were in place and periodically reported on as required. There were three projects funded by DDEG in the district in FY 2021/2022 as follows:

- (i) Mechanized maintenance of Laboke -Kololo Road 12.5 kms estimated at shs 80,374,000 as per page 73 of the District Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022; approved DDP page 422 and page 78 of the district AWP.
- (ii) Tilting of land for 12 Government institutions at district hospital, hospital lagoon, land and schools (Karugu II P/S), Kisekura P/S, Mutunda Senior Secondary School, Kigumba S.S.S, Bweyala Public P/S; Mboira S.S.S and Kaduku HC II. Estimated at shs 100,000,000 as per page 83 of the approved Annual Budget Performance Report, page 409 of the DDP and page 52 of the AWP.
- (iii) Raising of 45,000 assorted trees (Musizi, Pines, Eucalyptus) by district force account. The project appears on page 52 of the district AWP, page 409 of the DDP and page 83 of the Budget Annual Performance Report. Budgeted at shs 6,557,000.

All the DDEG projects undertaken were completed by closure of FY 2021/2022 as reflected in the 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report for FY 2021/2022.

A consolidated report by the CAO dated 8th September, 2022 under reference CR/210 was submitted to the PS MoLG and the report was copied to: Chairperson KDLG, RDC, Executive Committee and all the district heads of department.

The DLG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY 2021/2022 as follows:

1st Quarter on 22/09/2021;

2nd Quarter on 15/12/2021;

3rd Quarter on 10/03/2022;

4th Quarter on 15/06/2022.

District Engineer's report dated 3rd/ March/2022 in respect of Routine Mechanised Laboke-Kololo Road 12.5 kms was additional to the reports generated by the district in respect of DDEG funded projects.

## Human Resource Management and Development

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 of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.

Score 2 or else score 0

HRM availed to the Assessment Team a letter ref.: CR/115/1 dated September 16, 2021, addressed to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Public Service, and stamped received on September 30, 2021, submitting the consolidated staffing requirements for Kiryandongo DLG for the FY 2022/2023 to the MoPS. These requirements included wage provisions for staff in post as the District did not have wage provision to fill vacant positions.

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):	During the assessment, HRM availed to the Assessment Team with Attendance Registers used for tracking daily reporting for duty but there was no evidence adduced of analyzing the attendance.	0
		Score 2 or else score 0		
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:  HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous  FY: Score 1 or else 0	<p>Ms. Murungi Violet, a Principal Human Resource Officer, availed the Assessment Team files of HODs with duly endorsed Performance Agreements and Performance Reports for the FY 2021/2022, evidence that the CAO had appraised HODs during the previous FY. Among the appraisal folders reviewed were the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Obwona Richard the Chief Finance Officer was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 11/07/2022.</li> <li>2. Mr. Balikagira Julius the District Planner was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 20/07/2022.</li> <li>3. Mr. Bukenya Issa Hassan the District Production Officer was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 02/08/2022.</li> <li>4. Mr. Dabanja Geoffrey the District Community Development Officer was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 18/07/2022.</li> <li>5. Mr. Kakumba Sam the District Commercial Officer was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 28/08/2022.</li> <li>6. Mr. Ndiroraho Milton the Senior Procurement Officer was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 22/07/2022.</li> <li>7. Ms. Bingi Elizabeth the Principal Internal Auditor was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 02/07/2022.</li> <li>8. Rev. Kirya Edward the District Education Officer was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 14/07/2022.</li> <li>9. Dr. Mutyaba Imaam the District Health Officer was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Ochengel Ismail on 09/07/2022.</li> </ol> <p>However, many of the appraisals were done outside the timeline of 30th June stipulated in the Uganda Public Service Standing Orders.</p>	0
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	<p>During the assessment, HRM availed to the team documentary evidence constituting the Rewards and Sanctions Committee comprised of Mr. Dacan Denis (PAS) as Chairperson; Ms. Murungi Violet (PHRO) as Secretary; Mr. Katusabe Johnson (DIS) as Member; Mr. Balikagira Julius (District Planner) as Member; and Mr. Kyategeka David (SACAO) as Member.</p> <p>Minutes of the meetings of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee of April 01, 2022, and April 11, 2022 were availed but there were no specific instances cited where the Committee implemented administrative rewards and sanctions.</p>	0

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	At the time of assessment, the HRM did not adduce any evidence that Kiryandongo DLG had constituted a Consultative Committee to handle staff grievances.	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.	A review of the recruited staff lists indicated the DLG recruited various categories of staff including 43 teachers. The Assessment Team observed that the recruited staff accessed the payroll within the two months prescribed period as evidenced by the following randomly sampled cases: Mwambu Joel (an Environment Officer posted to the Natural Resources Department at the District Headquarters), Orishaba Rosette (Health Assistant), Kiiza Moses (Psychiatric Clinical Officer posted to Kiryandongo District Hospital), Ojara John Bosco (Assistant Engineering Officer), and Baluku Bahemuka Moses (Anesthetic Officer posted to Kiryandongo District Hospital) all appointed on March 29, 2022 accessed the salary payroll on May 28, 2022. Sunday Richard (Teacher) appointed on March 29, 2022 accessed the salary payroll on May 28, 2022.	1
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.	A review of the pension payroll and retired staff lists showed that the District did not comply with the requirement to access retired staff onto the pension payroll within two months of retirement. HRM explained that they had a pension budget deficit and had to request for a supplementary and this process delayed the access of retired staff to the pension payroll.	0

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	Direct transfers of the DDEG to LLGs was done during FY 2021/2022 totaling shs 657,854,758 in accordance with the requirements of the budget as detailed below:  In quarter one, a total of shs 219,284,667 was transferred to the LLGs. In quarter two, amount transferred to LLGs during quarter was shs 138,294,896 whereas shs 300,274,436 was transferred to the LLGs during the third quarter.  Examples of transfers to LLGs:  (i) Shs 14,806,000 was transferred to Bweyale Town Council on voucher number 38716308 dated 7th July, 2021 in quarter one.  (ii) Shs 33,153,877 was transferred to Mutunda sub county on voucher number 39694258 dated 2nd November, 2021 in quarter two.  (iii) Shs 96,078,358 was transferred to Kiryandongo sub county on voucher number 41607256 dated 15th February, 2022 in quarter three.	2
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---



10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>In quarter one, DDEG cash limits were received by the DLG on 14th July, 2021 from PS/ST, communication to LLGs was done on 15th July, 2021. Warranting was done on 16th July, 2021 and transfers effected accordingly as per CAO's instructions.</p> <p>In quarter two, DDEG cash limits were received by the DLG on 10th October, 2021 from PS/ST, communication to LLGs was done on 12th October, 2021. Warranting was done on 13th October, 2021 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions.</p> <p>In quarter three, DDEG cash limits were received by the DLG on 10th January, 2022 from PS/ST, communication to LLGs was done on 12th January, 2022. Warranting was done on 14th January, 2022 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions.</p> <p>There were no delays of more than five days from the time of receipt of expenditure limits and cash limits from MOFPED to warranting and release of funds to LLGs.</p>	2
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>In quarter one, invoicing was done on 31st August, 2021 for shs 29,191,333. In quarter two, invoicing was done on 27th October, 2021 for shs 109,103,563 and in quarter three, invoicing was done on 8th February, 2022 for shs 46,620,500.</p> <p>However, there was no evidence adduced to show that the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter. In Kigumba Town Council, the document posted on the Notice Board was not dated, not addressed, not referenced and had no author names. It did not show what the figures were, written by whom, and for what period.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district carried out supervision and mentoring of LLGs as per examples provided in the reports sampled below:</p> <p>In quarter One, report dated 18th September, 2021 was produced and discussion centered on operations of the PBS and its challenges. In report dated 9th December, 2021 in quarter two, discussion was on general administrative issues, to improve on efficiency and effectiveness of the computerized system during the communication of IPFs by MOFPED. In quarter three, report dated 16th March, 2022 was generated and addressed building functional partnerships. In quarter four, report dated 9th June, 2022 was produced and discussed performance of the Education Sector, status of LLGs, improvement of service delivery in LLGs, budget for FY 2022/2023 and the National Development Plan III. It was noted that not all LLGs were mentored.</p>	0

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

Supervision and monitoring reports were discussed by TPC and corrective action taken on recommendations as provided below:

The quarter one report was discussed in a TPC meeting that was held on 30th September, 2021 under minute reference 09/TPC/Sept/21 and joint supervision was encouraged but following the COVID-19 SOPs.

The quarter two report was discussed in a TPC meeting that was held on 30th December, 2021 under minute reference 13/TPC/Dec/2021. It was resolved that all sites that had stalled resume after the partial opening of the country after COVID-19 lockdown.

The quarter three report was discussed in a TPC meeting that was held on 30th March, 2022 under minute reference 10/TPC/March/2022, it was agreed that regular supervision guided by properly prepared schedule be introduced and adhered too.

The quarter four report was discussed in a TPC meeting that was held on 27th June, 2022 under minute reference 5/6/DTPC/2022 in which one of the recommendations was improvement of service delivery in the district and timely supervision of monitoring reports. The recommendations were followed up and it was observed that production of the inspection reports like for Education department were being timely produced and submitted to the DES.

## 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**

A computerized Assets Register maintained on IFMS system was in place and updated regularly and the last date of update was 30th September 2022. The Assets Register contained all the required information as provided by the guidelines. Assets of the district were properly categorized into Land, Buildings for office administration, Transport for motor vehicle LG 0008 RF, office equipment in clerk to Council Office, Office Equipment, Machinery and graders under motor vehicle LG 7778HU, office furniture and Fittings in CFO' etc. The Assets Register was accordingly verified.

2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Board of Survey Report for FY 2021/2022 was in place and a copy was submitted to the Accountant General by the CAO vide letter dated 29th August, 2022 under reference CR/157/1. Copies of the Board of Survey Report were circulated to the district Chair Person and all heads of department. The Accountant General acknowledged receipt of the BOS report on 22nd September, 2022. The report captured status of Kiryandongo DLG bank accounts, as on 30th June, 2022. Issues raised in the report covered: Disposal of vehicles as per page 5 of the report including disposal of furniture and equipment.</p> <p>The Board of Survey report was submitted in August, 2022. It was not possible to implement recommendations of the BOS between August, 2022 and the time of assessment in November, 2022.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The Physical Planning Committee was in place dully appointed by the CAO through letter dated 21st October, 2020 under reference CR/153/2 but it was non-functional during FY 2021/2022. Appointed committee members included:</p> <p>1. J. Candia, 2. Z. Businge, 3. S. Muhumuza, 4. E. Niyonzima, 5. M. Ochuba, and 6. E. Kafuko, 7. J. Tibemanya.</p> <p>There was no evidence that the Physical Planning Committee convened meetings as required by the guidelines. In the circumstances, there were no minutes of the committee that were generated. No minutes of the committee were submitted to Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development.</p> <p>In addition, there was no Physical Development Plan for submission to the National Physical Planning Board. There was no Buiding Plan, Registration Book in place as required.</p>	0
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 third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were three projects (Routine Mechanized Maintenance of .Laboke - Kololo Road (12.5Km) in Mutunda S/County, Tilting of land for 12 Government institutions at district hospital, hospital lagoon, land and schools and Raising ) financed by the DDEG during FY 2021/2022 and all were derived from the LG DDPIII under human capital development:</p> <p>All the three projects were desk appraised as per report dated 10th/02/2021.</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were three projects (Routine Mechanized Maintenance of .Laboke - Kololo Road (12.5Km) in Mutunda S/County, Tilting of land for 12 Government institutions at district hospital, hospital lagoon, land and schools and Raising of 45,000 assorted trees (Musizi, Pines, Eucalyptus) financed by the DDEG during FY 2021/2022:</p> <p>There were no field appraisal conducted for projects to be implemented in FY 2022/2023.</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>Not Applicable. There were No DDEG Projects planned for implementation in the FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The desk appraisal dated 16/3/2022, signed by the appraisal team on 16/3/22, FY 2022-2023 reviewed, environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures were screened for the construction of 2-stance VIP at Kiryandongo HC III, dated 16/3/2022 and signed by both the DEO and DCDO, all environmental issues were costed and clearly showing the implementing agency.</li> <li>2. The desk appraisal dated 16/3/2022, signed by the appraisal team on 16/3/22, FY 2022-2023 reviewed, environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures were screened for the construction of bathing shelters at Kiryandongo HC III, dated 16/3/2022 and signed by both the DEO and DCDO, all environmental issues were costed and clearly showing the implementing agency.</li> <li>3. The desk appraisal dated 16/3/2022, signed by the appraisal team on 16/3/22, FY 2022-2023 reviewed, environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures were screened for partitioning of surgical ward at Kiryandongo HC III, dated 16/3/2022 and signed by both the DEO and DCDO, all environmental issues were costed and clearly showing the implementing agency.</li> </ol> <p>The appraisal team was comprising of; Balikajira Julius (the LG Planner), Ms. Businge Zalfa (the senior environment officer), Dabanja Geoffrey (DCDO), Rev. Nyonzima Emmanuel (Ag. DE), Dr. Mutyaba Imaam (DEO) and Ms. Bingi Elizabeth (the internal auditor)</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan  Score 1 or else score 0	There was NO evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan.  The following Projects under the Natural Resources Department are captured in the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2022/23, but not in the Procurement Plan;  1. Nanda-Popara Road; Estimated (Budget) at UGX 1,693,000,000/=  2. Nyamusansa Playfield; Estimated at UGX 819,269,000/=	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	No Contracts Committee Minutes were seen as Entity said No Infrastructure Projects to be Funded under DDEG, that the ones captured in the Budget are not necessarily right narratives – rather USMID funding, not DDEG (as said by the D/Planner (Balikagira Julius) and the Ag. DE (Niyonzima Emmanuel). No comment from the PDU  The projects included  1. Nanda-Popara Road; Estimated (Budget) at UGX 1,693,000,000/=  2. Nyamusansa Playfield; Estimated at UGX 819,269,000/=	0
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 evidence that LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as per guidelines  A copy of Joint appointment of the PIT with members including the Project Manager - Niyonzima Emmanuel (Ag. DE); Contract Manager - Balikajira Julius (the LG Planner), Businge Zalfa (Senior Environment Officer), Dabanja Geoffrey (DCDO), Candia Joseph - Civil Engineer (for Clerk of Works duties) and Achola Jackline (Senior Labour Officer) among others, was seen by the Assessor in a letter dated 29th November, 2021 as endorsed by the CAO - Ochengel Ismael	1
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	Infrastructure projects under DDEG Funding were found to be Complaint with the standard designs and specifications - For example;  The Routine mechanized maintenance of the Laboke - Kololo Road (12.5Km) was undertaken following the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Bush Clearing was done, and then grading including back-sloping to a width of Seven (7) meters for the whole road length.  Spot gravelling was also done to sections that were swampy to appropriate breadth, and then the drainage works to majorly open Side drains and Mitre drains.	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	Kiryandongo DLG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY  The DE, and Roads Inspector supervised the Routine mechanized maintenance of the Laboke - Kololo Road (12.5Km), along with other projects as per reports dated 23/22022 and 3/3/2022. Also, the Roads Condition Assessment report dated 28/7/2021 was seen by the Assessor  The other relevant technical officers that include the Environmental Officer (Ms. Businge Zalfa) and the DCDO (Dabanja Geoffrey) also participated in the supervision. The reports among others included Tree Planting as a mitigation Measure for Mechanized Road Maintenance works dated 30/9/2022.	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that Kiryandongo DLG verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors timely; for example;  Payments for Works on the Routine mechanized maintenance of the Laboke - Kololo Road (12.5Km) - FORCE ACCOUNT were done timely, for example requisitions made on the 29/7/2021, were verified on 29/7/2021 and paid as per <i>EFT Nos., 38097306</i> (UGX 2,400,000/) and <i>38097345</i> (5,940,000/) on the 3/9/2021; then <i>EFT No. 38097305</i> (UGX 45,048,000/ was paid on 10/9/2021  Payments were made to suppliers of materials especially Fuel and Lubricants, Mechanical imprest, etc	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	There was NO evidence of Complete procurement files in place for ALL projects/contracts; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals and/or minutes. For example;  The project for the Routine Mechanized Maintenance of .Laboke - Kololo Road (12.5Km) in Mutunda S/County - File was in the Works Department (not known in the PDU), with No full requirements of a Complete Procurement File	0

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG designated a person, the person was designated to coordinate response to the feedback/complaints and a centralized GRC was established.</p> <p>In a letter dated 4/4/2021 the CAO appointed CDO Mr Dabanja Geoffrey as the focal person for GRC at the district and on 6/4/2021 the CAO appointed a committee of 9 officers headed by the Personal assistant chief administrative officer (PACAO) to stir the centralized GRC at the district, and each member signed and received a copy of the appointment.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for the system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included a centralized complaints log and the public display of information at district,</p> <p>-The grievance log book was reviewed, with sub titles capturing the information of the complainant, details of the grievance to be handled, including the date when the grievance was recorded and action taken and its recorded in both the logbook and on personnel file. The procedures of grievance handling were displayed on the LG notice board.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>there was evidence that district publicized the grievance redress mechanisms and all aggrieved parties know where to report,</p> <p>In the letter dated 28th/June/2022, signed by DCDO, members were informed about complaint handling procedures and ways of logging in their complaints for both the LG officials and the public, highlighting 8 key thematic procedures. Procedures for grievance handling were displayed on both the LG notice board and on the DCDO's office notice board.</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets;  1. In the DDP III for (2020/21-2024/25), ref EXD.103.58 dated 30th/6/2022, signed by district planner and executive director for planning authority, copied to CNPA, PS MoFPED, PS MoLG and LCV chairperson Kiryandongo, Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were captured on page 39, stating the climate extremes affecting the district.  2. In the approved budget of vote 592, kiryandongo district for the FY 2021/22 the Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated at tune of 6,792,139, and its evident in more than three projects.  3. In all work plans of different projects, Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated eg water projects for borehole locations Ref ENV/550, fencing Mutunda III and road maintenance of laboke-kololo road	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management  score 1 or else 0	there is evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets;  1. in the DDP III for (2020/21-2024/25), ref EXD.103.58 dated 30th/June/2022, signed by district planner and executive director for planning authority, copied to CNPA, PS MoFPED, PS MoLG and LCV chairperson Kiryandongo, Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were captured on page 39, stating the climate extremes affecting the district.  2. in the approved budget of vote 592 kiryandongo district for the FY 2021/22 the Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated at tune of 6,792,139, and its evident in more than three projects.  3. In all work plans of different projects Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated eg water projects for borehole locations Ref ENV/550, fencing Mutunda III and road maintenance of laboke kololo road  However their is no evidence for disseminating information to LLGs	0



15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	There was evidence that costed ESMP was incorporated in the BoQs, and contract/bidding documents and examples of costing of additional costs that addressed climate change adaptation,  1. Ssekago .F. construction LTD, was contracted to fence Mutunda health center III, dated 9th/2/2022, and ESMP was costed document signed by the CAO, DE, and the contractor and costed climate change adaptation by costing planting trees and restoration cost all totaling to Ugx3,000,000, the total budget for the project was Ugx152,633,000 quated from the BoQ  2. Contract document for eleven borehole drilling and installation between Kiryandongo district and m/s KLR U LMT P.O BOX 32370 Kampala, procurement ref no KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00016, dated for Nov 2021, supply & plant trees seedling (8000) at borehole site approved by supervisor, signed by CAO and contractor  3. Rehabilitation of boreholes in Kiryandongo district, Ref no kiry/592/WRKS/21-22/000015, dated 15/9/2021, supply and tree seedlings at borehole site approved by supervisor	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There was evidence for additional costing to address climate change adaptation;  Evidence  1. E&S safeguards management plan for full rehabilitation of Kigumba-Kinyara Masindiprt road (15.1km), sensitise community on sound waste management practices especially of plastic and promoting awareness on climate change adaptation & mitigation total Ugx5,037,500  2. E&S safeguards management plan for full rehabilitation of siriba-kalwala kiryanmmpula (11.3km) plant both woodlot and fruit tress, (880,000) sensitize community on sound waste management practices especially of plastic and promoting awareness on climate change adaptation & mitigation total Ugx9,280,000	3

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:	There is evidence that the DDEG projects are implemented on land which has has proof of ownership  Evidence  1. the consent for borehole voluntary land contribution at kiryanseka signed between Mr Nkamuhabwa Fred and Miss Diana Mbabazi land owners and community to transfer land without conditions, dated 6/12/2021, stamped by LC 1 chairman of Nyakibete 1 village and ownwers of the land  2. the consent for borehole voluntary land contribution at Nyakibete signed between Mr Nyang Peter and Mr Odoch George land owners and community to transfer land without conditions, dated 30/11/2021, stamped by LC 1 chairman of kiryanseka village and owners of the land  3. the consent for construction of two classroom block at Kigaragara village signed between church of Uganda the land owners and school to transfer land without conditions, dated 29/11/2022, stamped by LC 1 chairman of Kigaragara and Kigumba C.OU village	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:	there was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; however there were no monthly reports to this effect  Evidence  1. There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs, ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP Ugx192,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen. however no monthly reports were available at the time of assessment.  2. There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP Ugx192,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen. however no monthly reports were available at the time of assessment.  3. There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP Ugx2,600,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen. however no monthly reports were available at the time of assessment.	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that Environmental and Social compliance certificates were signed by both EO and CDO  1. REF: ENG/213, Ssekago .F. construction LTD, was contracted to fence mutunda health centre III, dated 9th/2/2022, on 11/FEB/2022 both EO and DCDO signed on the compliance certificate forms.  2. REF/213, Arid developers LTD, was contracted to construct 5-stance VIP latrine block at Kiryandongo BCS PS, compliance certificate signed on 20/June/2022 by both EO and DCDO.  3. REF/231, Ssekago .F. construction LTD was contracted to refurbish inpatient ward-Kigumba HC III, compliance certificate signed 20/June/2022 by both EO and DCDO.	1
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**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	The district had all the bank reconciliation statements prepared on a monthly basis up to 30th September, 2022. Examples of reconciliation statements:  (i) The District UNHCR account number 9030005665727 with Stanbic Bank Kigumba branch had been reconciled to 30th September, 2022 with a balance of shs 118,441, 425.  (ii) Kiryandongo DLG Hospital account number 9030005877333 with Stanbic Bank, Kigumba branch had a reconciled bank balance of shs 1,038,118 as on 30th September, 2022.  (iii) Reconciliation of the TSA account of the DLG was taken over by MOFPED. No reconciliation statements were in place.  (iv) Kibanda Sub health district bank account number 9030005877325 with Stanbic Masindi branch was reconciled up to 30th September, 2022 with a balance of shs 154,036.	2
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.  Score 2 or else score 0	All the quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2021/2022 were produced and accordingly submitted as required. The reports were addressed to the District Speaker.  Quarter One report was produced on 31st October, 2021 and circulated to Chairperson LGPAC, IAG, CAO, LG Accounts Committee, OAG, IAG, RDC, Chair person Regional Audit Committee, Western Region, (7 queries were raised);  Quarter Two report was produced on 30th January, 2022 and circulated to same officials as in quarter one. (13 queries were raised).  Quarter Three report was produced on 15th July, 2022 and circulated to same officials as in quarter one (10 queries were raised).  Quarter Four report was produced on 20th August, 2020 and circulated to same officials as in quarter one. (06 queries).	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Internal Auditor submitted all the quarterly reports through the District Speaker for consideration by LGPAC, CAO and Chairperson, PAC Western Region. The Accounting Officer (CAO) acknowledged receipt of all the audit reports as submitted to him.</p> <p>The Council meeting held on 30th August, 2022 reviewed the LGPAC reports. The LGPAC reports that were reviewed by Council covered quarter one, two and three of the internal audit reports for FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>In addition, there was follow up of status of implementation of the LGPAC recommendations vide letter dated 14th/12/2021, examples of follow up was procedure for disposal of district assets and the need to engrave the assets.</p>	1
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>All copies of the quarterly internal audit reports were circulated to LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC and they were accordingly acknowledged. For example: The delivery book indicated circulations of the reports as follows: Quarter One to CAO and LGPAC on 15/3/2022; Quarter Two and Quarter Three on 12/8/2021; Quarter Four on 20/10/2021.</p> <p>However, the LGPAC did not review the recommendations of the internal audit reports because its term of office had expired. There was no evidence in place indicating appointment of new LGPAC.</p>	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Local Revenues**

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The DLG originally budgeted shs 140,599,000 for local revenue for FY 2021/2022 as per financial statements of the district for FY 2021/2022 pages 11 and 12. It however realized revenue collection amounting to shs 372,996,714 during the financial year as provided on pages 11 and 12 of the DLG financial statements for FY 2021/2022. This was equivalent to 265% performance. The excessive performance was attributed to the fact that MOFPED declined to revise the budget for the local revenue of the district in spite of several correspondences to the ministry by the DLG.</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Local revenue collection amounting to shs 372,996,714 was realized during financial year 2021/2022 as detailed on pages 11 and 12 of the financial statements for FY 2021/2022. In FY 2020/2021, the district collected shs 219,844,075 as per page 34 of the audited financial statements for FY 2020/2021 resulting in an increment in revenue collection performance of 70%. I.e shs 372,996,714 less shs 219,844,075 = shs 153,152,639.</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 DLG realized a total of shs 74,685,967 and remitted shs 27,186,250 as the mandatory 65% share of local revenue to LLGs for FY 2021/2022 as detailed in the financial statements for FY 2021/2022. Computation:</p> $\frac{27,186,250}{74,685,967} \times 100 = 36.4\%$ <p>Remittance of the mandatory local revenue to LLGs was below 65% because, revenue collection was affected by COVID 19 pandemic.</p> <p>Examples of remittances to LLGs:</p> <p>(i) Shs 6,490,000 was transferred to Kiryandongo sub county per reference 840061016GL dated 14/03/2022.</p> <p>(ii) Shs 7,400,000 was transferred to Kiryandongo Town Council as per reference CF 84006101GLGL dated 23/12/2021.</p> <p>(iii) Shs 5,860,000 was transferred to Kigumba Town Council as per reference CF 84006101GLGL dated 24/02/2022.</p> <p>(ii) Shs 5,840,000 was transferred to Masindi Port Sub county as per reference CF 84006101GLGL dated 24/02/2022</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 Procurement Plan and the Awarded Contracts were duly published/displayed on the <i>Kiryandongo DLG</i> Procurement Notice board for Public View.</p> <p>Examples of Projects/Contracts awarded included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contract to M/S KLR (U) Ltd; for the Drilling and Installation of 5 Deep Boreholes; - Proc. Ref. No. <b>KIRY592/WRKS/22-23/00090 LOT 2</b>; with a Contract sum - UGX 133,570,395 /=-; signed for display on the 10/10/2022, and date of removal was 21/10/2022</li> <li>2. Contract to M/S ICON Projects Ltd; for the Drilling and Installation of 5 Deep Boreholes; - Proc. Ref. No. <b>KIRY592/WRKS/22-23/00090 LOT 3</b>; with a Contract sum - UGX 137,467,045 /=-; signed for display on the 10/10/2022, and date of removal was 21/10/2022</li> <li>3. Contract to M/S LHM Ground Water Exploration &amp; Geo-mapping Services Ltd; for the Siting and Drilling Supervision of 5 Deep Boreholes; - Proc. Ref. No. <b>KIRY592/SRVS/22-23/00091 LOT 2</b>; with a Contract sum - UGX 17,500,000/=-; signed for display on the 10/10/2022, and date of removal was 21/10/2022</li> </ol> <p>The above projects among others were as found on the Procurement Notice Board as signed by the CAO (<i>Martin Jacan Gwokto</i>)</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>Publicity of the DLG performance assessment results for FY 2020/2021 was done as required as per CAO'S circular letter dated 25th July,2022. Circular letter was distributed to the Chairperson of Council, Executive members, RDC, all heads of department, notice boards, website <a href="http://kiryandongo.go.ug/publication">kiryandongo.go.ug/publication</a> and all LLGs. In addition, free radio talk shows were held every Saturday of the week on FM radios. There was no charge for the radio talk shows.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district conducted public discussions through radio talk shows on FM radios in the district and discussed issues like food security, immunization and milk production on Kibanda FM radio.</p> <p>Barazas were held for example one that was held on 16th July,2021 under reference KDLG/20/FZ.</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG publicized tax collection through, tax rates, on revenue collection circulars dated 7/11/2021 and 13/1/2022. However, there was no evidence for publicization of appeal procedures.</p>	0

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure

a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0

Perusal of the district minutes of council for FY 2021/2022 indicated that the district had no case with IGG.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
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"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The PLE results indicated improvement of 12.1% in the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below.</p> <p>2019 (DIV 1: 390, DIV 2: 2714, DIV 3: 1366, TOTAL PASS: 4470, NEVER SAT: 48, TOTAL REGISTERED CANDIDATES: 5765).</p> <p><math>390+2714+1366=4470</math></p> <p><math>5765-48=5717</math></p> <p>2020 (DIV 1: 382, DIV 2: 1744, DIV3: 429, TOTAL PASS: 2555, NEVER SAT: 44 TOTAL REGISTERED CANDIDATES: 2875).</p> <p><math>382+1744+429=2777</math></p> <p><math>2875-44=2831</math></p> <p>Therefore, the calculated percentage for 2019 was <math>4470/5717 \times 100 = 78.2\%</math> while</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2020 was <math>2555/2831 \times 100 = 90.2\%</math></p> <p>Therefore <math>90.3\% - 78.2\% = 12.1\%</math> Improvement.</p>	4
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"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The UCE results indicated a decline of -20.4% which is below the scoring level between the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below.</p> <p>2019 (DIV 1: 201, DIV 2: 535, DIV 3: 592, TOTAL PASS: 1328, NEVER SAT: 13, TOTAL REGISTERED CANDIDATES: 2075)</p> <p><math>201+535+592=1328</math></p> <p><math>2073-13=2060</math></p> <p>2020 (DIV 1: 211, DIV 2: 537, DIV3: 605, TOTAL PASS: 932, NEVER SAT: 19, TOTAL REGISTERED CANDIDATES: 2130)</p> <p><math>211+537+605=932</math></p> <p><math>2130-19=2111</math></p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was <math>1328/2060 \times 100 = 64.5\%</math> While</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2020 was:</p> <p><math>932/2111 \times 100 = 44.1\%</math></p> <p>Therefore <math>44.1\% - 64.5\% = -20.4\%</math> Decline</p>	0



2	Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.	a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year	There was no LLGs performance assessment the previous FY but one and therefore no base data for comparison.	0
	Maximum 2 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>		
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0	The Budget performance report for 4th Quarter dated 22nd September 2021 on page 33 and 34 showed that the Education Development Grant was used on the following eligible activities:	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<p>1-Construction of 3 classroom block at Ndabulye PS., Kitwara PS. and Nanda PS. By Baguma and Sons Ltd valued at 198,833,395UGX.</p> <p>2-Construction of 5 stance Pit Latrines at Wakisanyi PS., Kyamugenyi COU PS. and Kiryandongo BCS PS. By Muzira Goodies General Agencies valued at 9414700UGX.</p> <p>3-Procurement and delivery of 126 desks for Nanda PS. (40 desks), Dyang PS. (46 desks) and Kitwara PS. (40 desks) valued at 20,160,000UGX.</p>	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0	The district implemented projects under the Education Department that included construction contracts during FY 2021/2022. Perusal of all the vouchers of construction contracts indicated that the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO all certified payments to contractors.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<p>Examples:</p> <p>Construction of a 2 classroom block at Nanda PS. Payment was made to Baguma and sons services Ltd for SHS 52,288,483 on voucher number 42017500 dated 26th April 2022. The environmental officer signed on 4th February 2022, the DEO signed on 11th February 2022, and CAO endorsed the payment on 21st February 2022. The CDO Certified payments on 4th February 2022.</p> <p>Payment to Baguma and sons services Ltd was paid SHS 63,254,980 for completion of a 2 classroom block at Ndabulye PS. CAO, DEO, CDO and the Environmental Officer certified payment on 26th May 2022.</p> <p>Payment to Baguma and sons services Ltd was paid SHS 71,586,352 for completion of a 2 classroom block at Kitwara PS. CAO, DEO, CDO and the Environmental Officer certified payment on 24th May 2022.</p>	

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

From the DE and DEO's offices, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineers estimates (Budgets) Versus the Contract Prices are as listed with the corresponding Variation  $\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\}$  percentages:

1. Construction of 2-roomed Classroom Blocks at Nanda, Ndabulye, and Kitwara P/Schools - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00013 with Engineers Estimates (budget amount) at UGX 205,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 198,833,395/=. **The Variation was at 3.01%**

2. Construction of a 5-Stance VIP Latrine at Kyamugenyi C.O.U P/S - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00071 with Engineers Estimates (budget amount) at UGX 24,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 23,982,162/=. **The Variation was at 0.07%**

3. Construction of a 5-Stance VIP Latrine at Kiryandongo B.C.S P/S- KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00072 with Engineers Estimates (budget amount) at UGX 24,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 23,946,500/=. **The Variation was at 0.22%**

4. Construction of Kitwara Seed Sec School in Kiryandongo S/County – MoES/UgIFT/WRKS/2018-2019/00119 LOT 5 with MoES (Engineers) Estimates (budget amount) at UGX 2,100,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 2,190,885,010/= (as amended). **The Variation was at -4.33%**

The **Variations;  $\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\}$**  were thus within +/-20% of the MoES/LG Engineers estimates

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

The Construction of Kitwara Seed Sec. School, in Kiryandongo S/County (Rolled over project - MoES/UgIFTWRKS/2018-19/00119/LOT 5) was completed as per workplan for the FY 2021/2022, and as per AWP page 65. By the time of the Assessment the work had been fully finished, and awaiting Commissioning as per letter to PS Ministry of Education and Sports dated 15/7/2022, received by the Office of the PS on 5/10/2022

Other Education/School infrastructure development completed as per Work Plan and evidenced by the project Completion reports from the DE and DEO

- Construction of 2-roomed Classroom Blocks at Nanda, Ndabulye, and Kitwara P/Schools
- Construction of a 5-Stance VIP Latrine Blocks at at Wakisanyi PS. Kyamugenyi C.O.U P/S and Kiryandongo B.C.S P/S,

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	At the time of assessment, the HRM did not adduce evidence that the LG had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines. A review of the staffing structure for schools, and the teachers' staff lists from HRM showed that the staff ceiling was filled 100%. However, this ceiling was last revised in 2010 and could no longer accommodate the current enrollment. The currently approved staff establishment for primary teachers stands at 897. Enrollment stands at 75,931 (39,397 boys and 36,534 girls). At the teacher-to-pupil ratio of 1:53, the required number of teachers would be 1433. There is therefore an actual deficit of 536 teachers. The current staff strength of 897 would only give a 63% staff capacity against the required staff numbers.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 – 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>		
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,	A review of the asset registers for 2021/2022 for both UPE and USE schools showed 73 out of 73 (100%) registered UPE schools met DES guidelines and 7 out of 7(100%) USE schools met DES guidelines.	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	Thus 100%.	

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The LG had accurately (100%) reported on teachers and where they were deployed as presented below:

At Kidididma PS: A review of the teacher's staff list posted on the walls of the head teachers' office against the deployment list at the DEO's office, the two were matching with 10 teachers including the head teacher. They included: Head teacher Onek Alice, Kabonesa Stella, Kabuubi David, Oluju Charles, Byaruhanga Collins, Mukaka Mary, Atugonza Flavia, Kyalisima Dinah, Nayosi Edward, Kusiima Violet

Jeeja PS.: The list of teacher's deployment at the DEO's office indicated 11 teachers and so was the teacher's list posted on the walls of the head teacher's office. These were: Sabiiti K. Richard (Headteacher) Mindraa Emily, Musimbi Paul, Wandira Stephen, Enjaru Annet, Abitegeka Godfrey, Nabwile Oliver, Aisa Mastura, Odur Patrick, Kilande Janepher and Murunga Joseph.

At Kigumba COU PS.: The list of 19 teachers including the head teacher that was posted on the walls of head teacher's office wall matched with what was at the DEO's desk. They included: Baguma Sbiiti Alex( Head teacher), Adiga Gilbert, Atuhairwe B. Sarah, Baguma Ismail, Baguma James, Basemera Doreen, Birungi Dorcas, Bitekerezozo Mebo, Byaruhanga Godfrey, Hakosi Beatrice Amooti, Isyepo Angopa Robert, Kidega Charles, Kiiza Aminah, Nyangoma Kezia, Ocheng Denish, Okene Geofrey, Tinkasiimire Fridah, Tino Rose and Tumusiime Florence.

Thus the information given by the LG was accurate.

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 review of asset register in the DEOs office indicated the following:

Kididima PS.: 10 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 120 three-seater Desks and 5 units of Teachers houses.  
Jeeja: 09 classrooms, 12 latrine stances, 183 three-seater Desks, and 5 units of Teachers houses.  
Kigumba COU PS.: 12 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 268 three-seater Desks and 5 units of Teachers houses.

In the three sampled schools that included: Kididima PS.: 10 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 117three-seater Desks and 5 units of Teachers houses. Jeeja PS.: 09 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 135 three -seater Desks and 5 units of Teachers houses. Kigumba COU PS.: 14 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 268 desks and 8 units of Teachers houses.

Thus the verification carried out at the three sampled schools, was not tallying with data at DEOs office.

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG evidence provided showed that all the 73 out of 73 (100%) UPE registered schools had submitted their annual school reports and budgets for FY 2021 duly signed by the respective Headteacher, Treasurer and Chairman SMC.</p> <p>A review of the annual school and budget reports of the three sampled schools that included Kididima PS., Jeeja PS. and Kigumba COU PS. had submitted their reports to the DEOs office and these were not in line with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines.</p> <p>The 3 sampled schools submitted the reports on the following dates:</p> <p>Kididima Primary School submitted on 29/12/2021</p> <p>Jeeja Primary School submitted on 04/04/2022</p> <p>Kigumba COU Primary School Submitted on 02/04/2022.</p> <p>This was after the 30th January deadline and hence not compliant.</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30– 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence provided to the assessor at the time of assessment to show the UPE schools that were supported to implement SIPs from the DEOs office.</p> <p>Observations established in the three sampled schools of Kididima PS., Jeeja PS. and Kigumba COU PS., had SIPs in place.</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had collected and compiled EMIS (OTIMS) return forms for all the 73 UPE registered primary schools. For example the list of 73 UPE primary schools indicated in Kiryandongo DLG Performance contract FY 2021/22 with total enrollment of 63,32 was consistent with the number of 73 UPE schools in excel data sheet (OTIMS) that was submitted to MoES on 10th December,2021.</p> <p>This was 100% Submission.</p>	4

## Human Resource Management and Development

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

Kiryandongo LG FY 2022/23 had a total of 76 PS as a result of the 3 community schools that were coded on 22nd March 2022.

The LG had budgeted for a Head teacher and a minimum of 7 Teachers per school. There are 76 Head teachers for the 76 Schools that have classes up to P7, with the exception of Namiryango primary school which stops at P6, but has 8 teachers which satisfies the minimum of a teacher per class. There was a total of 968 Teachers and they were all budgeted for during FY2022/23 at 6,290,182,655UGX as per LG Approved Budget Estimate on page 34 FY2022/23.

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 had deployed teachers according to MoES sector guidelines/staffing norms; which prescribe that a P7 school should have a minimum of seven teachers and a head teacher and all the 50 schools had a minimum of nine teachers and a head teacher.

The sampled schools deployment was as follows:

Kididma PS. 10 teachers were deployed and a head teacher, as per staff list at the DEO's office. These were: Onek (Head teacher) Alice, Kabonesa Stella, Kabuubi David, Oluju Charles, Byaruhanga Collins, Mukaka Mary, Atugonza Flavia, Kyalisima Dinah, Nayosi Edward and Kusiima Violet.

Jeeja PS. 11 teachers and a head teacher were deployed as per staff list and actual staff list and staff attendance register at school was also 11. They included: Sabiiti K. Richard (Headteacher) Mindraa Emily, Musimbi Paul, Wandira Stephen, Enjaru Annet, Abitegeka Godfrey, Nabwile Oliver, Aisa Mastura, Odur Patrick, Kilande Janepher and Murunga Joseph.

Kigumba COU PS. 19 teachers were deployed and a head teacher, as per staff list at the DEO's office corresponded with deployment in the school. These were: Baguma Sbiiti Alex( Head teacher), Adiga Gilbert, Atuhairwe B. Sarah, Baguma Ismail, Baguma James, Basemera Doreen, Birungi Dorcas, Bitekerezozo Mebo, Byaruhanga Godfrey, Hakosi Beatrice Amooti, Isyepo Angopa Robert, Kidega Charles, Kiiza Aminah, Nyangoma Kezia, Ocheng Denish, Okene Geoffrey, Tinkasiimire Fridah, Tino Rose and Tumusiime Florence.

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Teacher deployment list was found displayed on LG notice board and on the walls of the head teacher's offices in all the three sampled schools which were Kididima PS., Jeeja PS. and Kigumba COU PS.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>During the assessment, HRM availed school and headteacher lists, SAS's Headteacher Appraisal Reports submitted to HRM and a letter from the DEO to CAO dated April 07, 2022 submitting lists of 73 Head Teachers appraised. Other letters availed by HRM include one from the DEO to the CAO submitting lists of primary teachers who had been appraised dated October 14, 2022 and another dated July 08, 2022 for the Calendar Year 2021. Considering that all teacher are appraised following the calendar year, reports submitted after January 31 are out of time, justifying a score of zero.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence adduced by HRM to show that the Deputy CAO or Chairperson of the Board had appraised secondary school Head Teachers.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>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>A review of HRM staff registers, staff Performance Plans and Appraisal Reports for staff in the Education Department showed that the DEO appraised the two Inspectors of Schools:</p> <p>1. Mr. Katusabe Johnson Inspector of Schools was appraised on 22/07/2022</p> <p>2. Mr. Ojja Patrick Inspector of Schools was appraised on 09/07/2022</p>	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to the assessor at the time of assessment to show that the LG had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at school and LG level for FY 2021/22</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>The LG did not have any issue concerning correcting the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in PBS thus there was no correction to be made hence no need for the letter from Town Clerk correcting the list.</p> <p>The LG was compliant.</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---



9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines. According to the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2021/22 page 36 generated on 18th June 2021 a total of 41,045,000UGX was allocated for monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary schools for activities like printing stationary, photocopy and binding, travel in land and fuel lubricants and oils.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>In quarter one, schools capitation cash limits were received by the DLG on 4th July, 2021. Communication to schools was done on 15th July, 2021. Warranting was done on 16th July, 2021 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions.</p> <p>In quarter two, schools capitation cash limits were received by the DLG on 10th October, 2021. Communication to schools was done on 11th October, 2021. Warranting was done on 13th October, 2021 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions.</p> <p>In quarter three, schools capitation cash limits were received by the DLG on 10th January, 2020 from PS/ST. Communication to schools was done on 11th January, 2021. Warranting was done on 14th January, 2022 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions .</p> <p>There were delays from the time of receipt of cash limits from MOFPED to warranting and release of funds to schools.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to the assessor at the time of assessment as to when the DEO communicated the release of funds to the schools.</p> <p>The DEO stated that when Districts receive money immediately transfer the money to schools respective accounts and communication is made during head teachers monthly meetings held every second Thursday of the month during school time and during preparatory meetings during holidays.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG prepared an inspection work plan for term one, term two and term three dated 21st January 2021 that was signed by both the DEO and DIS. It indicated specified activities, output, time frame and the inspection team composition.</p> <p>This was backed up with inspection planning meetings for example, meeting held on 22nd September 2021 under minute number 3/Sept/2021 inspection plan was apprehended and 118 schools were identified for inspection and distributed to inspectors accordingly.</p>	<b>2</b>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG carried out inspections in the previous three school terms on the following dates:</p> <p>1: 30/05/2022 76 UPE out of 76 UPE = 76 (UPE 100%)</p> <p>2: 14/08/2022 76 UPE out of 76 UPE = 76 (UPE 100%)</p> <p>Percentage of the schools inspected = <math>76+76= 152</math></p> <p>Thus: <math>152/22 \times 100 = 66.7\%</math></p> <p>The overall percentage of UPE Schools inspected and monitored from the previous school terms was 66.7% which was below 80%.</p>	<b>0</b>

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The Departmental inspection follow up meeting held at DIS Office on 03/10/2021, under number Min 3/Oct./2021 DIS presented feedback reports on strength and areas of improvement. On 06/04/2022 inspection evaluation meeting that was held in the DIS office under minute number 5/April/2022 indicated presentation of inspection reports on general strength and schools for intervention.

From the three sampled schools, these were the findings which were discussed and used to recommend for corrective action.

Kididima PS.

Inspected on 21/03/2022 and 29/09/2021.

The following were the issues:

Improve learning supervision by the head teacher, stakeholders to have a meeting to sensitize the community on affecting learners.

Jeeja PS.

Inspected on 20/07/2021 and 28/03/2022.

Provision of furniture desks.

Both teachers and learners must adhere to SOPs

Kigumba COU PS.

Two inspections were carried out on 16/07/2021 and 22/03/2022.

The issues raised in both inspections were:

Regularly approve lesson plans for effectiveness.

Strengthen monthly and assessment of learners work.

Regularly check learners work for un marked exercises and corrections.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Copies of the inspection reports were left behind as evidenced from the three sampled schools mentioned below:</p> <p>Kididima PS. dated 28/09/2021, 21/03/2022 and 03/08/2022.</p> <p>Jeeja PS. dated 28/03/2022, 20/07/2021 and 01/10/2021.</p> <p>Kigumba COU PS. dated 26/09/2021, 27/03/2022 and 27/07/2022.</p>	2
			<p>The Inspection Reports were also submitted to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the MoES on the following dates:</p> <p>Term III 2021 was submitted on 28/06/2022.</p> <p>Term II 2021 was submitted on 28/06/2022.</p> <p>Term I 2021 was submitted on 30/05/2022.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Council committee responsible for education was in place and functional during FY 2021/2022, convened meetings and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. Examples: meeting held on 10th May, 2022 discussed the budget for the Education Sector, of the district for FY 2022/2023 under minute 06/ED2022. Meeting held on 24th February, 2022 discussed progress results covering service delivery reports and monitoring as well as inspection reports with minute number 10/ED/22. Meeting held on 21st October, 2021 discussed nominees to fill positions of various SACCOs in various schools in the LG with minute number 17/ED2021.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG Education Department conducted activities to mobilize and attract and retain children at school as evidenced in the report dated 28/05/2022 that was funded by UNICEF.</p> <p>The highlighted activities were community barazas that were conducted in the 5 sub counties of Mboira, Kigumba, Nyamahasa, Kicwabugingo and Mutunda that were considered with worst statistic's on enrollment, retention, child marriages, and teenage pregnancy.</p>	2

**Investment Management**

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, *score: 2, else score: 0*

The LG maintained schools asset register in a format prescribed by MoES , a review of the asset register from DEOs office indicated the following:

Kididima PS. (Semi Urban).

Number of Classrooms: 10, Number of Latrines:10

Number of Desks:120,Number of Teachers Houses: 1.

Jeeja PS. (Rural)

Number of Classrooms:9, Number of Latrines:12,

Number of Desks: 183, Number of Teachers Houses:1.

Kigumba COU PS. (Urban)

Number of Classrooms: 12, Number of Latrines:20,

Number of Desks: 268, Number of Teachers Houses:1.

From the three sampled schools the findings were as follows;

Kididima PS. (Semi Urban).

Number of Classrooms: 10, Number of Latrines:10

Number of Desks:117,Number of Teachers Houses: 5.

Jeeja PS. (Rural)

Number of Classrooms :9, Number of Latrines:10,

Number of Desks: 183, Number of Teachers Houses: 5.

Kigumba COU PS. (Urban)

Number of Classrooms: 14, Number of Latrines: 6,

Number of Desks: 268, Number of Teachers Houses: 8.

Thus asset registers observed from the 3 sampled schools did not rhyme with the asset register reviewed from the DEO's office.

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, *score: 1 or else, score: 0*

The Education Department had six projects to implement in FY 2021/2022.Two were sampled as indicated below

(i) Construction of two class room blocks at Nanda P/S at a cost of shs 62,801,736, Kitwara P/S at a cost of shs 72,635,207; Ndabulye P/S at a cost of shs 62,801,736.

(ii) Construction of 5 stance pit latrines at Kiryandongo BCS P/S at a cost of shs 23,536,750; Kyamugenyi COU P/S at a cost of shs 23,536,750 and Wakisanyi P/S at a cost of shs 47,073,500.

The Desk Appraisal Report was dated 10/02/2021. All the projects above listed were reflected on page 208 of the DDP III and page 61 of the AWP.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>The Education Department had six projects to implement in FY 2021/2022. Two were sampled as indicated below:</p> <p>(i) Construction of two class room blocks at Nanda P/S at a cost of shs 62,801,736, Kitwara P/S at a cost of shs 72,635,207; Ndabulye P/S at a cost of shs 62,801,736.</p> <p>(ii) Construction of 5 stance pit latrines at Kiryandongo BCS P/S at a cost of shs 23,536,750; Kyamugenyi COU P/S at a cost of shs 23,536,750 and Wakisanyi P/S at a cost of shs 47,073,500.</p> <p>The Field Appraisal Report was dated 13/04/2021. All the projects above listed were reflected on page 208 of the DDP III and page 61 of the AWP.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>As per the Approved Budget Estimates, the following projects were incorporated in the AWP and Procurement Plan (Page 1) for the current FY</p> <p>1) Construction of School Facilities for Kigumba Town Seed Sec. School; Budgeted at UGX 850,095,000/=.</p> <p>2) Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Kigumba C.O.U P/S in Kigumba T/C; Estimated at UGX 85,000,000/=.</p> <p>3) Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit Latrines at Nyakabale P/S in Kigumba S/Cty; Estimated at UGX 25,000,000/=.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>School infrastructure Projects were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of Works. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under <b>Min004/04/CC/KDLG/21-22</b>, the Construction of Classroom Blocks at Nanda, Ndabulye, and Kitwara P/Schools, in a siting held on 7/10/2022,</li> <li>• Under <b>Min074/13/CC/KDLG/21-22</b>, the Construction of a 5-Stance VIP Latrine at Kyamugenyi C.O.U P/S, and Kiryandongo B.C.S P/S were approved in a meeting held on 24/5/2022</li> </ul>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>From the DE, there was evidence of proper establishment of the PITS for the school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines</p> <p>A copy of joint appointment of Niyonzima Emmanuel - DE (Project Manager), Kiiza Edward - DEO (Contract Manager), Candia Joseph – Civil Engineer (Buildings), Senior Environment Officer – Businge Zalfa, DGDO – Dabanja Goeffrey, and Senior Labour Officer – Achola Jackline, among others as members of the PIT for Construction Works under Education Department. The letter was dated 29th November, 2021.</p> <p>Projects include, among others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of Classroom Blocks (2-Roomed) at Nanda, Ndabulye, and Kitwara P/Schools</li> <li>- Construction of 5-Stance VIP Latrine Blocks at Wakisanyi, Kyamugenyi C.O.U and Kiryandongo B.C.S Primary Schools</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The sampled projects as per the physical checks during the site visits were implemented following MoES technical designs.</p> <p>The 2-Classroom Block at Nanda P/S – was implemented following Standard technical designs with the Classroom Block, each class measuring 7800x6400mm on the interior, Masonry brick walls of 230mm. The structure was roofed in Ordinary/Corrugated Maroon-colored Iron Sheets on treated (in used Oil) timber trusses with fascia boards. The floor. The enclosures (steel casements), ie Doors (3No. each 900x2400mm) and glazed Windows – 1500mmx1200mm, The general finishing works in Plastering, floor works in cement – sand screeding with dividing strips to mitigate cracking, Chalk Boards (4500mmm wide by 1200mm high) and painting; all done as per the BoQs. The lightening arrestor was installed as well</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 NO evidence that monthly Site Meetings were conducted for School infrastructure projects during the previous FY (2021/2022)</p>	0

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>No Monthly Joint Technical supervisions of the construction of planned sector infrastructure projects were regular (w.r.t Critical stages).</p> <p>The Participation of the environment officer and CDO among other officers was evidenced in the Joint inspections and monitoring/supervision reports and environment monitoring reports dated 11/1/2022. The following projects were sampled;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5-Stance VIP Latrine Blocks at Wakisanyi, Kyamugenyi C.O.U and Kiryandongo B.C.S Primary Schools; supervision reports dated 19/4/2022, among others. The substantial completion Certificate was dated 20/6/2022</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block at Kiryandongo P/S , dated 11/1/2022.</li> <li>• Kitwara Seed Sec School – Stakeholders meeting and reports dated 21/4/2022</li> </ul> <p>The above supervisions were however not regular (Monthly at least)</p>	0
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>The CFO availed the following;</p> <p>(1). Certificate of substantial Completion issued to Sekago F Construction Ltd, of P.O. Box 28, Kigumba, dated 21/04/2022 in respect to the Project for fencing of Mutunda Health center III-Mutunda Subcounty. This was accompanied by a request for payment dated 29/04/2022 and payment voucher 43646551, dated 15/07/2022.</p> <p>(2). Certificate of substantial Completion issued to Sekago F Construction Ltd, of P.O. Box 28, Kigumba, dated 30/05/2022 in respect to the Project for refurbishment of inpatient Ward at Ikigumba HCIII. This was accompanied by a request for payment dated 08/06/2022 and payment voucher 44507835, dated 15/07/2022.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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></p>	<p>From the PDU, there was NO evidence that the LG Education Department <b>timely submitted</b> a Procurement Plans for the FY 2022/23 to the PDU. The following projects were however sampled from the Budget and Conslidated Procurement Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of Kigumba Town Seed SS</li> <li>• Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Kigumba C.O.U P/S</li> <li>• Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Pit Latrines at Nyakabale P/S in Kigumba S/Cty</li> </ul>	0



13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law</p> <p><i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>From the Procurement Plan and procurement Files; there were complete procurement file for all the school infrastructure projects; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals. The project Files sampled included the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 2-roomed Classroom Blocks at Nanda, Ndabulye, and Kitwara P/Schools - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00013. Approved by the CC under Min004/04/CC/KDLG/21-22 in a meeting held on 7/10/2021. The Contract Document was signed 10/11/2021</li> <li>• Construction of a 5-Stance VIP Latrine at Kyamugenyi C.O.U P/S - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00071. Approved by the CC under Min074/13/CC/KDLG/21-22 in a meeting held on 24/5/2022</li> <li>• Construction of a 5-Stance VIP Latrine at Kiryandongo B.C.S P/S - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00072. Approved by the CC under Min074/13/CC/KDLG/21-22 in a meeting held on 24/5/2022</li> </ul> <p>The above files were complete with, evaluation reports and approvals/minutes of the Contracts Committee meeting.</p>	1
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence at LG, to show that LG education grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, from the project level to the district level, though the grievances were aligned to the district committee</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 to show that education guidelines were disseminated to any of the schools checked, no report, or any document to to show the dissemination of education guidelines</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG had in place a costed ESMP and it was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents  example  During Construction of 2 classroom block at Ndabulye primary school, sector education ESMP was costed at a tune of Ugx1,050,000 dated 9/09/2021 and incorporated in the BoQs in section 7, item M and N as reviewed from the BoQ document.	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was evidence that the school construction projects were implemented on land with proof of land ownership, for example Kiryandongo GCS p/s has land ownership consent with Kiryandongo catholic parish signed by both parties and stamped by LC 1 chairperson, Construction of a toilet/latrine at Jeeja Primary school, the school signed consent between the catholic church and the school management stamped and signed by LC 1 of Jeeja village.	1
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There was evidence that environmental and community development officials, monitored and supervised compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; however no monthly monitoring reports were prepared, for example during the construction of 2 class block at Kiryandongo P/S , monitoring checklist signed by both officers, dated 11/1/2022, but no monthly report were available for review at the time of the assessment.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments  <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO countered signed at the interim and final stages of all ongoing projects, for example REF /213 for the construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine block at Kiryandongo p/s both environmental officer and DCDO countered signed substantial completion certificate, dated 20/June/2022	1

Health Performance  
Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_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 deliveries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence to confirm no increase in utilization of services by the LG health department by 20% between FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022 for the health centers iii and IVs (focus on total deliveries).</p> <p>The computation of the utilization of Health Care Services was based on HC III and HC IVs as agreed during the training for the health specialists/ thematic area.</p> <p>The assessment team reviewed health unit annual reports (HMIS 107) for FY 2020/2021 and compared them to those for FY 2021/2022</p> <p>Total deliveries for FY 2020/2021 were 3,002 Only while FY 2021/2022 had 3,485 deliveries (new)</p> <p>Percentage change was calculated using the formula (new-Old)/old x 100=3,485-3002/3002x100=16.1% which is less than 20% required by the indicator.</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>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 were essentially two projects in the health sector during FY 2021/2022: (i) Fencing Mutunda HCIII budgeted at shs 152,633,000. The health department received shs 131,520,000 which was subsequently spent on the project as reflected on page 59 of the Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022 and AWP.</p> <p>(ii) Renovation of Kigumba HCIII budgeted for shs 51,299,098. Total amount was spent on the project as indicated on page 52 of the district AWP and financial statements for FY 2021/2022. The project was implemented under the district force account.</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>Review of payment vouchers for contracts in the health department revealed that all payments to contractors were certified by the DHO, D/E, CDO and Environment Officer as required. Examples: (i) Payment to a service provider on voucher number 44507835 dated 20/06/2022 for shs 51,299,098 for Kigumba HCIII. The DHO, D/E, CDO and Environment Officer certified works on 20/6/2022.</p> <p>(ii) Payment to a service provider on voucher number 41889896 dated 23/02/2022 for shs 110,047,069 for fencing Mutunda HCIII. The DHO, D/E, DCDO and Environment Officer certified works on 23/2/2022.</p> <p>(iii) Payment to a service provider on voucher number 43646551 dated 26/05/2022 for shs 12,152,931, The DHO, D/E, DCDO and Environment Officer certified works on 11/05/2022.</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>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>From the DE and DHO, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineers estimates (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Prices are as listed with the corresponding Variation <math>\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\}</math> percentages:</p> <p>1. Fencing of Mutunda HC III in Mutunda S/County - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00012, with Engineers Estimates (A) at UGX 154,000,000/=. The contract Price (B) was UGX 152,633,000/=. <b>The Variation was at 0.89%</b></p> <p>2. Renovation of Kigumba HC III in Kigumba S/County - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00065, with Engineers Estimates (A) at UGX 53,999,402/=. The contract Price (B) was UGX 49.800,000/=. <b>The Variation was at 7.87%</b></p> <p>The variations <math>\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\}</math> were thus within +/-20% of the MoWT/LG Engineers estimates</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>No HC II to HC III upgrade for Kiryandongo DLG</p> <p>Other infrastructures were implemented (like the Fencing of Mutunda HC III, and Renovation of Kigumba HC III, both complete), but call to this indicator as per the LGMSD manual reviews call for Ref. HC II to HC III Upgrade</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"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>A review of the staffing structure for the Health Department showed approval of 1 General Hospital, 1 HC IV, 7 HC III; and 11 HC II. Review of staff lists, and the HRIS database indicated that there are 126 approved staff positions for HC III with only 75 filled indicating a 59.5% capacity. Panyadole HC III was elevated to HC IV but the additional staffing for this level has yet to be procured.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>No HC II to HC III upgrade for Kiryandongo DLG</p> <p>Other infrastructures were implemented, but call to this indicator as per the LGMSD manual reviews call for Ref. HC II to HC III Upgrade</p>	2

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence the health department deployed health workers as per guidelines/staffing levels and norms in the FY 2022/2023.HFs are at 67% deployment.</p> <p>Katulikire HC III:staff list shows 15 staff out of 19 required which 78.9%,</p> <p>Panyadoli HC IV: staff list both at the district and Health Center notice board has 16 out 48 per staffing norms (33.3%)</p> <p>Diima has 18 out of 19 thus 94.7%.Overall staffing for sampled facilities stands at 56.97% which is below the required standard</p>	0
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Only two facilities were upgraded using DRDIP funds. The facilities include :Panyadoli HC III to HC IV and Nyakadoti HC II to HC III. There was no financial implications for the said facilities as the structures were commensurate to the upgraded status. Furthermore , the DLG is not under a UGIFT districts therefore, the assessment indicator is not applicable.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Health Facility annual work plans and budgets conformed to the prescribed formats in the planning guidelines and were timely.</p> <p>1.Panyadoli HC IV.The annual work plan and budget prepared by the in charge and submitted to DHOs office on 31/3/2022.</p> <p>2.Diima HC IV :Annual work plan prepared by in charge Businge Emmanuel endorsed by Otubi Jasper Raymond (HUMC Chairperson)-and submitted to DHO's office on 25/3/2022</p> <p>3.Katulikire HC III was submitted by Omara Chodry Maxwel endorsed by HUMC on 8/3/2022 .</p> <p>All the sampled facilities met the requirements of March and budget formats .</p>	2

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.

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

During the assesment ,no performance reports for the sampled facilities I.e Panyadoli HC IV,Diima HC iii and Katulikire HC iii were available.

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.

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

There was evidence to confirm the sampled Health facilities improvement plans for the FY 2021/2022 incorporated performance issues identified in DHMT monitoring assessment reports.

The Quarter one DHMT report dated 22/10/2021 on the verification and assessment exercise for RBF financing for FY2021/2022 was prepared by Kyomuhendo Gorretty (Biostatistician). The report in Minute :3 2021/2022 agreed that all DHMT members support the facilities to conform to the gaps identified in the improvement plans as stipulated in the RBF guidelines through implementation of work plans, carrying out support supervision visits to all health facilities and attach respective DHMT members for follow up on respective facilities.

For example ,the ADHO environment was specifically assigned to Katulikire HC III and he followed up on ensuring regular staff meetings were conducted, more staff recruited as reviewed by the assessment team on the HUMC meeting dated **19th march 2022 min.4** that confirmed 3 new staff were recruited, incentives given to mothers to increase ANC attendance and RBS machine procured for the facility. Furthermore ,the burn pit has been fenced ,mothers receive incentives during 1st & 4th ANC visits (mosquito nets and soap)as agreed upon in the joint staff and HUMC minutes dated 1/9/2021.

There was evidence that these performance issues were incorporated into the Health Facility PIPs as per each sampled Facility identified gaps below:

1.Panyadoli HC IV:The plan was prepared by in charge Omoti Dickson Olanya endorsed by -HUMC chairperson in october 2021.Activities included keeping the compound clean, use of dispensing logs.

2.Diima HC III: The PIP was generated by Bahemuka Ronald (Facility In charge) endorsed by HUMC chairperson and forwarded to the DHO (Dr.Myatyaba Imaam) on 17/6/2021.Issues/gaps identified included :Reducing client waiting time through triage, staff monthly meetings. A duty roster is in place for staff attendance to patients ,The ART clinic has been supported by Baylor Uganda by seconding a staff and payment of the staff salary.

Katulikire HC III. The PIP was prepared and submitted by the In charge Omara Chodry on 2/5/2022.Issues addressed include: fencing of the burn pit, use of IPC correctly, improving staff attendance, improving ANC 1st & 4th ANC visits by mothers, increase immunization and facility deliveries..

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.

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

There was evidence to confirm the three sampled health facilities did not submit their HMIS reports on time. i.e. by 7th of the following month of reporting for example Panyadoli ,Diima and katulikire were not at 100% timely reporting. Analysis of the HC IV is here by represented below:

**Panyadoli HC IV** :July 2021 on 5.8.21, August 2021 on 7/9/21, Sept 2021 on 7/10/2021, October 2021 on 7/11/2021, Nov 2021 on 7/12/2021, Dec 2021 on 6/1/2022, Jan 2022 on 4/2/2022, Feb 2022 on 4/3/2022, Mar 2022 on 7/4/2021, April 2022 on 6/5/2022, May 2022 on 6/6/2022, June 2022 on 7/7/2022. **Quarterly reports**: Q1 on 7/10/2021, **Q2** on 6/1/2022, **Q3** on 7/4/2021 & **Q4** on 7/7/2022.

**Katulikire HC III**: July 2021 on 5/8/2021, August 2021 on 7/9/2021, Sept 2021 on 12/10/2021, Oct 2021 on 10/11/2021, Nov 2021 on 7/2021, Dec 2021 on 7/01/2022, Jan 2022 on 7/2/2022, Feb 2022 on 4/3/2022, March 2022 on 7/4/2022, April 2022 on 5/5/2022, May 2022 on 6/6/2022 & June 2022 on 7/7/2022. **Quarterly reports** : **Q1** on 12/10/2021, **Q2** on 7/01/2022, **Q3** on 5/5/2022 & **Q4** on 7/7/2022.

**Diima HC III** : July 2022 on 5/8/2021, Aug 2021 on 7/9/2021, Sep 2021 on 7/10/2021, Oct 2021 on 7/11/2021, Nov 2021 on 7/12/2021, Dec 2021 on 6/01/2022, Jan 2022 on 4/2/2022, Feb 2022 on 4/3/2022, March 2022 on 7/4/2022, April 2022 on 6/5/2022, May 2022 on 6/6/2022 & June 2022 on 7/7/2022. **Quarterly reports**: **Q1** on 7/10/2021, **Q2** on 6/1/2022, **Q3** on 7/4/2022, **Q4** on 7/7/2022.



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.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

There was late submission of most of the invoices by the District though from the respective Health centers, it's indicated that the health In charges submitted to the district timely. The information is herein represented in the table below:

#	Name of facility	Amount	Date submitted	Comment
1	Katulikire HC iii	1,18,140/=		submitted on 21/10/21 timely
2	Diima HC iii	29,802,960/=		submitted on 22/10/21 late
3	Kigumba HC iii	25,850,160/=		submitted on 20/10/21 timely
4	St.Mary's Kigumba HC iii	7,269,840/=		submitted on 20/10/21 timely
5	Panyadoli HC iii	5,061,960/=		submitted on 21/10/21 timely
6	Karungu HC iii	6,345,000/=		submitted on 21/10/21 timely
7	Masindi Port Hc iii	11,542,320/=		submitted on 20/10/21 timely
8	Mutunda hc iii	23,187,680/=		submitted on 22/10/21 late
9	Panyadoli HC iii	31,258,840/=		submitted on 17/01/22 timely
10	St.Mary's Kigumba HC iii	8,133,720/=		submitted on 14/01/22
11	Masindi port HC iii	4,968,200/=		submitted on 14/01/22 timely
12	Karungu HC iii	4,685,790/=		submitted on 12/01/22 timely
13	Diima HC iii	18,864,830/=		submitted on 13/01/22 timely
14	Mutunda HC iii	22,726,950/=		submitted on 13/01/22 timely
15	Kigumba HC iii	23,038,870/=		submitted on 14/01/22 timely
16	Katulikire hc iii	6,268,800/=		submitted on 12/01/22 timely

The above scenario shows that in quarter One 75% thus 6 out 8 (eight) of the facilities submitted their RBF invoices on time while in quarter two ,all (100 %) facilities submitted on time. Therefore the DLG submitted later than 15th of the next month after end of the quarter.

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>Quarter one consolidated District RBF invoice for eight (8) was generated by Kyomuhemdo Gorrety (Biostatician) ,recommended by the CAO and endorsed by the DHO of total amount 144,047,210/= on the 22/10/2021 indicating a late submission .</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 of timely preparation and submission of the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY 2221/2022 by August 31 of the current Financial Year as follows:  1st Quarter on 20/10/2021,2nd Quarter on 18/01/2022;3rd Quarter on 26/04/2022;4th Quarter on 20/07/2022.</p> <p>All the three sampled health Facilities i.e Panyadoli HC III ,Katulikire HC III and Diima QBPRs were submitted on 20th July 2022 through joint meetings of all heads of department including the health department at the district headquarters. Therefore the DLG met the indicator requirement of submission of the reports by August 31st of the current FY.</p>	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>The DHO availed an approved performance Improvement plan for example Diima HCIII dated 17/06/2021 and endorsed by Okello Patrick, HUMC Chairperson and prepared by the In-Charge Bahemuka Ronal and approved by the DTPC.  Katulikire HCIII PIP was prepared by Omara Chodry Maxuel (the In-charge) and endorsed by HUMC Chairpreson on 2-May-2022;</p>	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>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DLG health department developed and prepared Performance improvement plan for the lowest performing health facilities. The plan for Katulikire HC III addressed key areas identified such as: low ANC 1 attendance, high staff turnover, no waste segregation. meeting was held on 11/11/2021 and later a joint staff and HUMC meeting to address identified issues during the support supervision. The burn pit was fenced, Bin liners provided in their color codes and incentives for mothers provided to encourage them attend ANC 1 &amp; 4 visits.</p>	1
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG budgeted for health workers as per guidelines .Vote 896 page 16 with a total amount of 7,854,322,000UGX -Local Government Quarterly performance report for FY 2022/2023 ,same figure in the annual work plan and budget was reflected .Furthermore ,an updated staff list was reviewed by the assessment team with a total staff list of 341 for all health facilities and District health staff.</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not deploy health workers as per guidelines for example for the 3 sampled health facilities,Panyadoli HC IV has only 16 of the 48 positions filled,katulikire has 15 posts filled out of 21 while Diima has 18 out of the 19 positions .This gives 55.6% below the indicator requirement.</p> <p>The LG performance contract has a wage of 7,854,322,000 UGX ,page 16 with 24 % unspent of the total budget- Local Government performance report FY 2021/2022.</p>	0
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).

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

There was evidence to confirm the health staff in sampled health facilities were working where there were deployed. The assessment team reviewed staff list at all sampled health facilities shown below:

**Panyadoli HC IV:** The deployment list provided by the DHO's office had 16 out of 48 staff on payroll, however the facility serves over 60,000 refugees. The in charge Rita Atugonza provided two lists one for the District and the other for the facility incorporating staff from the implementing partners that had a total of 131 staff, with 16 on government payroll.

**Katulikire HC III:** The staff list provided by Omara Chodry -the in-charge had 15 staff out of 19.

**Diima HC IV:** The deployment list provided by Emma Businge -the in-charge had 18 staff out of 19, 15 on government payroll while 3 are paid by Baylor Uganda with the MOU that supporting the DHO's office.

Staff attendance books/registers and lists were reviewed by the assessment team and all tallied with the list provided from the DHO's office for all sampled facilities for example at Panyadoli HC IV - Katulikire HC III and Diima. However, there was no staff automated attendance (AAA) both at the District and facility level.

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).

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

There was evidence to confirm the health workers deployed in the sampled facilities were displayed on the health facilities notice boards.

1. Panyadoli HC 1V: The list provided by Atugonza Rita - the in-charge had a list of 16 Health workers out of 48, stamped & displayed on the staff facility notice board.

2. Diima HC III: The list provided by Emma Businge - in-charge had 18 Health workers stamped & displayed on the facility notice board

3. Katulikire HC III: The staff list provided by Omara Chodry -in-charge had a list of 15 health workers, stamped & displayed on the facility notice board.

Panyadoli HC 1V had less than half of the desired level.

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>A review of the personal files of the health facility in charges, Performance Plans, and Appraisal Reports showed that the DHO had appraised all of these staff in the previous FY. Some of the files reviewed include: Lakot Pauline from Kiroko HC II; Atugonza Ritah from Panyadoli HC IV; Businge Emmanuel from Diima HC III; Atuhura Jacqueline from Kiterara HC II; and Okello Denis from Masindi Port HC II.</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. 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>A review of personal files for a random sample of 10 health workers showed they were appraised by their health facility in-charges during the previous FY. The sampled files included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ms. Nyanjura Lucy from Diima HC II was appraised by Mr. Oyuku Tom Francis on July 01, 2022;</li> <li>2) Mr. Ogwal Francis Okello from Diima HC II was appraised by Mr. Oyuku Tom Francis on July 01, 2022;</li> <li>3) Mr. Oyugi Patrick from Kiryandongo District Hospital was appraised by Mr. Mwesigwa James on September 01, 2022;</li> <li>4) Ms. Kobusingye Hannah from Kiryandongo District Hospital was appraised by Ms. Adoch Mary Paito on July 05, 2022;</li> <li>5) Ms. Drateru Beatrice from Apodorwa HC III was appraised by Mr. Kiiza Nelson on July 17, 2022;</li> <li>6) Ms. Driciru Lillian from Panyadole HC IV was appraised by Mr. Omot Dickson Olanya on July 21, 2022;</li> <li>7) Ms. Achan Joyce Winny from Kiryandongo District Hospital was appraised by Ms. Akwongo Sophie Okot on July 12, 2022;</li> <li>8) Ms. Atuhwa Marion from Masindi Port HC III was appraised by Mr. Okello Denish on July 01, 2022; and</li> <li>9) Mr. Okumu Gladys Nekyon from Diika HC II was appraised by Ms. Apio Josephine on July 19, 2022; and 10) Ms. Driciru Lillian from Panyadole HC IV was appraised by Mr. Omot Dickson Olanya on July 21, 2022.</li> </ol>	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>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Corrective action taken by the DHO included mentoring, coaching and recommendations for further professional development courses. A case in point was Dr. Mutabazi Fred who was recommended for a MSc in Medicine Obstetrics, Reproductive Health, and Gynecology.</p>	2

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>The assessment team reviewed one training report on \"District Health Information System 2 (DHIS2) funded by IRC targeting 13 participants prepared by Kyomuhendo Goretty that took place on 29-30/11/2021 with the purpose to equip M &amp; E staff at 6 facilities with knowledge on data entry in DHIS2,extraction of data to help visualize trends for planning and decision making.</p> <p>Another report -HMIS training funded by High Commissioner for refugees (23-25/2/2022) dated 26/2/2022 took place at Green Pearl Hotel kiryandongo was availed to the assessment team.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG did not avail a complete training database .</p>	0

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG availed an updated list of Health Facilities for FY 2021/2022 dated 29/07/2022, signed by DHO Dr. Mutyaba Imaam detailing the cost centers,level and amounts of money submitted for the current FY 2022/2023 .</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The approved budget for the Health Department for FY 2020/2021 PHC NWR was shs 670,000,000 as per page 62 of the approved budget. Actual allocation for service delivery and management was shs 102,000,000 as per page 62 of the approved budget equivalent to 15%.</p>	2

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities during FY 2021/2022 in accordance with the requirements of the budget.</p> <p>In quarter one, grant for health cash limits were received by the DLG on 14th July, 2021 from PS/ST. Communication to health facilities was done on 15th July, 2021. Warranting was done on 16th July, 2021 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions.</p> <p>In quarter two, grant for health cash limits were received by the DLG on 10th October, 2021 from PS/ST. Communication to health facilities was done on 11th October, 2021. Warranting was done on 13th October, 2021 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions.</p> <p>In quarter three, grant for health cash limits were received by the DLG on 10th January, 2022 from PS/ST. Communication to health facilities was done on 14th January, 2022. Warranting was done on 15th January, 2022 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions.</p> <p>There were no delays of more than five days from the time of receipt of cash limits from MOFPED to warranting and release of funds to the health facilities.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Invoicing for quarter one was done on 31st August, 2021;</p> <p>Invoicing for quarter two was done on 27th October, 2021;</p> <p>Invoicing for quarter three was done on 8th January, 2022;</p> <p>There were no delays experienced in invoicing and communication of PHC NWR Grant beyond five days.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district 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.</p> <p>As for quarter one, the CAO issued circular dated 30th July 2021. As for quarter two, the CAO's circular was dated 20th October, 2021. As for third quarter, CAO's circular dated 20th January, 2022.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHO availed minutes of the quarterly Meetings dated 15 June 2021, 20-24 September 2021, 26 October 2022, 17 Jan 2022 and were reviewed by the assessment team.</p>	2
			<p>The assessment team was able to access minutes for the quarterly review meetings which were on file for example DHMT minutes dated 26 October 2021 was generated by Gorretty Kyomuhendo with a total of attendance of 16 Members. Quarter 4 meeting held on 5/7 2022 noted there was poor coverage of ANC1 attendance, Vitamin A capsules stock outs,no CME schedules, stock outs of HEBB registers.recomendations were made to redistribute vitam A capsules from Hospital to panyadoli HC IV and prepare a CME schedule for the different facilities.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Minutes availed dated 5/7/2022 there was an EDHMT and mini meeting involving CHD , CDO, and Other implementing partners. There was evidence showing that the DHT implemented quarterly performance review meetings involving Implementing partners.</p>	1
			<p>Quarter one meetings dated with 16 Participants, involved IPs as Baylor ,TPO,ACF, HF in charges, DHMT, CAO.</p>	
			<p>Quarter four Meeting held on 22/6/22 with 11 participants noted issues such as poor documentation ,poor prescription habits and need to complete registers.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The DHO's office did not avail quarterly support supervision reports to the assessment team.</p>	0
		<p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>		



Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

• If not applicable, provide the score

There was evidence to confirm the HSD carried out support supervision to lower level health facilities within the FY 2021/2022 .The DLG availed quarterly support supervision reports by Kiryandongo Hospital - Kibanda HSD for 21 health facilities including 1 HC IV, 7 HCIII and 13 HCII. For example a report dated 27/9/2021 advised health facilities to ensure they follow the work plans ,carry out monthly meetings while the QI monitors were to follow up the QI teams at facility level

The assessment team also reviewed other HSD reports dated 22nd April 2022,31st March 2022 and noted facilities were not implementing the approved work plans, there was no QI activities and therefore advised facilities to prioritize monthly CQI meetings, follow up of work plans as a prerequisite also for accessing RBF funds.

Quarter 4 report dated 28/6/2022 identified gaps that required urgent follow up that included staff practicing licenses that needed to be renewed and submitted to the DHO's office for consolidation as a requirement to allow staff work in their different facilities .All in-charges were tasked to ensure this is followed through and updates submitted to the Biostatistician.

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

Basing on the recommendations of the support supervision and DHMT, staff in Kitwa was transferred to hospital and all in-charges were cross-transferred. In addition Awor Justine, was transferred from Mutunda to Kitwara on 26/10/2022 , Ngole Andrew(Askari) was transferred from Mpumwe HCII to Kijja HCII, Kimenzi Godwin was transferred on 6/12/2021 from Kitwara HCII to Kiryandongo hospital.

Evidence from the health Department provided recommendations from support supervision visits during FY 2021/2022 for which implementation was followed up as follows:

Panyadoli HC IV:

Katulikire HC III: Quarter 3 report highlighted requirement for RBS machine low ANC attendance and late coming of staff. A staff meeting was later held in which incentives e.g soap for mothers attending ANC was introduced to increase on ANC attendance,RBS machine was acquired and more 3 staff recruited .This was a follow up of Quarter one support supervision report submitted on 19/3/2022 and 8 participants were in attendance .

Quarter 4 support supervision report highlighted issues of poor infection prevention control measures at the facility including need for fencing the burn pit. This was followed up by a HUMC meeting where all the above issues have been addressed.

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 to confirm the LG health department provided support supervision to health facilities to support in the management of medicines and health supplies in the FY 2021/2022.</p>	1
			<p>In the SPARs report for Katulikire HC III dated 5/5/2022, the facility was advised to use the current guidelines in prescribing drugs for patients and also prepare for SPARS comprehensive assessment because at the time the facility had improved in prescribing quality and stock management though not using stock cards accurately.</p>	
			<p>In the same report, HMIS data reporting was still an issue especially drugs while facilities were advised to redistribute some drugs such as Vitamin A capsules i.e Kiryandongo Hospital to redistribute to Panyadoli HC IV by Katusiime the EPI focal person by 5th July 2022 which was done.</p>	
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>The total amount budgeted under non-wage was shs 878,545,000 as per page 24 of the district approved Budget Estimates and AWP page 51 for FY 2021/2022. Allocation for promotion and prevention activities was shs 97,120,000 equivalent to performance of 11% hence below 30% as required.</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHT implemented health promotion ,disease prevention and social mobilization in the FY 2021/2022. There were radio talk shows on Covid-19 prevention as per the schedule dated 11/3/2022 for which the District accessed airtime from the RDC to carry out radio talk shows. Report on joint support supervision dated 31.3.2022 with the objective of IPC assessment noted there was no work plan guiding IPC ,no guidelines, burn pit was open at Katulikire HC III and recommended the facility to put in place IPC work plan, fence the burn pit and prioritize monthly meetings for the same.</p>	1

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the health Department provided recommendations from support supervision visits during FY 2021/2022 for which implementation was followed up as follows:</p> <p>Panyadoli HC IV:</p> <p>Katulikire HC III: Quarter 3 report highlighted requirement for RBS machine low ANC attendance and late coming of staff. A staff meeting was later held in which incentives e.g soap for mothers attending ANC was introduced to increase on ANC attendance, RBS machine was acquired and more 3 staff recruited .This was a follow up of Quarter one support supervision report submitted on 19/3/2022 and 8 participants were in attendance .</p> <p>Quarter 4 support supervision report highlighted issues of poor infection prevention control measures at the facility including need for fencing the burn pit. This was followed up by a HUMC meeting where all the above issues have been addressed.</p> <p>Diima HC IV: Quarter 3 support supervision was carried out by the</p>	0
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>An updated asset register was reviewed from the stores listing all facilities and their respective equipment in the DLG.all sampled facilities had inventory lists that were not signed for example Diima HC III had recently received beds from MOH but the list was updated without date and stamp. The inventory at panyadoli and Katulikre were not updated nor signed by the respective in charges.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were at a cost of shs 53,999,402 essentially three projects implemented by the department during FY 2021/2022 namely:</p> <p>(i) Tilting of land for 5 government institutions at the following areas:</p> <p>Kavuma HC II, Yabweng HC II, Diika HC II, Mutunda HC III and Teca HC II. All these projects were budgeted at shs 31,000,000(page 48 of DDP III).</p> <p>(ii) Fencing of Mutunda HC III at an estimated cost of shs 152,633,000 (page 51 of DDP III)</p> <p>(iii) Renovation of Kigumba HC III(page 60 of DDP III)</p> <p>The Desk Appraisal Report was dated 10/02/2021 while the field appraisals report was dated 13th April,2021.</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>There were essentially three projects implemented by the department during FY 2021/2022 namely:</p> <p>(i) Tilting of land for 5 government institutions at the following areas:</p> <p>Kavuma HC II, Yabweng HC II, Diika HC II, Mutunda HC III and Teca HC II. All these projects were budgeted at shs 31,000,000.</p> <p>(ii) Fencing of Mutunda HC III at an estimated cost of shs 152,633,000</p> <p>(iii) Renovation of Kigumba HC III</p> <p>The Desk Appraisal Report was dated 10/02/2021.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist</p> <p>1. Environmental and social risks and mitigation measures for the construction of a 2 stance lined VIP pit latrine at Kiryandongo hospital ere put in place dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO was carried out, ESMP costed Ugx1,200,000 dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both EO and DCO, mitigation measures put in place, eg restoration and greening of the area around the facility.</p> <p>2. Environmental and social risks and mitigation measures for the construction of a 2 bath room shelter at Kiryandongo hospital were put in place, dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO was carried out, ESMP costed Ugx1,200,000 dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both EO and DCO, mitigation measures put in place, eg restoration and greening of the area around the facility.</p> <p>3.Environmental and social risks and mitigation measures for the construction of a 5 stance lined VIP pit latrine at Diima health center III were put in place dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO was carried out, ESMP costed Ugx1,200,000 dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both DEO and DCO, mitigation measures put in place, eg restoration and greening of the area around the facility.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence of letters and/or memos to the PDU by the LG Health department to ascertain submission. However the Infrastructure Procurement requests for the current FY were incorporated in the AWP and Consolidated Procurement Plan of Kiryandongo DLG; The following Projects were visible;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovation of Diika HC II</li> <li>• Construction of 5 Stance latrine Blocks at Diima HC III, Mutunda HC III, and Diika HC III</li> <li>• Construction of a 2-Stance latrine with terrazzo at Kiryandongo Hospital</li> </ul>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0	There was No evidence of submission of Procurement Requisition Forms – LG PP Forms to the PDU by the LG Health department submitted by 1st Quarter of the current FY	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	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	Health infrastructure Projects for the previous FY (2021/2022) were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of Works. For example  • Under <i>Min008/04/CC/KDLG/21-22</i> , the Fencing of Mutunda HC III in Mutunda S/County - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00012; was approved by the Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 7/10/2021  • Under <i>Min005/11/CC/KDLG/21-22</i> , the Renovation of Kigumba HC III in Kigumba S/County - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00065; was approved by the Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 6/4/2022	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0  If there is no project, provide the score	There was evidence of proper establishment of the PITS for the Health construction projects within the last FY as per guidelines. The following examples were cited;  A copy of joint appointment of Niyonzima Emmanuel - DE (Project Manager), Mutyaba Imaam - DHO (Contract Manager), Candia Joseph – Civil Engineer (Buildings), Senior Environment Officer – Businge Zalfa, DCDO – Dabanja Goeffrey, and Senior Labour Officer – Achola Jackline, among others as members of the PIT for the Fencing Works at Mutunda HC III under the LG Health Department. The letter was dated 29th November, 2021.  -	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0  If there is no project, provide the score	The sampled projects included the following, and were Compliant as per approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs  1) Mutunda HC III – Fence, was completed - with the 75x75mm Concrete Poles mounted 2100mm high and a G10 chain link fixed as per specifications of the BoQ.  2) The Renovations at Kigumba HC III were also as per instructions of the LG Engineer; in Painting, Removal of Old Timber Doors to Metallic (Casement Steel Doors and windows), Roof Repairs included removal of old dilapidated Iron Sheets	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO evidence of daily/weekly records maintained by the Clerk of Works seen by the Assessor</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO Monthly site meetings to hold for the health infrastructure projects implemented in the last FY w.r.t upgrade of HCIIIs to HCIIIIs since Kiryadongo DLG did not benefit in that respect</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO evidence Monthly Joint Technical supervisions of the construction of health infrastructure projects (by the Engineers team - including the Environment Officer and CDO among other officers) carried out (w.r.t Critical stages).</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Review of payment vouchers for contracts in the health department revealed</p> <p>That the DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timelines as provided in the examples below:</p> <p>Review of payment vouchers for contracts in the health department revealed that all payments to contractors were certified by the DHO, D/E, CDO and Environment Officer as required. Examples: (i) Payment to a service provider on voucher number 44507835 dated 20/06/2022 for shs 51,299,098 for Kigumba HCIII. The DHO, D/E, CDO and Environment Officer certified works on 20/6/2022.</p> <p>(ii) Payment to a service provider on voucher number 41889896 dated 23/02/2022 for shs 110,047,069 for fencing Mutunda HCIII. The DHO, D/E, CDO and Environment Officer certified works on 23/2/2022.</p> <p>(iii) Payment to a service provider on voucher number 43646551 dated 26/05/2022 for shs 12,152,931, The DHO, D/E, CDO and Environment Officer certified works on 11/05/2022.</p> <p>The DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frame (within two weeks or 10 working days)</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Complete Procurement files for the health infrastructure contracts with Evaluation Reports and Minutes of the Contract Committee, and the very contract documents were seen by the Assessor.</p> <p>Files for the following projects were sampled accordingly;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fencing of Mutunda HC III in Mutunda S/County - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00012; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min008/04/CC/KDLG/21-22 in a meeting held on 7/10/2021 after evaluation. The contract document was signed on 26/11/2021</li> <li>• Renovation of Kigumba HC III in Kigumba S/County - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00065; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min005/11/CC/KDLG/21-22 in a meeting held on 6/4/2022 after evaluation. The contract document was signed on 26/4/2022</li> </ul> <p>The above projects are both on the Contract Register for the FY 21/22, had all evaluation reports on file; and were approved by the Contracts Committee as above</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>There was no evidence that grievances were recorded, investigated, responded or reported, since the guidelines of ministry of gender were not followed of having committees from project site to the district, but instead the LG aligned all the grievances to the district committee.</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 on evidence that the LG disseminated guidelines on health care/medical waste mangement to health facilities.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had put in place a functional system for Medical waste management</p> <p>The district had put in place mechanism to dispose off medical waste in all the 3 health facilities that were visited, for example in Nyakadote HC III, Panyadoli HC IV and Panyadoli hill HC III, all these health centers had functional placenta pits, and incinerators.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no training reports at time of the assessment</p>	0



16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	There was evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY for example during fencing of Mutunda health center III ESMP was costed at a tune of Ugx2,600,000 dated 20/10/2021 and incorporated in the BoQs in section 7, item L, M, N as reviewed from the BoQ document.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	there is evidence that health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<p>Evidence</p> <p>1. the land titles for the following health centers were in place during this assessment, Kiigya health center III (registered 2/10/2020, Vol MA S 86 folio 23), Apodorwa health center II (registered 26/02/2021, Vol MA S 112 folio 6, Diima health center III (registered 6/7/2022, Vol MA S 195 folio 18), Kiroko health center (registered 6/7/2022, Vol MA S 195 folio 18), Mpumwe health centre II (registered 2/10/2020, Vol MA S 87 folio 1) Kigumba health center III (registered 2/10/2020, Vol MA S 86 folio 25) Kitwara health center (registered 6/7/2022, Vol MA S 195 folio 21) on these these health centers they projects for pervious or current FY</p>	
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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.	There is evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs however no monthly reports were available at time of the assessment	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<p>1. Nyakadote health center III, the site is well maintained, PPEs used, there was no evidence on sensitisation of works, however waste was well managed with existing placenta pit, inclinator and dumping pit, the health center lacks a green cover.</p> <p>2. Panyadili H/C IV, the site is well maintained, PPEs used, there was no evidence on sensitisation of works, waste was poorly managed with open burning of un sorted waste, placenta pit, inclinator were available, though health center lacks a green cover.</p> <p>3. Panyadoli Hill H/C III the site is well maintained, PPEs not used by workers on site, there was no evidence on sensitisation of works, however waste was well managed with existing placenta pit, inclinator and dumping pit, the health center lacks a green cover.</p>	

Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that the 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, for example during the fencing of Mutunda health center III project contracted to Ssekago F construction LMT, both the Environment Officer and CDO signed on substantial completion certificate dated 5/May/2022, stamped by contractor and the DE

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>As per the MWE-MIS for the previous FY (2021/2022), the rural water functionality for Kiryandongo District was 88% which falls between 80% and 89% thereby justifying a score one (1)</p>	1
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the MWE -MIS for the previous FY (2021/2022), the % of WSS facilities with functional WSCs in Kiryandongo DLG, as seen under the Management Column was 88% that falls between 80% to 89%, thereby justifying a score one (1).</p>	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>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Above 80% score 2</li> <li>b. 60 -80%: 1</li> <li>c. Below 60: 0</li> </ul> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>Pending - LLG Assessment is pending until Performance Improvement reports are available in January 2023.</p>	0

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

• According to the Kiryandongo DLG 4th Quarter report for FY 2021/2022 submitted by CAO on 4th /07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 22nd /08/2022; the Safe Water Coverage (SWC) for Kiryandongo DLG was 74%. The Sub-Counties (S/Cs) with SWC below the district average and were therefore to be targeted included: (i) Diima S/C with SWC of 42%; (ii) Kiryandongo S/C with SWC of 67% and (iii) Mutunda S/C with SWC of 54%.

• As per the document titled Annual work plan for FY 2021/2022 (REF:CR/158/1) submitted by CAO on 29th/07/2021 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 2nd/08/2021 and in reference to my analysis of the annual progress reports for FY 2021/2022, Kiryandongo district water department implemented the following budgeted water projects in the targeted sub counties.

i) Project 1: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00016: Drilling of eleven (11) Deep boreholes: Mutunda, Kiryandongo, Kigumba and Masindi Port S/Counties at a cost of UGX 355,091,179; which is a target of 7 out of 11, equivalent to 63.6%

(ii) Project 2: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00015: Rehabilitation of five (05) boreholes in Mutunda, Kiryandongo, Kigumba and Masindi Port S/Counties at a cost of UGX 53,907,941; which is a target of 3 out of 5, equivalent to 60%

(iii) Project 3: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00069: Drilling a production well in Nyawino RGC, Kiryandongo S/C :

Contractor: KLR-Uganda Ltd. at a cost of UGX 43,490,775; which is a target of 1 out of 1, equivalent to 100%

Therefore, the number of projects implemented in target S/Cs is 11 out of 17 budgeted projects in the Previous FY 2021/2022, equivalent to 64.7%, which is below 80%, thereby justifying a score of zero (0).

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 review of Kiryandongo DLG Annual Work Plan for FY 2021/2022 (REF:CR/158/1) submitted by CAO on 29th/07/2021 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 2nd/08/2021 and basing on sample of three (3) WSS contracts that were implemented in Kiryandongo DLG, the following percentage variation of the engineering estimates were revealed:

(i) Project 1: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00016: Drilling of eleven (11) Deep boreholes: Mutunda, Kiryandongo, Kigumba and Masindi Port S/Counties:

- Contractor: KLR-Uganda Ltd.;
- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 355,432,000 (A);
- Contracted Sum of UGX 294,392,595 (B);
- Percentage variation=  $[(A-B)/A]*100 = [(355,432,000 - 294,392,595)/355,432,000]*100 = 17.2\%$

(ii) Project 2: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00015: Rehabilitation of five (05) boreholes in Mutunda, Kiryandongo, Kigumba and Masindi Port S/Counties:

- Contractor: KLR-Uganda Ltd.;
- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 57,610,000 (A);
- Contracted Sum of UGX 56,745,200 (B);
- Percentage variation=  $[(A-B)/A]*100 = [(57,610,000 - 56,745,200)/57,610,000]*100 = 1.5\%$ ;

(iii) Project 3: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00069: Drilling a production well in Nyawino RGC, Kiryandongo S/C :

- Contractor: KLR-Uganda Ltd.;
- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 40,000,000 (A);
- Contracted Sum of UGX 38,674,500 (B);
- Percentage variation=  $[(A-B)/A]*100 = [(40,000,000 - 38,674,500)/40,000,000]*100 = 3.3\%$

• Therefore percentage variations in the contract price compared to the Engineer's estimate is equivalent to: Project 1 = 17.2%; Project 2 = 1.5%; and Project 3 = 3.3%

• Hence the variations in the contract price and engineer's estimates of the three (3) sampled WSS infrastructure investment contracts for FY 2021/2022 are all within +/-20%, thereby justifying a score of two (2)

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

o If 100% projects completed: score 2

o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1

o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

According to the Kiryandongo DLG Annual work plan for FY 2021/2022 (REF:CR/158/1) signed and submitted by Kiryandongo CAO on 29th/07/2021 to the Permanent Secretary MWE and received by MWE Central Registry and approved by the MWE Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 2nd/08/2021, and the Annual Budget performance report (4th Quarter for FY 2021/2022) (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by the CAO of Kiryandongo District on 04th/07/2022 to the Permanent Secretary MWE and received by the RWSSD on 22nd/08/2022, all the planned projects were completed by the end of the FY 2021/2022. The following were the planned WSS infrastructure projects and level of achievement by the end of the FY 2021/2022:

i) Project 1: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00016: Drilling of eleven (11) Deep boreholes: Mutunda, Kiryandongo, Kigumba and Masindi Port S/Counties: Achieved 100% at a cost of UGX 355,091,179

(ii) Project 2: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00015: Rehabilitation of five (05) boreholes in Mutunda, Kiryandongo, Kigumba and Masindi Port S/Counties: Achieved 100% at a cost of UGX 53,907,941

(iii) Project 3: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00069: Drilling a production well in Nyawino RGC, Kiryandongo S/C :

Contractor: KLR-Uganda Ltd.; Achieved 100% at a cost of UGX 43,490,775

Therefore, 100% projects completed thereby justifying a score of two (2)

New\_Achievement of Standards:

The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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

o If there is an increase: score 2

o If no increase: score 0.

• From Ministry of Water and Environment Management Information System (MWE-MIS) assessment report for the FY 2021/2022, Kiryandongo DLG had 621 functional and 86 non-functional rural water sources, that was equivalent to a functionality of  $[621/(621+86)]*100 = 87.8\%$  approximated to 88%.

• Also, from MWE-MIS assessment report for the FY 2020/2021, Kiryandongo DLG had 568 functional and 89 non-functional rural water sources, that was equivalent to a functionality of  $[568/(568+89)]*100 = 86.4\%$  approximated to 86%.

• The variation in Kiryandongo DLG rural water functionality from 86.4% to 87.8% represents an increase of 1.4% in the water supply facilities that are functional.

• There is an increase and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).

New\_Achievement of Standards:

The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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

o If increase is more than 1% score 2

o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1

o If there is no increase : score 0.

• From Ministry of Water and Environment Management Information System (MWE-MIS) District Software Report (rural water Management) for FY/2021/2022, Kiryandongo DLG had 456 functional WSCs out of the 523 established WSCs equivalent to Management of  $[456/523]*100 = 87.2\%$  approximated to 87%.

• Also, MWE-MIS District Software Report (rural water Management) for FY/2020/2021, Kiryandongo DLG had 407 functional WSCs out of the 468 established WSCs equivalent to Management of  $[407/468]*100 = 86.97\%$  approximated to 87%.

• The variation in Kiryandongo DLG rural water functionality from 86.97% to 87.2% represents an increase of 0.23% in the water supply facilities with functional water and sanitation committees.

• There is an increase that is between 0-1%, and therefore, justifying a score of one (1).

### 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

As per review of Kiryandongo DLG 4th Quarter report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by CAO on 4th /07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 22nd /08/2022 and in reference to my analysis of the 4th Quarter DWO progress report (REF: WAT/213/11) for FY 2021/2022 written by DWO on 18th/10/2022, Kiryandongo district water department implemented (constructed/ rehabilitated) 17 WSS facilities were in FY 2021/2022 under DWSCG funding, GOU. I sampled and visited five (5) WSS facilities in three (3) S/Counties and I observed/noted the following:

(i) Drilling of Atugo deep borehole (DWD 78837) in Tugo village, Kyankende S/C: completed in April 2022 and commissioned on 8th July 2022 by district C/Person. I found the borehole functional and properly maintained, well fenced with soak pit, pathway for easy access and a very clean environment (planted paspalum grass); we found three (3) WSC members including the caretaker-WSC members confirmed that since June 2022, each of the approximately 60 households pays 1,000 UGX/ month as water user fees collection; WSC members confirmed that they were trained on general cleanliness around the borehole, avoid over pumping, playing/gossiping. The caretaker mentioned only one minor challenge-noise from the bearing of the borehole. -upon testing the minimum well yield, on average a 20-litre jerry can was filled in 110 seconds approximated to  $[(20/110)*3600] = 655$  litres per hour greater than 600 litres per hour reported in the design and thus good well yield. The borehole was well numbered and engraved.

Overall, the deep borehole was functioning well as reported by Kiryandongo DWO

(ii) Rehabilitation of Sambya deep borehole (No Source ID) in Sambya village, Kiryandongo S/C: completed in Jan 2022. I found the borehole was well fenced with soak pit, pathway for easy access with some planted

trees; we found no WSC members. The borehole was well engraved. However, it was not functional. Overall, the deep borehole was not functioning and seemed abandoned by the community.

(iii) Drilling of Alero A deep borehole (DWD 78841) in Alero village, Mutunda S/C: completed in April 2022 and commissioned on 8th July 2022 by district C/Person. I found the borehole functional and well fenced with soak pit and pathway for easy access. However, the drainage channel was dirty an inlet to soak pit blocked. I found no WSC member. I tested the minimum well yield, and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in 95 seconds approximated to  $[(20/95)*3600] = 758$  litres per hour greater than 600 litres per hour reported in the design and thus good well yield. The borehole was well numbered and engraved. Overall, the deep borehole was functioning well as designed and reported by DWO.

(iv) Drilling a production well (DWD 78949) in Nyawino RGC, Kiryandongo S/C completed in June 2022 (no information about commissioning). I found the production well was functional and well fenced with soak pit. However, there was no pathway for easy access and environment was bushy; there is no WSC established; Since the production well was still installed with a hand pump, I could not test for the minimum well yield of 10 m<sup>3</sup>/ hr as reported in the technical specifications in the design report or for 13.3 m<sup>3</sup>/ hr reported in the 4th Quarter Report for DWSCG FY 2021/2022. Overall, the production well was (manually) functioning as reported by DWO.

(v) Rehabilitation of Mutunda P/School deep borehole (DWD 14585) in Mutunda A village, Mutunda S/C: completed in Jan 2022. I found the borehole with a soak pit, pathway for easy access. We found the Supervisor of the WSC, however no member was present. The Supervisor confirmed that the WSC had become non-functional since Oct 2022, due to accountability related matters. The borehole was well engraved. However, The borehole fencing was completely dismantled (reportedly for firewood). Also, the drainage channel was dirty an inlet to soak pit blocked. I tested the minimum well yield, and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in 95 seconds approximated to  $[(20/95)*3600] = 758$  litres per hour greater than 600 litres per hour reported in the design and thus good well yield. The borehole was well numbered and engraved. Overall, the deep borehole was functioning well as reported by DWO.

One (1) of the two (2) sampled rehabilitated borehole was non-functional at the time of visit. Therefore, on average four (4) out of five (5) WSS facilities I visited/ observed were constructed/ rehabilitated are generally functioning well, and the DWO fairly reported on them in the Annual Performance and Progress Reports of 4th Quarter in the FY 2021/2022 and therefore, justifying a score of three (3)



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

As per quarterly WSS reports, Kiryandongo district 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

There is evidence that Kiryandongo district LG Water Office collects and compiles information on sub-county water supply and sanitation reported in the minutes of the coordination committee meetings held each quarter incorporated in the following Quarterly reports:

i. 1st Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 28th/10/2021 to MWE Permanent Secretary (PS), received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 18th/11/2021

ii. 2nd Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 23rd/02/2022 to MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 4th/03/2022

iii. 3rd Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 26th/04/2022 to MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 28th/04/2022

iv. 4th Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 4th/07/2022 to the MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 22nd/08/2022.

The other information details on functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water coverage, and community involvement especially in management through WSCs are also reported in the summary list attached to especially the 4th Quarter report and Form 1 for data collection for new point water sources/facilities.

Examples of information in 4th Quarter included establishment of four (4) newly constructed water points (Boreholes) in 2021 by NGO (Salvation Army) submitted in 3rd quarter FY 2021/2022 and were updated in the 4th quarter FY 2021/2022 as presented in Water Source database update forms:

i. DWD 66646 Kitukuza Borehole in Kitukuza Village, Waibango Parish in Masindi Port S/C;

ii. DWD 66649 Opok I borehole in Opok I village, Kichwabugingo Parish in Kiryandongo S/C

iii. DWD 66648 Kawiti in Kawiti village, Kakwokwo Parish in Mutunda S/C

iv. DWD 66647 Kinyara I in Kinyara I village, Kiigya Parish in Kigumba S/C

and therefore, justifying a score of two (2)

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

There was evidence that Kiryandongo DLG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) as evidenced in all the Quarterly Reports, the newly constructed facilities are reported and their details are filled in Form 1 as a data collection form for point water sources for new facilities, detailing location of the new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.. These are compiled together sent to MWE for updating and the DWO downloads this information as Form 4 compilations of the updated MWE database forming the DWO MIS.

There were also the following data update reports for District Water and Sanitation Conditional Development Grant (DWSCDG) for FY 2021/2022, submitted to MWE as listed below:

- Submission of the 1st Quarter data update report for DWSCDG for FY 2021/2022 by CAO on 28th/10/2021 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 18th/11/2021;
- Submission of the 2nd Quarter data update report for DWSCDG for FY 2021/2022 by CAO on 23rd/02/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 4th/03/2022;
- Submission of the 3rd Quarter data update report for DWSCDG for FY 2021/2022 by CAO on 26th/04/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 28th/04/2022;
- Submission of the 4th Quarter data update report for DWSCDG for FY 2021/2022 by CAO on 27th/07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 22nd/08/2022;
- The information collected in the Form 1 include: the type of source; water source location; general information covering month/year of construction, source name, source number, source of funding, current ownership, and estimated number of users; operation and maintenance covering type of management, establishment of WSCs and their training, WSCs collecting user fees, WSCs undertaking regular or minor repairs, WSCs holding regular meetings, and environment/sanitation around the source; Operation status (Functionality); Other information as required by the DWO; contacts of village guide respondent and Data verification. There was a compilation for form 1s and form 4s at the LG Water Office and these are used by the DWO for planning purposes (plan for villages/ S/Counties based on their access/ functionality of water sources).
- and therefore, justifying a score of three (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>Pending: - awaits performance of LLGs IVA. LLG Assessment is pending until Performance Improvement reports are available in January 2023.</p>	0
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence adduced to show that the District Water Officer budgeted for the critical staff in the District Water Office.</p>	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence adduced to show that the District Natural Resources Officer budgeted for critical staff in the Natural Resources Department.</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>A review of Personal files, Performance Plans and Appraisal Reports for staff in the District Water Office showed that the District Water Officer appraised the staff in the previous FY. Some of the appraisal reports reviewed indicate that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Muhumuza Samuel Civil Engineer (Water) was appraised on 15/07/2022</li> <li>2. Mr. Ojara John Bosco Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization was appraised on 01/07/2022</li> <li>3. Mr. Mwambu Joel Environment Officer was appointed on 29/03/2022 and was not due for appraisal.</li> </ol>	3

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 Capacity needs assessment report provided by Kiryandongo DWO and no Training plans and Training reports were availed. Therefore, the DWO never submitted staff capacity needs to the PHRO for consolidation into the District Training database and no staff was trained.

- and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0)

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

- Safe Water Coverage (SWC) for Kiryandongo District for the previous FY (2021/2022), as obtained from the DWO, and in reference to my analysis of of Kiryandongo DLG 4th Quarter report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by CAO on 4th /07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 22nd /08/2022 was 74%. The Sub-Counties (S/Cs) with SWC below the district average, that are not covered by NWSC, and were therefore to be targeted included: (i) Diima S/C with SWC of 42%; (ii) Kiryandongo S/C with SWC of 67% and (iii) Mutunda S/C with SWC of 54%.

- These were to be the target S/Cs for budget allocations in the FY 2022/23.

- As per the document titled Annual work plan for FY 2022/2023 (REF: CR/158/1) submitted by CAO on 17th /07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 22nd/08/2022, the following were the budget allocations under the District Rural Water Supply-Development Fund part of the DWSCG:

(i) Drilling fifteen (15) Deep Borehole in Mutunda S/C, Diima S/C, Kyankende S/c, Masindi Port S/C, Kichabugingo S/C, Kiryandongo S/C, Kigumba S/C and Karuma T/C at a cost of UGX 34,439,000 @ and thus a total of UGX 516,585,000 of which eight (8) projects are planned to be implemented in target S/Counties.

(ii) Drilling production well in Masindi Port S/C at a cost of UGX 47,000,000, of which none is to the Target S/C.

- The Budget for FY 2022/23, therefore reflects a total of UGX 563,585,000 (A ) allocated to water sources developmental projects out of which UGX 275,512,000 (B) is allocated to target S/Cs.

- Therefore % of the budget allocation for FY 2022/2023 that is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage is  $(B/A) \times 100 = \text{UGX } 275,512,000 / \text{UGX } 563,585,000 \times 100 = 48.9\%$  approximated to 49%.

- This below 60 % and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0)

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 Kiryandongo DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the FY 2022/23 as seen from the following:

(i) Letters written on 16th/09/2022 by the District Water Officer (DWO) to the Senior Assistant Chief Administrative officer (SACAOs) of Mutunda S/C, Diima S/C, Kyankende S/c, Kichabugingo S/C, Kiryandongo S/C, Masindi Port S/C, Kigumba S/C and Town Clerk-Karuma T/C on the subject of "Boreholes Allocations for FY 2022/23":

Copies of Boreholes Allocations for FY 2022/23 were given to RDC, LCV and CAO Kiryandongo as well as LCIII Chairpersons- Mutunda S/C, Diima S/C, Kyankende S/c, Kichabugingo S/C, Kiryandongo S/C, Masindi Port S/C and Kigumba S/C.

(ii) The district quarterly Software reports within the Quarterly progress reports listed below:

a. 1st Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 28th/10/2021 to MWE Permanent Secretary (PS), received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 18th/11/2021

b. 2nd Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 23rd/02/2022 to MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 4th /03/2022

c. 3rd Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 26th/04/2022 to MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 28th/04/2022

d. 4th Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 4th/07/2022 to the MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 22nd/08/2022.

Other reports:

- A "List of Planned projects (Water Sources) FY 2022/23": as displayed on Kiryandongo DLG notice board by the DWO and on notice boards of benefiting S/Counties

- Also, there was minutes of water and sanitation advocacy meeting (though conducted at district level) held on 14th/ 04/ 2022 at Kiryandongo Youth Center written by SCDO but not yet confirmed by CAO

- and therefore, justifying a score of three (3)

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

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

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

- There was some evidence that Kiryandongo District Water Office monitored each of the WSS facilities implemented in FY 2021/2022 at least quarterly.

- Basing on my analysis of the DWO monitoring reports for FY 2021/2022, monitoring of WSS projects was done in three (3) out of the four (4) quarters since activities on project sites for most Water development projects for FY 2021/2022 started in the 2nd Quarter.

- The List of sources for Rural Water Supply and sanitation facilities for Kiryandongo district constructed in FY 2021/2022 included the following:

- Project 1: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00016: Drilling of eleven (11) Deep boreholes: Mutunda, Kiryandongo, Kigumba and Masindi Port S/Counties at a cost of UGX 355,091,179. All boreholes were sufficiently monitored/supervised, 100%.

- Project 2: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00015: Rehabilitation of five (05) boreholes in Mutunda, Kiryandongo, Kigumba and Masindi Port S/Counties at a cost of UGX 53,907,941. All boreholes were monitored /supervised and 100% achieved.

- Project 3: Kiry592/WRKS/21-22/00069: Drilling a production well in Nyawino RGC, Kiryandongo S/C at a cost of UGX 43,490,775; There was no monitoring and supervision report and thus 0% achieved.

- According to the Kiryandongo district Water Department 4th Quarter Implementation progress monitoring report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: WAT/213/11) for April-June 2022 by District Water Officer (DWO)) to the CAO, dated 18th/07/2022, only 16 out of 17 WSS facilities implemented in FY 2021/2022 were monitored at least quarterly.

- According to the Monitoring and Commissioning report of water projects delivered in FY 2021/2022 (REF: WAT/210/8) by District Water Officer (DWO) to the CAO, dated 18th/07/2022, all the eleven (11) newly constructed deep boreholes and two (2) out of five (5) rehabilitated deep boreholes were monitored and commissioned equivalent to 13 water facilities monitored and commissioned.

- However, there were no monitoring plans for each of the newly constructed 17 water facilities in Kiryandongo DLG for FY 2021/2022. Besides, out of the 803 water facilities (A) in Kiryandongo DLG by June 2022, Kiryandongo District Water Department planned for and monitored 400 water facilities (B) at least quarterly

- Overall, from my analysis of all the project implementation monitoring reports for FY 2021/2022, I conclude that the estimated percentage of water facilities monitored at least quarterly was  $(B/A)*100 = (400/803)*100 = 49.8\%$  equivalent to 50% that lies far below 80% and thereby, justifying a score of justifying a score of zero (0).

Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided

b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues

There is evidence that Kiryandongo DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed:

follow up support.

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2

- Minutes of the 1st Quarter Kiryandongo DLG District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 15th/09/2021 at the District Headquarters (Water boardroom), attended by 20 participants: Especially under agenda item 5 -"Presentation from Development Partners/NWSC". However, minutes were not signed by 'Chairman'

- Minutes for the Second Quarter Kiryandongo DLG District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 20th/12/2021 at the District Headquarters (Water Boardroom), attended by 20 participants: Especially under agenda item 6-"Presentations and reports" and agenda item 7-"Discussions and way forward". However, minutes were not signed by Secretary and Chairman

- Minutes of the 3rd Quarter Kiryandongo DLG District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 24th/05/2022 at the District Headquarters, attended by 22 participants: Especially under agenda item 6 on "Presentation of reports from the DWO and ADWO Sanitation and NWSC.

- Minutes of the 4th Quarter Kiryandongo DLG District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 30th/06/2022 at Bweyale Town Council Hall, attended by 44 participants: Especially under agenda item 6 on "Presentation from the DWO and DPs/NWSC

Key Issue identified and discussed included but not limited to the following:

(i) NWSC representative admitted that a number of schools were applying for water connection: NWSC Managers invited applications from schools near main pipelines (within NWSC networks) for connections

(ii) Many new Rural Growth Centers (RGC) were developing without latrines: ADWO-Sanitation, ADHO-EH, Has,VHTs, etc: follow up/ home visits of homes was ongoing in 40 villages including RGCs

(iii) NWSC Kigumba and Bweyale should identify and register people who need (needed) water and conduct extension where necessary.

(iv) Parish Chiefs were requested to enforce latrine construction at household to curb open defecation and encroachment on school latrine facilities by villagers

(v) Bweyale Town Clerk and NWSC were to produce an inventory of shadoof water structures and stop Rampart shadoof water structures in Bweyale Town Council

(vi) NWSC was to improve the quality and reliability of service among the public

(vii) The District Water Officer was tasked to compile and present a report on Sanitation in primary and secondary government aided and private schools

(viii) Town Clerks were tasked to formulate water boards in each Town Council to handle water issues

(ix) Plan Approval Committee were asked to ensure before final approval of building plans that water pipelines are indicated in the plans

and therefore, justifying a score of two (2)

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>There is evidence that Kiryandongo district water office publicizes budget allocations for the current FY 2022/23 in a A "List of Planned projects (Water Sources) FY 2022/23": as displayed on Kiryandongo DLG notice board on 16th/09/2022 by the DWO and on notice boards of benefiting S/Counties. The following was displayed:</p> <p>(i) Drilling fifteen (15) Deep Borehole in Mutunda S/C, Diima S/C, Kyankende S/c, Masindi Port S/C, Kichabugingo S/C, Kiryandongo S/C, Kigumba S/C and Karuma T/C at a cost of UGX 34,439,000 @ and thus a total cost of UGX 516,585,000</p> <p>(ii) Drilling production well in Masindi Port S/C at a cost of UGX 47,000,000.</p> <p>• The projects were listed in a displayed Table with column entries of Project, Location/ Village, Parish, S/C, Construction Cost, Investment Service Cost, Total and Source of Fund. The distribution per S/C was as follows:</p> <p>Karuma T/C - one (1) Deep Borehole (DBh);</p> <p>Mutunda S/C - five (5) Deep Boreholes (DBh);</p> <p>Diima S/C - one (1) Deep Boreholes (DBh);</p> <p>Kyankende S/C - two (2) Deep Boreholes (DBh);</p> <p>Kigumba S/C - one (1) Deep Boreholes (DBh);</p> <p>Kiryandongo S/C - two (2) Deep Boreholes (DBh);</p> <p>Masindi Port S/C - three (3) Deep Boreholes (DBh);</p> <p>Kichwabugingo S/C - one (1) Deep Boreholes (DBh);</p> <p>and therefore, justifying a score of two (2)</p>	2
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"><li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li><li>• If not score 0</li></ul>	<p>The Total Non-Wage Recurrent budget for the previous FY 2021/2022 was UGX 92,219,463 (A) while the amount spend on Mobilization was UGX 38,502,936 (24,022,936 +14,480,000) (B).</p> <p>Percentage of NWR rural water and sanitation budget allocated mobilization = <math>(B/A) \times 100 = (38,502,936 / 92,219,463) \times 100 = 41.8\%</math></p> <p>This percentage is greater than the minimum of 40% as per sector guidelines and therefore, justifying a score of three (3).</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&amp;M</p>	<p>From the District software report, the DWO in liaison with the CDO established and trained WSCs for the new facilities constructed in FY 2021/2022 on their roles and responsibilities on O&amp;M for the facilities, and on hygiene as indicated in the Quarterly Software</p>	3



The Annual (4th quarter) Software report for Kiryandongo for FY 2021/2022, dated 4th/06/2022, under post support to communities showed 4 WSCs/WUCs for old water sources that were followed up by the Extension staff, in terms of S/C, Parish, Village, Water source Functional, WUC/WSC Functional and at least one woman in key position. Similar information is seen in 3rd quarter software report, dated 12th/04/2022

There was a table in this software report for WSCs that were trained for 15 out of 16 water sources constructed/rehabilitated in FY 2021/2022, listed by S/C, Parish, Village, Water point visited, Water source Functional, WUC Functional, WUC composition by Gender (Female or Male) and at least a woman in key position.

Kiryandongo District Water Department availed the following WSC training reports.

i. Report titled 'Training of Water Source Committee submitted by Health Assistant Kyankende/ Kichwabugingo sub-counties to Kiryandongo DWO on 16th/05/2022: trained WSCs for four (4) water sources (Kooki Borehole, Nyamuntende borehole, Kamusenene borehole, Tugo Borehole) from 11th-14th May 2022

ii. Report not titled about training of WSC members of Sambya C.O.G. Borehole submitted by Health Assistant Kyankende S/C to Kiryandongo DWO on 17th/02/2022

iii. Report titled 'Report on Training of Water and Sanitation Committee in Three (3) Water Points in Mutunda Sub-County' submitted by Health Assistant Mutunda S/C to Kiryandongo DWO on 17th/05/2022: trained WSCs for three (3) water sources (Kasanja B Borehole, Alero A borehole, Kisura East B Borehole) from 13th-16th May 2022.

iv. Report titled 'Report on Training of Water User Committees' submitted by Community Development Officer Kigumba S/C to Senior Community Development Officer, Kiryandongo District Water Department on 19th/05/2022: trained WSCs for two (2) water sources (Jeeja1 and Nyakibete I) from 1th-18th May 2022.

v. Also, there were follow-up on WSC forms (Post construction: Monitoring of water sources-Operation and Maintenance) stamped by respective LCI C/Persons on functionality of four (4) water points in Nyamahasa S/C conducted by a team of CDOs, Parish chiefs and Health Assistants.

For the five (5) WSS facilities sampled in three (3) S/Counties namely

i. Drilling of Atugo deep borehole (DWD 78837) in Tugo village, Kyankende S/C: The WSC was established and trained. three (3) WSC members were present at the time of the field visit and recalled that they were trained on general cleanliness around the borehole, proper operation and maintenance of borehole by avoiding over pumping, playing/ gossiping around borehole.

ii. Rehabilitation of Sambya deep borehole in Sambya

village, Kiryandongo S/C: The WSC was established and trained but none of the members was present at the time of the visit and no recall of content was checked.

iii. Drilling of Alero A deep borehole (DWD 78841) in Alero village, Mutunda S/C: The WSC was established and trained but none of the members was present at the time of the visit and no recall of content was checked.

iv. Drilling a production well (DWD 78949) in Nyawino RGC, Kiryandongo S/C: The WSC was not yet established and trained but none of the members was present at the time of the visit and no recall of content was checked.

v. Rehabilitation of Mutunda P/School deep borehole (DWD 14585) in Mutunda A village, Mutunda S/C: The WSC was established but non-functional since Oct 2022. The Supervisor of the WSC was present , however no member was present at the time of the field visit and no recall of content was checked.

It can therefore be concluded that Kiryandongo District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer established (all 16) and trained (10 out of 16) WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities, constructed in FY 2021/2022, and therefore, justifying a score of three (3).

## **Investment Management**

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>Upon reviewing the Kiryandongo district assets register for WSS facilities, I found out/ noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was two (2) categories of Asset Register: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Category I: There was a Kiryandongo DLG Asset Register titled “Kiryandongo District-Water Assets” listed by Asset Number, Subcounty, Parish, Village, UR Setting, Type, YoC, Source Name, Source Number, F, Price (‘000”), Source of Fund and Source of Ownership. The facilities year of construction ranged between 1952 to 2021.</li> <li>ii. Category II: Also, Kiryandongo District Water Department provided another asset register titled “Asset Upload Sheet: Asset Category: Water Plants, Pipelines and Sewers’ listed by No., Description, Asset Category Class, Asset Category Sub Class, Type, Category, Length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The eleven (11) deep boreholes and one (1) production well drilled in FY 2021/2022 were updated in Category II. However, for category II Assets register, WSS facilities were updated by description but details of LLG (columns of S/C, Parish, Village, etc.)were missing</li> </ul> <p>The facilities were not listed per financial years thus it was hard to establish for instance the list and number of Kiryandongo district WSS facilities for the last 10 financial years.</p> <p>The Asset Register was available at Kiryandongo District Water Department. However, it was not up-to-date, and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0).</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>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There were two categories of water projects namely: (i) Deep Borehole Drilling made up of 7 sites and construction of a production well at Kaduku RGC in Kaduku Parish and Masindi Port subcounty.</p> <p>Desk appraisal report dated 12th January, 2022 was in place.</p> <p>The desk field report dated 16th March, 2022 was equally in place.</p> <p>All projects were captured in the approved Budget Estimates, DDP III Page 131 as well as the Annual Workplan page 76.</p>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is</p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per the document titled Annual work plan for FY 2022/2023 (REF: CR/158/1) submitted by CAO on 17th</li> </ul>	2

conducted effectively completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2  
*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

/07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 22nd/08/2022, the following were the budget allocations under the District Rural Water Supply-Development Fund part of the DWSCG:

(i) Drilling fifteen (15) Deep Borehole in Mutunda S/C, Diima S/C, Kyankende S/c, Masindi Port S/C, Kichabugingo S/C, Kiryandongo S/C, Kigumba S/C and Karuma T/C at a cost of UGX 34,439,000 @ and thus a total of UGX 516,585,000 of which eight (8) projects are planned to be implemented in target S/Countries.

(ii) Drilling production well in Masindi Port S/C at a cost of UGX 47,000,000, of which none is to the Target S/C.

• There is evidence that the beneficiary communities applied for WSS investments for the current FY 2022/23 as seen from the following applications/ requests sampled:

i. Request for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LC1 of Gwara II Cell in Southern Ward, Krauma T/C, dated 26th/10/2021

ii. Request for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LC1 of Popara East village, Kakwokwo parish, Mutunda S/C dated 17th/03/2021

iii. Request for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCIII of Mutunda S/C dated 17th/08/2021

iv. Request for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kimogororo A village, Kakwokwo Parish, Mutunda S/C dated 10th/06/2021

v. Application for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kihura village, Diika Parish, Kyankende S/C dated 13th/06/2022

vi. Application for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Pii Akeyo B village, Diima Parish, Diima S/C dated 23th/04/2022

vii. Application for a borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kabonyi village, Kibeka Parish, Kiryandongo S/C dated 10th /01/2022

viii. Requisition for a borehole waterpoint from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Panyadoli B village, Panyadoli Parish, Mutunda S/C dated 4th /04/2022

ix. Request for a Borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Nyakakora Area, Kiryandongo S/C dated 1st/11/2017

x. Application for a water source in Karagalya I village Church of Uganda (C.O.U) from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Karagalya I village, Kyankende Parish, Kyankende S/C dated 23th/06/2021

xi. Application for a Borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kiruli village, Buhomoozi Parish, Kigumba S/C dated 15th/01/2022

xii. Application for a Borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kiruli village, Buhomoozi Parish, Kigumba S/C dated 10th/05//2021

xiii. Application for a Borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kimogoro B village, Kimogoro Parish, Mutunda S/C dated 15th /02/2021

xiv. Request for a Borehole to be drilled in our village from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Myeeba village, Wakisanyi Parish, Masindi Port S/C dated 12th/12/2021

xv. Application for a Borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kitaleba village, Kaduku Parish, Masindi Port S/C dated 21st/01/2022

xvi. Requisition for a village Borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Hanga Mak-kwsi, village, Chopelwor Parish, Kichwabugingo S/C dated 5th /04/2022.

Therefore, all 16 beneficiary communities applied for the 16 budgeted WSS investments for current FY 2022/23 and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Desk appraisal report dated 12th January, 2022 was in place.  The field appraisal report dated 16th March, 2022 was equally in place.  All projects were captured in the approved Budget Estimates, DDP III as well as the AWP. The appraisal team was composed of the District Planner; Balikagira Julius, Dababja Geoffrey the DCSO, Ms. Businge Zalfa the Environment Officer, Muhumuza Samuel the DWO and Acting District Engineer, Nyonzima Emmanuel.	2
11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	There was evidence that the WSS contract projects contained clauses on environmental and social protection  1. Screening was done for borehole drilling at Hangamakwer village for FY 2022/2023, signed by both DEO and DCO and dated on 24/10/2022, ESMP prepared, impacts identified with its corresponding mitigation measures and E&S protection clauses were well stipulated.  2. Screening was done for borehole drilling at Gwara II cell for FY 2022/2023, signed by both DEO and DCO and dated 24/10/2022, ESMP prepared, impacts identified with its corresponding mitigation measures and E&S protection clauses were well stipulated.  Only two samples projects were available at the time of this assessment	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>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the Approved Budget Estimates, the following water infrastructure investment projects among others were incorporated in the Procurement Plans for the current FY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling and Installation of 15 Deep Boreholes; Budgeted for UGX 424,800,000/=.</li> <li>2. Siting and Drilling Supervision of 15 Deep Boreholes; Estimated at UGX 69,150,000/=,•</li> </ol>	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>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 Projects for the Previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of Works. These Included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rehabilitation of 5 Boreholes within Kiryandongo District - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00015; approved by the Contracts Committee under <b>Min006/05/CC/KDLG/21-22</b> in a meeting held on 8/10/2021</li> <li>2) Drilling and Installation of 11 Deep Boreholes within Kiryandongo District - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00016; approved by the Contracts Committee under <b>Min007/05/CC/KDLG/21-22</b> in a meeting held on 8/10/2021</li> <li>3) Drilling of Production Well at Nyawino RGC - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00069; approved by the Contracts Committee under <b>Min004/12/CC/KDLG/21-22</b>, in a meeting held on 19/4/2022</li> </ol>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence of proper establishment of the PITS for the Water Sector projects within the last FY (2021/2022) as per guidelines</p> <p>A Copy of joint appointment of the DE - Niyonzima Emmanuel, DWO as Contract Manager (Muhumuza Samuel), Senior Environment Officer – Businge Zalfa, DCDO – Dabanja Goeffrey, Senior Labour Officer – Achola Jackline, among others as members of the PIT for Water and Sanitation projects of FY 2021/2022. The letter was dated 29th November, 2021.</p> <p>The projects included, among others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drilling and Installation of 11 Deep Boreholes within Kiryandongo District,</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of 5 Boreholes within Kiryandongo District</li> <li>- Drilling of Production Well at Nyawino RGC</li> </ul>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the</p>	<p>There was evidence that the five (5) water facilities I sampled and visited in three (3) S/Counties and presented below were constructed as per the standard Technical Designs provided by the DWO in the BOQs</p>	2

managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2

and Technical drawings:

(i) Drilling of Atugo deep borehole in Tugo village, Kyankende S/C

- The borehole was installed and fitted with hand pump cast on reinforced concrete aprons as reported in 4th Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 4th/07/2022 to the MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 22nd/08/2022.

- It was functioning well and properly maintained, well fenced (wooden) and constructed with soak pit,

- It was constructed on area over 10m x 10m thus surrounded by clear pathway for easy access.

- There was paspalum planted around the area

- I tested the minimum well yield by recording time taken to fill a 20 litre jerrycan. This was repeated three times and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in 110 seconds approximated to  $[(20/110)*3600] = 655$  liters per hour that is greater than 600 litres per hour reported in the terms of reference-summary in document titled "Kiryandongo DLG: Drilling of Deep Boreholes for provision of Water under DWSCG Funding, GOU" ", Bills of Quantities provided by Kiryandongo DWO and thus good well yield.

- The borehole was well numbered (Source ID is DWD 78837) and engraved.

- The facility was installed according to the Technical Standards, BOQs and drawings provided by the DWO.

(ii) Rehabilitation of Sambya deep borehole in Sambya village, Kiryandongo S/C

- The borehole had 13 Pipes and 14 new pipes were needed for rehabilitation

- The borehole was well fenced (wooden) with soak pit

- There was a pathway for easy access with a few tree planted around but no paspalum

- The borehole was well engraved but not numbered .

- Overall, the borehole was rehabilitated according to the specifications in the BOQs reported in document titled "Kiryandongo DLG: Borehole Rehabilitation under DWSCG Funding, GOU", Bills of Quantities provided by Kiryandongo DWO

- However, the borehole was not functioning and seemed abandoned by the community.

(iii) Drilling of Alero A deep borehole in Alero village, Mutunda S/C:

- The borehole was installed and fitted with hand pump cast on reinforced concrete aprons as reported in 4th Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 4th/07/2022 to the MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 22nd/08/2022.

- It was functioning well and properly maintained, well fenced (wooden) and constructed with soak pit,

- It was constructed on area over 10m x 10m thus surrounded by clear pathway for easy access.
- The paspalum planted around the area had dried due to dry season
- Also, the drainage channel was dirty an inlet to soak pit was blocked at the time of field visit.
- It was functional and well fenced with soak pit and pathway for easy access.
- The borehole was well numbered (Source ID: DWD 78841) and engraved.
- I tested the minimum well yield, and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in 95 seconds approximated to  $[(20/95)*3600] = 758$  litres per hour greater than 600 litres per hour reported in the terms of reference-summary in document titled "Kiryandongo DLG: Drilling of Deep Boreholes for provision of Water under DWSCG Funding, GOU", Bills of Quantities provided by Kiryandongo DWO and thus good well yield.
- Overall, the deep borehole was functioning well as designed and reported by DWO.

(iv) Drilling a production well in Nyawino RGC, Kiryandongo S/C.

- The production well was installed and finished cast on a reinforced concrete aprons as reported in 4th Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/11) submitted by Kiryandongo DLG CAO on 4th/07/2022 to the MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 22nd/08/2022.
- The production well was functional and well fenced with soak pit.
- However, there was no pathway for easy access and environment was bushy.
- The production well was well numbered (Source ID: DWD 78949) and engraved.
- Since the production well was still installed with a hand pump, I could not test for the minimum well yield of 10 m<sup>3</sup>/ hr as reported in the terms of reference-summary in document titled "Kiryandongo DLG: Siting and Drilling of a Production well for Water Supply under DWSCG Funding, GOU", Bills of Quantities provided by Kiryandongo DWO or for 13.3 m<sup>3</sup>/ hr reported in the 4th Quarter Report for DWSCG FY 2021/2022.
- Overall, the production well was (manually) functioning as reported by DWO.

(v) Rehabilitation of Mutunda P/School deep borehole in Mutunda A village, Mutunda S/C:

- The borehole had 18 Pipes and 18 new pipes were needed for rehabilitation.
- The borehole had a soak pit but the borehole fencing was completely dismantled (reportedly for firewood).
- There was a pathway for easy access, but there were no trees and paspalum planted around.
- The borehole was well engraved and properly



numbered (DWD 14585).

- Overall, the borehole was rehabilitated according to the specifications in the BOQs reported in document titled "Kiryandongo DLG: Borehole Rehabilitation under DWSCG Funding, GOU", Bills of Quantities provided by Kiryandongo DWO

- Also, the drainage channel was dirty an inlet to soak pit was blocked at the time of field visit.

- I tested the minimum well yield, and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in 95 seconds approximated to  $[(20/95)*3600] = 758$  litres per hour greater than 600 litres per hour reported in the design and thus good well yield. The borehole was well numbered and engraved.

- Overall, the deep borehole was rehabilitated and functioning well as reported by DWO.

- On average all the five (5) water facilities sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO, and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).

12

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

Monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects was carried out by the relevant technical officers (DE, DWO, DCDO, Environmental Officer, and others) as per the Inspection and Supervision /Progress reports dated 7/4/2022, 25/5/2022, and 13/6/2022.

There was also evidence of the Environment Officer, and CDO, in carrying out supervision of WSS infrastructure projects as per the reports and minutes of meetings held on the dates above

The projects sampled included;

- Drilling and Installation of 11 Deep Boreholes within Kiryandongo District,

- Rehabilitation of 5 Boreholes within Kiryandongo District

- Drilling of Production Well at Nyawino RGC.

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>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>The CFO availed the following contract documents;</p> <p>(1). Certificate of substantial completion, dated 13/06/2022, issued to Aquatech Enterprises Ltd, of P. O. Box 40230, Kampala, in respect to a contract for feasibility studies and Design of SPMPWS for Nanda RGC (<b>KIRY592/SRVS/21-22/00020</b>), completed on 13/05/2022. This was accompanied with payment request from Aquatech Enterprises Ltd, dated 8/6/2022 and a payment Voucher No.4450734, dated 24-June-2022.</p> <p>(2)Certificate of substantial completion, dated 25/05/2022, issued to LHM groundwater exploration and Geomapping services , of P.O. Box 7435, Kampala, in respect to a contract for Deep borehole siting and drilling supervision, 5No.,(<b>KIRY592/SRVS/21-22/00030-LOT2</b>) completed on 20/05/2022. This was accompanied with payment request from LHM groundwater exploration and Geomapping services, dated 10/5/2022 and a payment Voucher No.44507848, dated 24-June-2022.</p> <p>(3). Certificate of substantial completion, dated 25/05/2022, issued to KLR-Uganda, of P.O. Box 32370, Kampala, in respect to a contract for Drilling, Pump testing and installation of deep boreholes , 11No. (<b>KIY592/WRKS/21-22/00016</b>), completed on 13/05/2022. This was accompanied with payment request from KLR-Uganda, dated 3/5/2022 and a payment Voucher No.44507849, dated 24-June-2022.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for all water infrastructure investments with all records; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals and/or Minutes</p> <p>The Projects files included;</p> <p>1. Rehabilitation of 5 Boreholes within Kiryandongo District - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00015; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min006/05/CC/KDLG/21-22, after a thorough evaluation process. The Contract was awarded to M/S SCABS Technical Services Ltd at a Cost of UGX 118,539,170/= and signed on 1/10/2020</p> <p>2. Drilling of Production Well at Nyawino RGC - KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00069; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min004/12/CC/KDLG/21-22, in a meeting held on 19/4/2022 after a thorough evaluation process. The Contract was awarded to M/S KLR (U) Ltd at a Cost of UGX 38,674,000/= and signed on 6/5/2022</p>	2

**Environment and Social Requirements**

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p>	<p>The GRCs were aligned to existing structures at district, however the LG didn't follow the guidelines from Ministry of Gender of having GRC committees from the project, subcounty upto the district, there was evidence of the records for grievances, however there was no evidence that they were investigated and responded too.</p>	0
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p>	<p>The minutes dated 12/4/2022, signed by SCDO assigned to water department with stipulated agenda, a total number of 53 people attended the meeting in which the guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management were disseminated.</p>	3
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented:</p>	<p>There was no evidence for water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY</p>	0
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		
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>there is evidence of MOUs to show that all WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. borehole voluntary land contribution offered by Mr Okeba James, stamped by L.C 1 Nkwenda village, and signed by Mr Okeba James and Mr Kasunge Samuel the land owners, dated 30/11/2021</li> <li>2. borehole voluntary land contribution offered by Mr Tumuhairwe Edward, stamped by L.C 1 Katuugo village, and signed by Mr Tumuhairwe Edward the land owner, not dated</li> <li>3. borehole voluntary land contribution offered Church of Uganda, stamped by L.C 1 Sambya village, and signed by pastor Sam Ochama on behalf of the church the land owner, dated 25/10/2021</li> </ol> <p>There is evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent as seen from the following listed requests and the accompanying land consent statements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Mutunda S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Mr. Mutabazi Muhamadi as the Land owner, signed (no date but stamped) and Kisura LC 1 Chairperson.</li> <li>ii. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Mutunda S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Mr. Kisimbisi James as the Land owner and</li> </ol>	3
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		

Kasanja B LC 1 Chairperson on (no date but stamped).

iii. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Nyamahasa S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Aryemo Nora as the Land owner, signed 27th/01/2022 and Alero A LC 1 Chairperson.

iv. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Kigumba S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Okaba James and Kesunge Samuel as the Land owners, and Mwenda II LC 1 Chairperson signed 30th/11/2021

v. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Kyankende S/C for borehole rehabilitation with Church of God (COG) of E. Africa (U) as the Land owner, and Sambya LC 1 Chairperson signed 25th/10/2021

vi. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Masindi Port S/C for borehole drilling with Tumuhairwe Edward as the Land owner, and Katuugo-Epanga ibiri LC 1 Chairperson signed and stamped (but no date)

vii. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Nyamahasa S/C for borehole rehabilitation with Nyamahasa P/S as the Land owner, and Nyamahasa I LC 1 Chairperson signed 24th/11/2021

viii. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Nyamahasa S/C for borehole rehabilitation with Church and Mutunda P/S as the Land owner, and Nanda LC 1 Chairperson signed 29th/11/2021

ix. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Masindi Port S/C for borehole drilling with Nkamuhabwa Fred and Diana Mbabazi as the Land owners, and Kiryanseka LC 1 Chairperson signed 6th/12/2021

x. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Masindi Port S/C for borehole drilling with Imai Noah and Akisa Sabbiti as the Land owners, and Kuduku II LCI Chairperson signed 8th/12/2021

xi. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Kigumba S/C for borehole drilling with Ayang peter, Odoch George and Kisembo Robert as the Land owners, and Nyakibete I LCI Chairperson signed 30th/11/2021

xii. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Kiryandongo S/C for borehole drilling with Byraruhanda Tadeo as the Land owner and Kamusenene LCI Chairperson signed but no date and stamp

xiii. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Kiryandongo S/C for borehole drilling with Surusoni Chapel as the Land owner and Nyamutende LCI Chairperson signed but no date and stamp

xiv. Consent Agreement between the landowner and community of Kyankende S/C for borehole drilling with Mrs. Taban Christine Mulu as the Land owner and Tugo LCI Chairperson signed 15th/05/2022

xv. Consent Agreement between the landowner and

community of Kiryandongo S/C for borehole drilling with Muhanguzi Henry as the Land owner and Kooki LCI Chairperson signed 15th/05/2022 but no date and stamp

There is evidence that 15 out of the 17 water facility projects budgeted for FY 2021/2022 were implemented on land where Kiryandongo DLG had proof of consent , and therefore, justifying a score of three (3).

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	1. There was evidence that the Environmental Officer and DCDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the rehabilitation of boreholes, procurement reference No. KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00015, dated 25th/2/2022, contractor Kahora technical services ltd, copied to CAO, CFO, DO, DWO  2. there was evidence that the Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the borehole siting and drilling supervisions, procurement reference No. KIRY592/SRVS/21-22/00030-LOT 1 dated 25th/2/2022 contractor ROK technical services LMT, copied to CAO, CFO, DO, DWO  3. there was evidence that the Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the drilling pump testing and installation of deep boreholes, procurement reference No. KIRY592/WRKS/21-22/00016-LOT 1 dated 25th/2/2022 contractor ROK technical services LMT, copied to CAO, CFO, DO, DWO	2
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0	1. monitoring reports were seen, monitoring environment and social safeguards compliance for drilling of production well at Nyawino RGC, dated 10th/6/2022, signed by SCDO, no monthly reports were available at the time of the assessment.  2. monitoring Environment and social safeguards for compliance in water projects for FY 2021/2022, dated 7/6/2022, signed by SCDO, however there were no monthly reports to this effect	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Senior Agricultural Engineer, Mr. Percy Mpuuga, availed a document dated June 30,2022 having a list of all irrigated land in Kiryandongo district for FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022, having data for only non- Micro Scale irrigation grant beneficiaries because the Micro-scale irrigation program had not yet been implemented therefore having 0 beneficiaries.</p> <p>According to this document, Kiryandongo had 18 irrigation facilities as of June 30th 2021 and 23 Irrigation facilities as of 30th June 2022 . Some of the facilities listed include the following, <i>inter alia</i>;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 7 acres belonging to Mr. Acaku Alex (0776795309) in Kigumba Subcounty, No. 19 on the list.</li> <li>2. 4acres belonging to Mr. Balikagira Julius(0782013704) in Nyakatiti village in Mboira Subcounty, No.1 on the list.</li> <li>3. 0.5acre belonging to Ms. Nalwanga Teopista (0774265038) in kecwa vilage in Kiryandongo Subcounty, No.11 on the list.</li> <li>4. 2.4acres belonging to Mr. Kizito Edemaga (0773975039) in Kigaragara Village in Kigumba Subcounty , No.18 on the list.</li> </ol> <p>Therefore, Kiyandongo DLG had up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the document availed, in FY 2020/2021 the acreage of Irrigated land was estimated at 67.4 acres while in 2021/2022 it was estimated at 94.4acres, giving an increase of <math>(94.4-67.4)/67.4=40.06\%</math>.</p>	2
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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
	Maximum score 6			
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
	Maximum score 6			
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  • If 100% score 2  • Between 80 – 99% score 1  • Below 80% score 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
	Maximum score 6			
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2  • If 75 – 99% score 1  • If below 75% score 0	A review of the staffing structure, staff lists, and appointment letters for LLG Extension Workers showed that the structure provides for 66 positions (3 at each of the 4 TC (Agric. Officer; Asst. Agric. Officer; and Asst. Vet. Office) and 6 at each of the 9 Sub County (Agric. Officer; Asst. Agric. Officer; Vet. Officer; Fisheries Officer; Asst. Animal Husbandry Officer; and Asst. fisheries Development Officer) and only 24 are filled, indicating a 36.36% capacity.	0
	Maximum score 6			
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
	Maximum score 6			

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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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	A review of the LLG Extension Workers' staff lists, Attendance registers, and deployment letters in the three sampled LLG of Kiryandongo TC, Nyamahasa Sub County, and Kiryandongo Sub County showed that information on the position of Extension Workers filled is accurate.	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

In Kiryandongo Town Council the deployed staff were Mr. Tindyebwa Evace, an Agricultural Officer; Ms. Ayebare Evaline, an Assistant Agricultural Officer; and Mr. Mandrerua Emmanuel, an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer.

In Nyamahasa Sub County there was Mr. Bigirwa Sabiiti Benard, an Assistant Agricultural Officer.,

In Kiryandongo Sub County, the deployed staff were Mr. Sentalo Fred, an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer; Mr. Bulizzo Alex, an Agricultural Officer; Mr. Atugonza Adinan, an Entomological Assistant; Mr. Abau Opolot James, an Assistant Agricultural Officer; and Ms. Aweko Julliet, an Assistant Fisheries Officer.

This was consistent with the understaffing standing at 36.36% positions of Extension Workers filled.

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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not assess the LLGs	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not assess the LLGs	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>According to the approved budget estimate for Kiryandongo DLG for FY 2022/23 available on the budget website, the DLG has budgeted UGX1006,890,000 towards extension staff wage bill.</p>	1
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The DPO availed a staff register for the production department dated 31/10/2022, titled "Kiryandongo District Production Staff as at 5/7/2022." However, staff are not yet involved in Microscale Irrigation program activities because the DLG has not received the funds.</p>	1
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>A review of LLG Extension Workers' staff lists, Attendance Registers at the three sampled LLGs (Kiryandongo TC, Nyamahasa Sub County, and Kiryandongo Sub County), deployment letters and monitoring reports showed that Extension Workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed.</p> <p>In Nyamahasa Sub County there was:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Bigirwa Sabiiti Benard, an Assistant Agricultural Officer.,</li> </ol> <p>In Kiryandongo Sub County, the deployed staff were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Sentalo Fred, an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer;</li> <li>2. Mr. Bulizzo Alex, an Agricultural Officer;</li> <li>3. Mr. Atugonza Adinan, an Entomological Assistant;</li> <li>4. Mr. Abau Opolot James, an Assistant Agricultural Officer; and</li> <li>5. Ms. Aweko Julliet, an Assistant Fisheries Officer.</li> </ol> <p>In Kiryandongo Town Council the deployed staff were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Tindyebwa Evace, an Agricultural Officer;</li> <li>2. Ms. Ayebare Evaline, an Assistant Agricultural Officer; and</li> <li>3. Mr. Mandrerua Emmanuel, an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer.</li> </ol>	2

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>During the assessment, the assessor sampled Kiryandongo TC, Nyamahasa Sub County, and Kiryandongo Sub County and found that staff lists with telephone numbers of Extension Workers were displayed on Notice Boards in all the three sampled LLGs, evidence that Extension Workers deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs.</p>	2
Maximum score 6				
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Review of Personal files, Performance Plans and Appraisal Reports of LLG Extension Workers showed that the District Production Coordinator had conducted Annual Performance Appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed Performance Plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY. Some of the files reviewed include Oola Denish (Asst. Vet Officer) Kigumba TC; Ejwau Moses (Vet. Officer) Mutunda SC; Manderwa Emmanuel (Asst. Vet. Officer) Kiryandongo TC; Kanya Ben (Vet. Officer) Masindi Port; Mutebi Paul (Asst. Vet. Officer) Bweyale TC; Bingi Patrick (Sr. Vet. Officer) Kiryandongo DLG; Atugonza Adnan (Entomology Asst.) Diima SC; Sekamattee Stephen (Agric. Officer) Masindi Port; Badura Kaija John (Asst. Vet. Officer) Mutunda SC; Kaaye Banyumya Charles (Asst. Vet. Officer) Kigumba SC; Bigirwa Sabiiti Benard (Asst. Agric. Officer) Nyamahasa SC; and Sentalo Fred (Asst. Vet. Officer) Kiryandongo SC.</p>	1
Maximum score 4				
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:  Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Corrective action taken included coaching and mentoring for performance improvement, and a technical training session on soil analysis for crop sector extension staff.</p>	1
Maximum score 4				
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Though no training database was availed, the DPO availed a report on staff capacity building training on soil analysis for all crop sector extension staff, dated 5th September 2021. Also, the DPO facilitated District fisheries officer to attend a conference on Artisanal fisheries and aquaculture as per the approval document dated 22/08/2021. Similarly, the senior Veterinary officer was permitted and released from station to go for training as per his Back to station report dated 12th May, 2022.</p>	1
Maximum score 4				

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	No training database was availed.	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities	0
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.  Maximum score 10	c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities</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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities</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>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities</p>	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>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>At the time of assessment and visit to the three sampled LLGs of Kiryandongo Sub County, Nyamahasa Sub County and Kiryandongo Town Council, there was no evidence in the three sampled LLGs 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.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable since the DLG will not have Micro-scale irrigation program activities/Projects for the Current FY</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No MSI projects for Kiryandongo DLG</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	No MSI projects for Kiryandongo DLG	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable since No MSI projects for Kiryandongo DLG	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 since No MSI projects for Kiryandongo DLG	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 isince Kiryandongo DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 since No MSI projects for Kiryandongo DLG	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	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 for this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	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 since there was no project on micro scale irrigation	0

Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum  
Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited;  a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer  <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	The position of Senior Agriculture Engineer was substantively filled by Mr. Mpunge Percy appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 10/03/2017 as directed by the DSC under Minutes No. 81/2017 and 03/2017.	70
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.  <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG:  Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening  score 30 or else 0.	There was no project on micro-scale irrigation to verify at the time of the assessment because the LG never implemented irrigation projects during the previous FY.,	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The position of Civil Engineer (Water) was substantively filled by Mr. Muhumuza Samuel appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 10/03/2014 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 005/2014.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization was substantively filled by Mr. Ojara John Bosco appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 29/03/2022 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 318/2022.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was no evidence adduced by HRM during the assessment to show that the District had a substantively appointed Borehole Maintenance Technician.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	There was no evidence adduced by HRM at the time of assessment to show that the District had a substantively appointed Natural Resources Officer.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Environment Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Mwambu Joel appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 29/03/2022 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 319/2022.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was no evidence adduced by HRM during the assessment to show that the District had a substantively appointed Forestry Officer.	0

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

If the LG:

a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.

There was evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was carried out for all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY.

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening of borehole drilling at Tugo village dated 11/Jan/2022 and signed by both Environment Officer and CDO, mitigation measures assessed, plans developed and implemented/followed up eg planting of indigenous tree

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for borehole rehabilitation drilling at Nsabya village dated 11/Jan/2022 and signed by both Environment Officer and DCDO, mitigation measures assessed, plans developed and implemented/followed up eg planting of indigenous tree

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for a production well at Kiyogoma I village dated 1/1/2022, signed both EO and DCDO and mitigation measures assessed,

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 LG during the previous FY implemented projects which according to the screening never required ESIAs. The projects like drilling of a borehole at Tugo, rehabilitaion of a bore hole at Nsambya and construction of a production well at Kiyogoma are captured under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019 and the screening therefore never recommended for conducting ESIAs.

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

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

- Kiryandongo District Water Department (DWO) did not provide copies of water abstraction permit for Solar-powered Mini-piped Water Supply System at Apodorwa RGC, Kiryandongo with pump installed capacity  $Q=2.5$  m<sup>3</sup>/hr pumping for 10 hours per day.

- According to Kiryandongo DWO, the mini-piped water supply system has been operational since June 2019 serving approximately 3400 people.

- The WSC for Solar-powered Mini-piped Water Supply System at Apodorwa RGC submitted application forms for abstraction permit but the permit had not yet been processed by DWRM.

- Therefore, Kiryandongo DLG did not get abstraction permit for piped water systems issued by DWRM thereby justifying a score zero (0)

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of District Health Officer was substantively filled by Dr. Mutyaba Imaam appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 22/04/2013 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 42/2013.	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	The position of ADHO Maternal, Child Health and Nursing was substantively filled by Ms. Ada Christine P'amoru appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 07/04/2017 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 32/2017.	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	The position of ADHO Environmental Health was substantively filled by Mr. Ochiba James Michael appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 11/03/2022 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 304/2022.	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.	The position of Principal Health Inspector was substantively filled by Mr. Muliko Augustine appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 29/06/2021 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 198/2021.	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Senior Health Educator was substantively filled by Ms. Nkuba B. Esther appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 11/03/2021 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 305/2022.	10



1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	The position of Biostatistician was substantively filled by Ms. Kyomuhendo Abwoki Gorrety appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 17/04/2014 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 127/2014.	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	The position of District Cold Chain Technician was substantively filled by Ms. Mugisa Anna appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 02/09/2021 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 230/2021.	10
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0		

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

There is evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening of Health projects for the current FY, E&S was completed and, ESMPs were prepared and costed and implemented/followed up.

1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of a 2 stance lined VIP pit latrine at Kiryandongo hospital dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO was carried out, ESMP costed Ugx1,200,000 dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both EO and DCO, monitoring checklists were available for review

2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of a 2 bath room shelter at Kiryandongo hospital dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO was carried out, ESMP costed Ugx1,200,000 dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both EO and DCO, monitoring checklists were available for review

3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of a 5 stance lined VIP pit latrine at Diima health center III dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO was carried out, ESMP costed Ugx1,200,000 dated 4th/10/2022 and signed by both DEO and DCO, monitoring checklists were available for review

2

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

Maximum score is 30

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

There was no evidence that the LG carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs),

The LG during the previous FY implemented projects which according to the screening never required ESIAs. The projects like construction of a 5-stance lined at Dima HC III, a 2-stance lined pit latrine and 2 bath rooms at Kiryandongo hospital were captured under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019 and the screening therefore never recommended for conducting ESIAs

15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The position of District Education Officer was substantively filled by Rev. Kirya Edward appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 15/02/2015 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 356/2015.	30
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	<p>The HRM availed the Assessment Team a customized and costed staff structure for Kiryandongo District approved in a letter from the Ministry of Public Service ref.: ARC 135/306/01 dated June 16, 2017 showing that the District has two positions of Inspector of Schools substantively filled as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Katusabe Johnson appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 07/02/2018 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 140/2018.</li> <li>2. Mr. Ojja Patrick appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 24/11/2020 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 121/2020.</li> </ol>	40
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
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)	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>there was evidence for Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, ESMPs prepared and costed and implemented/followed up</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening at Ndabulye p/s for construction of 2 class rooms dated on 9/9/2021 signed by both District community development officer and Environment officer, ESMP prepared and costed at a tune of Ugx1,050,000, dated 9/9/2021, signed by both District community development officer and Environment officer, monitoring checklists seen</li> <li>2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening at Nanda P/S for construction of 2 class rooms dated on 7/9/2021 signed by both District community development officer and Environment officer, ESMP prepared and costed at a tune of Ugx4,400,000, dated 7/9/2021, signed by both District community development officer and Environment officer, monitoring checklists seen</li> <li>3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening at Wakisanyi P/S for construction of 2 VIP latrines for both boys and girls dated on 8/9/2021 signed by both District community development officer and Environment officer, ESMP prepared and costed at a tune of Ugx2,200,000, dated 8/9/2021 signed by both District community development officer and Environment officer, monitoring checklists seen</li> </ol>	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

The LG did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works education sector projects because at the time of screening all civil works projects were captured under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019

The projects were; Nadabulye p/s, construction of 2 class rooms, Nanda P/S, p/s, construction of 2 class rooms and Wakisanyi P/S construction of 2 VIP latrines for both boys and girls

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Chief Finance Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Obwona Richard appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 16/02/2015 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 355/2015	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Planner was substantively filled by Mr. Balikagira Julius appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 15/05/2019 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 156/2019	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	There was no evidence adduced to show that the District has a substantively appointed District Engineer. Mr. Niyonzima Emmanuel, the incumbent is holding the office on Acting Appointment by the DSC under Minute No. 316/2022 signed by the CAO.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	There was no evidence adduced to show that the District has a substantively appointed Natural Resources Officer. Mr. Kigoye Yasin, the incumbent is holding the office on Acting Appointment by the DSC under Minute No.137/2018 signed by the CAO.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Production Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Bukenya Issa Hassan appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 05/04/2018 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 01/2018	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Dabanja Geoffrey appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 07/06/2018 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 118/2018	3

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Kakumba Sam appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 24/05/2019 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 203/2019	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The position of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Ndiroraho Milton appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 15/05/2019 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 157/2019	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The position of Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Ms. Tumuhaise Christine appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 24/11/2020 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 137/2020	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Administration) was substantively filled by Ms. Murungi Violet appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 24/05/2019 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 200/2019	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Ms. Businge Zalfa appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 02/09/2021 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 234/2021	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The position of Senior Land Management Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Kigoye Yasin appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 27/04/2014 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 163/2014	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The position of Senior Accountant was substantively filled by Mr. Wandera Christopher appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 23/12/2020 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 159/2020	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The position of Principal Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Ms. Bingi Elizabeth appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 24/05/2019 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 202/2019	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence adduced to show that the District had a substantively appointed officer in the position of PHRO (Secretary DSC). There was no formal secondment.	0
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).	The Assessment Team found that at the time of assessment, Kiryandongo District Local Government had nine Sub Counties and four Town Councils and there was no evidence adduced to show that the position of Senior Assistant Secretary/Sub-county Chief in each Sub County and that of Town Clerk in each Town Council had been substantively filled. There was also no evidence of formal secondment.	0
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	The Assessment Team found that at the time of assessment, Kiryandongo District Local Government had nine Sub Counties and four Town Councils and there was no evidence adduced to show that the position of Community Development Officer in each Sub County and that of Senior Community Development Officer in each Town Council had been substantively filled. There was also no evidence of formal secondment.	0
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	The Assessment Team found that at the time of assessment, Kiryandongo District Local Government had nine Sub Counties and four Town Councils and there was no evidence adduced to show that the position of Senior Accounts Assistant/ an Accounts Assistant in each Sub County and Town Council had been substantively filled. There was also no evidence of formal secondment.	0

## Environment and Social Requirements

3

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

Maximum score is 4

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

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

Kiryandongo DLG had allocated for the Natural Resources Department for shs 5,936,031,794 as detailed by the district financial statements for FY 2021/2022 on page 11.

Release of funds for the department was shs 3,837,202,215 on the same page of the financial statements mentioned above.

Performance was equivalent to 64%

Computation:  $\frac{3,837,202,215}{5,936,301,794} \times 100 = 64\%$

5,936,301,794

This was equivalent to 64% performance and therefore not all funds as allocated for implementation of environmental and social safeguards were released to the department during the financial year.

0

3

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

Maximum score is 4

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

b. Community Based Services department.

score 2 or else 0.

The Community Based Services department was allocated shs 1,033,167,200 as provided on page 11 of the District financial statements for FY 2021/2022. The actual released for the year amounted to shs 1,033,107,526 per page 11 of the financial statements for FY 2021/2020. Performance was 99.9%

$\frac{1,033,107,526}{1,033,167,200} \times 100 = 99.9\%$

This was equivalent to 99.9% performance and therefore all funds as allocated for implementation of environmental and social safeguards were released and spent by the department.

2



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

Maximum score is 12

a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,

score 4 or else 0

There was evidence that the LG carried out carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for projects implemented using the DDGE.

Evidence

1. The Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction for 2 classroom block at Ndabulye primary school was carried out, sector education, dated 09/09/2021, signed by both the DCDO and EO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx1,050,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen.

2. The Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for borehole drilling at Tugo village was carried out, sector water, dated 11/Jan/2022, signed by both the DCDO and EO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx192,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen.

3. The Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for fencing of Mutunda health center III was carried out, sector health, dated 20/10/2021, however it was not signed by by both DCDO and EO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx2,600,000 dated 20/10/2021, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen.

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or 0

There was no evidence that the LG 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)

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or 0

There is evidence for E&S screening completed, ESIA/ESMPs prepared and costed as required, implemented and followed up.

Evidence

1. The screening of construction for 2 classroom block at Ndabulye primary school, sector education, dated 09/09/2021, signed by both the CDO and DEO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP 1,050,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen.

2. The screening for borehole drilling at Tugo village sector water, dated 11/Jan/2022, signed by both the CDO and DEO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP 192,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen.

3. The screening of fencing of mutunda health center III sector health, dated 20/10/2021, however it was not signed by both CDO and DEO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP 2,600,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen.

#### Financial management and reporting

Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.

Maximum score is 10

If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;

If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5

If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0

The OAG opinion on FY2021/2022 LG performance was unqualified

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>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>Provision of information to PS/ST on status of implementation of OAG and IAG findings:</p> <p>The CAO responded to the 15 queries that were raised by the Office of the Auditor General in respect of FY 2020/2021 per letter under reference CR/106 and dated 29th March, 2022. This was done beyond the prescribed time frame of February, 2022. The letter was copied to the Principal Internal Auditor. All the 15 queries had been cleared at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
	<p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>As for the IAG, the CAO responded to the three queries that were raised in FY 2020/2021 through letter dated 17th December, 2021 signed by the Principal Internal Auditor. A copy of the letter was sent to the CAO. The three queries included: (i) Unaccounted for advances to staff amounting to shs 123,250,000; (ii) Unbanked funds for Kiryandongo Hospital private wing amounting to shs 12,744,110 and (iii) Unacknowledged remittance to LLGs totaling shs 21,170,076.</p> <p>All the three queries had been cleared at the time of the assessment and communication was done within the February, 2022 as required.</p>	
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p>	<p>The DLG submitted an Annual Performance Contract on 17th June, 2022 by the Programme Budget System and it was acknowledged on 17th June, 2022 within the prescribed time frame of 31st August, 2022. The Annual Performance Contract was countersigned by PS/ST on 17th June, 2022.</p>	4
	<p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>		
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>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>The DLG submitted the Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022 on 17th August, 2022 within the prescribed time frame of 31st August, 2022. The Annual Performance Report was acknowledged at MOFPED on 17th August, 2022.</p>	4
	<p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</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

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,

score 4 or else 0.

The DLG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY 2021/2022 by August 31 of the current Financial Year 2022/2023 as follows:

1st Quarter on 15/11/2021;

2nd Quarter on 28/01/2022;

3rd Quarter on 6/05/2022;

4th Quarter on 17/08/2022.