



LGMSD 2021/22

Kamuli District

(Vote Code: 517)

| Assessment | Scores |
|---|---------------|
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions | 73% |
| Education Minimum Conditions | 100% |
| Health Minimum Conditions | 90% |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions | 50% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions | 100% |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures | 73% |
| Educational Performance Measures | 75% |
| Health Performance Measures | 61% |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures | 53% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 47% |

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|---|--|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 | <p>The LG infrastructure DDEG funded projects in the previous FY were functional and in use as evidenced in the 3 sampled projects below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partial completion of the Northern Wing of the new Administration block completed on 23/6/2022 at a cost of 220,000,000 as on page 37 of ABPR was functional and in use as per monitoring report dated 14/1/2022 Ref. CR/130/1. 2. Renovation of DSC block completed on 10/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 47,968,480 as indicated on page 37 of the ABPR was functional and in use as per monitoring report dated 13/5/2022. 3. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Busandha P/s completed on 29/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 23,000,000 as indicated on page 76 of the ABPR was functional and in use but not captured in any of the monitoring reports. | 4 |
| 2 | <p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 | <p>LLGs were not assessed in the previous assessment thus no basis to assess performance increase at the time of the current Assessment.</p> | 0 |

Service Delivery
Performance

Maximum 6 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

The LG implemented 9 (nine) out of 10 (ten) DDEG funded projects which were completed and in use as evidenced below:

1. Partial completion at a cost of Shs. 260m as indicated on page of the budget which was completed on 23/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 220,900,000 and in use as indicated on page 37 of the ABPR.

2. Renovation of DSC block at a cost of Shs.20m as indicated on page 11 of the budget which was completed on 10/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 47,968,480 and in use as indicated on page 37 of the ABPR.

3. Procurement of furniture for offices at a cost of Shs. 30,349,000 as indicated on page 11 of the budget which was completed on 6/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 29,900,000 and in use as indicated on page 37 of the ABPR.

4. Reconnection of generator power between Administration block and Planning Unit block at a cost of Shs.2m as indicated on page 11 of the budget which was completed on 23/6/2022 at a cost of Shs.16,350,000 as indicated on page 37 of the ABPR.

5. Expansion of laboratory at Namwendwa HC IV at a cost of Shs. 36m as indicated on page 36 of the budget but which had not started by 30/6/2022 as indicated on page 67 of the ABPR.

6. Construction of antenatal shade at Kamulin General Hospital at a cost of Shs. 18m as indicated on page 36 of the budget which was completed on 23/6/2022 at a cost of Shs.18m and in use as indicated on page 67 of the ABPR.

7. Procurement of x-ray for Kamuli General Hospital at a cost of Shs. 80m as indicated on page 36 of the budget which was completed on 29/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 71,500,000 and in use as indicated on page 132 of the ABPR.

8. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Busandha P/s at a cost of Shs. 23m as indicated on page 47 of the budget and completed on 29/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 23m as on page 76 of the ABPR

9. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Namaira SDA P/s at a cost of Shs. 23m as indicated on page 47 of the budget which was completed on 29/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 23m and in use as indicated on page 76 of the ABPR.

10. Demarcation and Titling of 4 parcels of Institutional land at a cost of Shs. 16m as indicated on page 47 of the budget and completed on 30/6/2022 at a cost of Shs. 16m as on page 97 of the ABPR.

Percentage of planned projects that were completed was:
 $9/10 \times 100 = 90\%$

Investment
Performance

Maximum 4 points on
this performance
measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0.

The LG budgeted to spend Shs. 4,111,977,000 on DDEG funded projects in the previous FY as indicated on page 1 of the approved budget which was all spent on eligible projects/activities in accordance with the DDEG grant implementation guidelines as evidenced below:

1. Partial completion of Northern wing of the new Administration Block at a cost of Shs. 220,900,000 as per completion certificate dated 23/6/2022 was eligible for funding under DDEG as on page 7 under Code 148272.
2. Renovation of DSC block at a cost of Shs. 47,968,480 as per completion certificate dated 10/6/2022 was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 under Code 148272
3. Procurement of furniture for offices at a cost of Shs. 29,900,000 as per completion certificate dated 6/6/2022 was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 8 under Code 148272
4. Reconnection of generator power between Administration block and Planning Unit Block at a cost of Shs. 16,350,000 as per completion certificate dated 23/6/2022 was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 under Code 148272
5. Expansion of laboratory at Namwendwa HCIV at a cost of Shs. 36m on page 36 of the budget but which had not yet started as at 30/6/2022. It was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 under Code 088283
6. Construction of antenatal shade at Kamuli General Hospital at a cost of Shs. 18m as per completion certificate dated 23/6/2022 was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 under Code 088182
7. Procurement of an X-RAY for Kamuli General Hospital at a cost of Shs. 71,500,000 as per completion certificate dated 29/6/2022 was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 8 under Code 088104
8. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Busandha P/s at a cost of Shs. 23m as per completion certificate dated 29/6/2022 was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 under Code 078181
9. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Namaira SDA P/s at a cost of Shs. 23m as per completion certificate dated 29/6/2022 was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 under Code 078181
10. Demarcation and Titling of 4 parcels of institutional land at a cost of Shs. 16m as per completion certificate dated 30/6/2022 was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 8 under Code 98310.

3

Investment
PerformanceMaximum 4 points on
this performance
measureb. If the variations in the
contract price for sample of
DDEG funded infrastructure
investments for the
previous FY are within +/-
20% of the LG Engineers
estimates,

score 2 or else score 0

The variations in the contract price and Engineer's
estimates of the sampled DDEG projects were as follows:Variation = 100% ((Contract Price – Engineers
Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))

- KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00065. Proposed renovation of the district service phase II. budgeted at UGX 221,035,927/= actual contract price was UGX 220,900,000/= with a variation of UGX 135,927/= represented by - 0.06%
- KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00021. Proposed renovation of the district service Phase 1. budgeted at UGX 20,000,000/= actual contract price was UGX 19,570,500/= with a variation of UGX 429,500/= represented by - 2.15%
- KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00001. Completion of New admin block Phase II; budgeted at UGX 29,000,000/= actual contract price was UGX 28,379,980/= with a variation of UGX 620,020/= represented by - 2.14%.

In conclusion,

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

2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4

Accuracy of reported
informationMaximum 4 points on
this Performance
Measurea. Evidence that information
on the positions filled in
LLGs as per minimum
staffing standards is
accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

From the 3 sampled and visited LLGs, it was confirmed that information on the positions filled was accurate as indicated below,

1. Kitayunjwa S/C

Waziko Ronald works as SAA which position was provided for on the approved staff structure and List.

2. Balawoli S/C

Anyango Dona was deployed as CDO which position was provided for in the approved staff structure.

3. Kisozi S/C

Nambi Esther was employed as Agriculture Officer which was provided for in the approved staff structure.

Note: They were 37 extension workers inclusive of those attached to the DLG and LLGs

2

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p> | <p>The following 3 (three) sampled infrastructure constructed using DDEG were all in place and completed as evidenced in the quarterly monitoring reports for the previous FY.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partial completion of Northern Wing of the new Administration block was under completion as indicated on page 1 of Q3 monitoring report dated 14/1/2022 and completed as on page 37 of the ABPR 2. Renovation of DSC Block was under completion as indicated on page 3 of Q4 monitoring report dated 13/5/2022 and completed as on page 37 of the ABPR. 3. Construction of 5-stance VIP latrine at Busandha P/s was completed as indicated on page 76 of ABPR <p>Percentage of completion on the 3 sampled projects above as per Q3 and Q4 monitoring reports and ABPR of the previous FY was: $3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$</p> | 2 |
|---|---|--|--|---|

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG consolidated and Submitted staffing requirements for FY2022/23 to MoPS on 22/08/2022 and received on 12/09/2022</p> | 2 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG conducted tracking and analysis on staff attendance on monthly basis. According to the attendance analysis report for the month of February 2022, Kalema Cornelius (PAS) was present for 18 days</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence to prove that HODs were all appraised. However, some were appraised after the time frame.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Talugende Moses (District Commercial Officer) was appraised on 16/08/2022 2. Kafuse Alex (Head Internal Auditor) was appraised on 22/07/2022 3. Musenero Richard (DPO) was appraised on 18/07/2022 4. Mmerewoma Leo (DCDO) was appraised on 22/07/2022 5. Waibi Joseph (DEO) was appraised but no date indicated 6. Mwiru Emmanuel (Senior Procurement Officer) had nothing to show on the file that was appraised. 7. Also Makoosi Barker (PHRO-DSC) | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG implemented administrative rewards and sanctions. The Rewards and Sanctions Committee sat on 23/06/2022 and recommended that Geoffrey Kabaawo (Education Assistant) stay at Kasolwe P/S under close supervision by the Head Teacher, following his irregularity on duty under MIN NO.05/KDLG/RSC/2022</p> | 1 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence of an established consultative committee but instead the LG put in place a 10 member Negotiating, Consultative and Dispute Settlement Committee (NCDSC) effective 13/06/2022 which wasn't functional at the time of assessment. Members included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eaisu Peter Emwos (DCAO) 2. Kasiko Prossy (PHRO) 3. Kaleleja Abdul (Principal Finance Officer) 4. Mawerere Grace (SAS) 5. Mutyaba Irene (SAS) 6. Mukembo Winfred (Nursing officer) 7. Kimpi Alimansi (UNATU) 8. Kaiza Winfred (Senior Health Environment Officer) 9. Isabirye Bamuleke (Asst.Educ.Officer) 10. Lugada Richard (Asst. CDO) | 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. | Only 30% of staff recruited accessed payroll within two months. The LG recruited 163 and only 50 staff began receiving salary within two months from date of their appointment. | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 9 | Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0 | a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1. | The LG retired 32 staff and only 22 (68%) accessed pension payroll within two months of their retirement. Some retirees who accessed pension payroll included; 1. Byekwaso James (D/Head Teacher) retired on 28/10/2021 and accessed pension payroll on 01/11/2021 2. Nakisita Margaret (Records Assistant) retired on 27/07/2021 and accessed pension payroll on 01/08/2021 | 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 | The DDEG budget for LLGs was Shs.1,532,390 as indicated on page 1 of the approved budget for the previous FY. The DDEG to LLGs was directly transferred in full as evidenced below: Q1 of Shs. 410,462,409 was transferred on 9/8/2021 1. Balawoli Sc: Shs. 23,215,783.28 2. Bugulumbya Sc: Shs. 33,458,942.59 3. Bulopa Sc: Shs.28,184,022.26 4. Butansi Sc: Shs. 28,613,376.26 5. Kagumba Sc: Shs.30,576,137.26 6. Kisozi Sc: Shs. 25,791,907.27 7. Kitayunjwa Sc:36,219,075.25 8. Magogo Sc: Shs.23,277,119.61 9. Mbulamuti Sc: Shs.28,613,376.26 10. Nabwigulu Sc: Shs. 23,215,783.28 11. Namasagali Sc: Shs.34,378,986.92 12. Namwendwa Sc: Shs. 48,731,677,.21 13. Nawanyago Sc: Shs. 24,503,845.27 14. Wankole Sc: Shs. 21,682,376.28 TOTAL: 410,462,409 Q2 of Shs. 410,462,409 was transferred on 26/10/2021 1. Balawoli Sc: Shs. 23,215,783.28 2. Bugulumbya Sc: Shs. 33,458,942.59 3. Bulopa Sc: Shs.28,184,022.26 | 2 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

4. Butansi Sc: Shs. 28,613,376.26
 5. Kagumba Sc: Shs.30,576,137.26
 6. Kisozi Sc: Shs. 25,791,907.27
 7. Kitayunjwa Sc:36,219,075.25
 8. Magogo Sc: Shs.23,277,119.61
 9. Mbulamuti Sc: Shs.28,613,376.26
 10. Nabwigulu Sc: Shs. 23,215,783.28
 11. Namasagali Sc: Shs.34,378,986.92
 12. Namwendwa Sc: Shs. 48,731,677,.21
 13. Nawanyago Sc: Shs. 24,503,845.27
 14. Wankole Sc: Shs. 21,682,376.28
- TOTAL: 410,462,409

Q3 of Shs. 410,462,409 was transferred on 21/1/2022

1. Balawoli Sc: Shs. 23,215,783.28
 2. Bugulumbya Sc: Shs. 33,458,942.59
 3. Bulopa Sc: Shs.28,184,022.26
 4. Butansi Sc: Shs. 28,613,376.26
 5. Kagumba Sc: Shs.30,576,137.26
 6. Kisozi Sc: Shs. 25,791,907.27
 7. Kitayunjwa Sc:36,219,075.25
 8. Magogo Sc: Shs.23,277,119.61
 9. Mbulamuti Sc: Shs.28,613,376.26
 10. Nabwigulu Sc: Shs. 23,215,783.28
 11. Namasagali Sc: Shs.34,378,986.92
 12. Namwendwa Sc: Shs. 48,731,677,.21
 13. Nawanyago Sc: Shs. 24,503,845.27
 14. Wankole Sc: Shs. 21,682,376.28
- TOTAL: 410,462,409

SUMMARY

Q1: Shs: 410,462,409

Q2: Shs: 410,462,409

Q3: Shs: 410,462,409

TOTAL: Shs. 1,231,387,227

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 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>The Assesment team and LG were unable to trace the dates of quarterly uploading of the cash limits and warrants for the previous FY due to IFMS failure at the time of assessment rendering it not possible to establish warranting within 5 working days as required.</p> <p>This system failure was attributed to blockage of the old IFMS during the update by MoFPED and the LG could not log onto it hence the inability to trace the dates when cash limits for the previous FY were uploaded.</p> | 0 |
| | | Score: 2 or else score 0 | | |
| 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>The LG communicated all the DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs as evidenced below but compliance within 5 working days could not be established at the time of assessment due to failure to trace the dates of uploading the cash limits on IFMS:</p> <p>Q1 DDEG transfer of Shs. 410,462,409 was communicated to all LLGs on 13/8/2021 Ref.CR/103/2.</p> <p>Q2 DDEG transfer of Shs. 410,462,409 was communicated to all LLGs on 8/10/2021.</p> <p>Q3 DDEG transfer of Shs. 410, 462,409 was communicated to all LLGs on 21/1/2022</p> | 0 |
| | | Score 2 or else score 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>The LG supported/ mentored the LLGs at least once per quarter as evidenced in the mentoring reports below:</p> <p>Q1 Mentoring report dated 31/8/2021 captured mentoring of LLGs staff on roles of PDC in the planning process, integration of cross cutting issues into the planning process among others.</p> <p>Q2 Mentoring report dated 20/12/2021 captured mentoring of LLGs staff on reporting and accountability, local revenue generation, mobilization and management at various levels among others.</p> <p>Q3 Mentoring report dated 4/4/2022 captured mentoring of LLGs staff on environmental mainstreaming, preparation of good situation analysis among others.</p> <p>Q4 Mentoring report dated May/June 2022 captured mentoring of LLGs staff on concepts of PBS to the LLG TPC leadership as a new planning framework among others.</p> | 2 |
| | | Score 2 or else score 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

Support supervision/mentoring and monitoring reports for the previous FY were discussed in TPC meetings as evidenced below:

Q2 Mentoring report dated 20/10/2021 was discussed in TPC meeting held on 8/2/2022 Agenda 5 under Min. No. 05/DTPC08/02/2022

Q2 Monitoring report dated 17/12/2021 was discussed in TPC meeting held on 22/12/2021 Agenda 7 under Min. No. BDLGDTPC7/21/DEC/2021. Resolved on need for continuous training of Parish Chiefs on data collection and analysis.

Q4 Mentoring report dated May/June 2022 was discussed in TPC meeting held on 28/9/2022 Agenda 6 under Min. No.06/DTPC 28/9/2022 where it was noted that capacity gaps on PBS reporting had been addressed.

Q1 Monitoring report dated 14/1/2022 was discussed in TPC meeting held on 8/2/2022 and noted that some projects were behind schedule.

Q2 & Q3 Monitoring reports dated 13/5/2022 & 28/7/2022 respectively were discussed in TPC meeting of 24/5/2022 Agenda 6 under Min. No. 6 TPC.24th May2022 and noted that all projects were on course except for health projects which had been handed over to UPDF Engineering Brigade.

Q4 Monitoring report dated 28/7/2022 was discussed in TPC meeting of 5/8/2022 Agenda 4 Min. No. 03/DTPC 5TH AUGUST 2022 and noted that all projects had been completed except for health which were to be undertaken by UPDF Engineering Brigade but who had not yet reported on site.

Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

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

The LG maintained an IFMIS assets register as indicated below:

1.Assets register for Land & buildings:

- District Headquarter land Plot no. 425 Headquarters land
- Kitayunjwa Sc land Plot 199
- Kitayunjwa Seed SS Plot 246
- District Administration block
- Story Administration block
- Planning Unit
- District Administration block
- Nankandulo HC IV

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

- Toyota Prado LG0021-043 for CAO
- Isuzu Double Cabin LG0017-043 for LC V Chairperson
- Motor Grader UG 1990W
- Wheel loader UG 2035W

3. Assets General:

- ICT Equipment for Planning Unit
- ICT Equipment: for Production department.
- ICT Equipment for Health department.

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

The District Annual BoS for the previous FY dated 30/8/2022 was available with recommendations on page 19 of the report to board off the following unserviceable assets among others:

- Squeezer at District Hospital
- Projector
- Ford Drifter double Cabin UAA 7601 for NAADs
- Nissan hard body D/C UG 2222M
- Old Chairs in all departments (Need for maintenance)

The LG made a decision to implement the BoS recommendation by maintaining all old chairs in Finance, Audit and other departments.

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

The District had a functional Physical Planning Committee which comprised of 13 (thirteen) members with the 4 sets of minutes duly submitted to MoLHUD (Jinja Mzo) as indicated below:

Q1 PPC minutes for the meeting held on 16/9/2021 attended by 13 members were submitted to Jinja Mzo on 30/9/2021.

Q2 PPC minutes for the meeting held on 22/10/2021 attended by 13 members were submitted to Jinja Mzo on 30/3/2022.

Q3 PPC minutes for the meeting held on 16/3/2022 attended by 13 were submitted to Jinja Mzo on 30/3/2022

Q4 PPC minutes for the meeting held on 12/5/2022 attended by all members were submitted to Jinja Mzo on 25/5/2022.

The PPC comprised of 13 (thirteen) members appointed by CAO as indicated below:

1. CAO Chaiperson

2. District Physical Planner appointed as Secretary on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

3. District Staff Surveyor appointed as a member on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

4. District Roads Engineer appointed as a member on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

5. District Education Officer appointed on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

6. District Agricultural Officer appointed on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

7. District Water Officer appointed on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

8. District Community Development Officer appointed a member on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

9. District Health Officer appointed as a member on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

10. Municipal Town Clerk – Kamuli appointed as a member on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

11. District Environment Officer appointed as a member on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

12. District Natural Resources Officer appointed on 11/6/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

13. Physical Planner in Private Practice (Mr. Lubanga Salimu) appointed on 22/7/2019 Ref. CR/156/1

Plans Registration Book was in place with a record of 7 (seven) plans submitted in FY 2021/2022.

The District Physical Development Plan was not in place but had Kasambira growth area at the level of mapping.

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

d. For DDEG financed projects;

Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:

Score 2 or else score 0

The District conducted a desk appraisal on all the 10 (ten) DDEG funded projects for the previous FY between as per report dated 29/3/2021. The appraisal identified that the DDEG prioritized projects were derived from the LGDP III and were all eligible for funding under DDEG as indicated below:

1. Partial completion of Northern Wing of the new Administration block was derived from LGDP III as on page 135 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 Code 148272 of the implementation guidelines.
2. Renovation of DSC block was derived from LGDP III as on page 132 and was eligible under DDEG funding as on page 7 Coded 148272 of the implementation guidelines.
3. Procurement of furniture was derived from LGDP III as on page 135 and as eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 Coded 148272 of the implementation guidelines.
4. Reconnection of generator power between Administration block and Planning Unit block was derived from LGDP III as on page 135 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 Coded 148272 of the implementation guidelines.
5. Expansion of laboratory at Namwendwa HCIV was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 Coded 088283 of the implementation guidelines.
6. Construction of antenatal shade at Kamuli General Hospital was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 8 Coded 088182 of the implementation guidelines.
7. Procurement of X-ray for Kamuli General Hospital was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 8 Coded 088104 of the implementation guidelines.
8. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Namaira SDA P/s was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 Coded 078181 of the implementation guidelines.
9. Demarcation and Titling of 4 parcels of Institutional land was derived from LGDP III as on page 165 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 8 Coded 098310 of the implementation guidelines.
10. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Buwala P/s was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 Code 078181 of the implementation guidelines.

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG conducted field appraisal as per report dated 11/1/2022 to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs as evidenced in the 3 sampled projects below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partial completion of Northern Wing of the new Administration block complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report. .2. Renovation of DSC block complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as indicated on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report. 3. Construction of antenatal shade at Kamuli General Hospital complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report. | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The LG developed 18 (eighteen) project profiles with costings for all investments as on pages 170-184 in the AWP for the FY 2022/2023 and also discussed by DTPC as evidenced below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of 2 SEED SS at an estimated cost of Shs. 4.6bn as per page 170 of LGDP III. 2. Construction of primary schools' infrastructure at an estimated cost of Shs. 2,663,500,000 as on page 173 of LGDP III. 3. Upgrading of Bubago HC II -HC III at an estimated cost of Shs. 750m as on page 173 of LGDP III. <p>The project profiles for FY 2022/2023 were discussed by DTPC on 18/3/2022 Agenda 6 Min. No.6 TPC 18TH March 2022.</p> | 1 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>LG had screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures were required before being approved for construction using checklists evidenced by the following screening forms by the DEO & DCDO as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E&S Screening form for the proposed completion of new administration block in phase four right wing by the DEO&DCDO on 02/07/2021 • E&S Screening form for the proposed renovation of Kamuli district Service Commission by the DEO&DCDO on 08/10/2021 • E&S Screening form for the proposed rehabilitation of 3 classroom block at Guwula P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 30/09/2022 | 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 | DLG had evidence that all infrastructure projects for FY22/23 to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan signed on 04th July 2022 by the DCAO. The project Was; • Sectional completion of the district administration Block. On Page 1 SN.1 of the approved annual procurement plan. | 1 |
| | | Score 1 or else score 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 | There was no DDEG projects for FY 2022/23 contained in the procurement plan; No submissions of infrastructure projects had been done as of the date of Assessment. | 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: | The LG had no project implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines for DDEG Projects | 0 |
| | | Score 1 or else 0 | | |

13

Procurement, contract management/execution
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG were implemented well, with no major defects seen. The following activities were done.

Proposed renovation of the district service commission phase II.

- Ceiling replacement
- Internal & External Painting of wall and doors and windows
- Renovation of Splash aprons
- Painting of facia boards and replacing of damaged ones
- Renovation of some floor parts
- Construction of the ramp.

The works were done perfectly as seen on site, there were no cracks on the floor and splash aprons, painting was done perfectly and ceiling well replaced and painted.

Completion of New admin block Phase II;

- Exterior facing Bricks
- Painting Floor tiling
- New splash aprons
- Door and window fittings
- Plumbing works and water tank
- Construction of septic tank
- Plastering and rendering
- External doors.

All the above works were done perfectly with no defects.

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

From the reviewed site supervision reports sampled below, there was evidence of joint technical supervision of infrastructure projects;

- Supervision reports dated 28th Feb 2022, 29th April 2022 and 29th April 2022 on completion of Administration block.
- Supervision reports stating 100% Completion dated 06th Jun 2022 on renovation of the district service commission.

all those reports were from the DE, with no signed E&S forms from the Environmental officer and the CDO

0

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0 | <p>The LG had evidence of Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes in sampled project examples:</p> <p>KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00065. Proposed renovation of the district service phase II by Funika Technical Services LTD as a contractor; payment request made by the contractor on 10th Jun 2022 and approved by the DE on 10th Jun 2022 and subsequent payment of 25,343,322/= initiated and timely paid on 23rd Jun 2022 under Voucher No. 44517807.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00021. Proposed renovation of the district service Phase 1 by Funika Technical Services LTD as a contractor; payment request made by the contractor on 28th Feb 2022 and approved by the DE on 02nd Mar 2022 and subsequent payment of 17,476,457/= initiated and timely paid on 13th April 2022 under Voucher No. 42675577. <p>KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00001. Completion of New admin block Phase Iv; by Inerbuild Technical Services Ltd 1st payment request made by the contractor on 11th Nov 2021 and approved by the DE on 16th Nov 2021 and subsequent payment of 127,403,087/= initiated and timely paid on 06th Dec 2021 under Voucher No. 40342808. 2nd payment request made by the contractor on 18th Jan 2022 and approved by the DE on 18th Jan 2022 and subsequent payment of 12,422,493/= initiated and timely paid on 20th Jan 2022 under Voucher No. 41114474, 3rd payment request made by the contractor on 16th Mar 2022 and approved by the DE on 18th Mar 2022 and subsequent payment of 41,191,106/= initiated and timely paid on 06th April 2022 under Voucher No. 41114474,</p> <p>4th payment request made by the contractor on 14th Jun 2022 and approved by the DE on 17th Jun 2022 and subsequent payment of 6,833,504/= initiated and timely paid on 23rd Jun 2022 under Voucher No. 42654485.</p> | 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 | <p>From 3 procurement files, there was evidence to show that the LG had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA. Examples of project files reviewed alongside the contract register include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00065. Proposed renovation of the district service phase II by Funika Technical Services LTD as a contractor; approval of evaluation reports on 05th April 2022 Under MIN. KDCC29/2022/4 and contract agreement signed on 14th April 2022. • KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00021. Proposed renovation of the district service Phase 1 by Funika Technical Services LTD as a contractor; approval of evaluation reports on 05th April 2022 Under MIN. KDCC125/2021/8 and contract agreement signed on 09th Feb 2022. • KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00001. Completion of New admin block Phase II; by Interbuild Technical Services Ltd as a contractor; approval of evaluation reports on 27th Nov 2021 Under MIN. KDCC123/2021/4 and contract agreement signed on 29th Nov 2021. | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>LG had not designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance / complaints) in FY 2021/2022 as required.</p> <p>LG had not established a Central Grievance Redress Committee in FY 2021/2022 as required</p> | 0 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>LG had a specified system for Recording, investigating and responding to grievances evidenced by the Centralized Grievance Registration form Log as of 2018-2019</p> | 2 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>LG had publicized a notice of the existence of a GRC and the Grievance Focal Person on the district notice board by the Grievance Focal Person dated 23/11/2018, Ref: CR/159/1</p> | 1 |

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

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

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

1.Environment and climate change interventions.

LGDP III:

The following environmental/climate change intervention were captured on pages and 99-102 of the LGDP III:

1.Resoration of forests and tree cover by natural regeneration.

2.Maintain and restore clean, healthy and productive environment.

3.Reduce human and economic loss from hazards and disasters

AWP

Provision in the AWP for FY 2022/2023 was Shs.243,983,000 as on pages 98-106

BUDGET

Environment and climate change interventions were provided for in the approved budget with Shs. 243,983,000 as on pages 62-63

2.Social safeguards

LGDP III:

The following Social safeguards were captured on page 102:

1.Promotion of social protection, equality, human rights and sustainable working conditions'

2.Promotion of the vulnerable groups like women, children, the unemployed youth, internally displaced persons, the elderly, PWDs who are often marginalized and excluded from the benefits of economic growth.

AWP

Provision in the AWP for FY 2022/2023 was Shs. 1,554,425,000 as indicated on pages 107-123.

BUDGET

Provision for Social safeguards interventions in the approved budget was Shs. 1,554,425,000 was made as indicated on pages 64-65.

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 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 | The LG disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG implementation guidelines in the DTPC meeting attended by SAS, TCs, CDOs held on 9/3/2021 as indicated on the Agenda No. 7 under Min. No. 7 DTPC 9th /03/2021. Issues for dissemination included use of DDEG for infrastructure development at LLG levels among others. | 1 |
| | | score 1 or else 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: | LG had incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into BoQs for investments that were financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation as evidenced below; • Items F-J on page 1 of the BoQs for the proposed completion of Kamuli District Administration block with Procurement Reference: KAMU 517/WRKS/21-22/00001 signed 29/11/2021 • Items F-H on unspecified page of the BoQs for the proposed renovation of Kamuli District Service Commission with Procurement Reference: KAMU 517/WRKS/21-22/00065 signed 14/04/22 | 3 |
| | | score 3 or else score 0 | | |
| 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. | LG had no Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change | 3 |
| | | Score 3 or else score 0 | | |
| 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: | LG had proof that all projects were implemented on land where it had proof of ownership, access and availability as evidenced below; • Land title for Kamuli DLG Headquarters of P.O.Box 425, plot 425, block 10 at Kiwolera covering 12.6700 hectares issued on 28/02/2022 • Land title for Kamuli DLG (Mbulamuti Sub County Headquarters) of P.O.Box 88, plot 57, block (road) at Buwanana covering 12.1210 hectares issued on 25/09/2018 | 1 |
| | | Score 1 or else score 0 | | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0 | DEO and DCDO conducted quarterly not monthly support supervision and monitoring as required; for example; • E&S Monitoring report for quarter 4 proposed construction of DDEG projects by the DEO&DCDO on 16/06/2022 • E&S Monitoring report for quarter 3 proposed construction of DDEG projects by the DEO&DCDO on 30/03/2022 | 0 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0 | The E&S certifications were prepared and signed by the DEO and DCDO prior to executing the project contractor payments as evidenced below; • E&S Certification form of 178,649,582/= for the proposed completion of new administration block in phase four right wing by the DEO&DCDO on 13/06/2022 • E&S Certification form of 19,570,500/= for the proposed renovation of Kamuli district Service Commission by the DEO&DCDO on 19/07/2022 | 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 LG made monthly bank reconciliations for the previous FY up to date as indicated on the only one sampled account. Other LG monthly reconciliations like YLP Recovery and UWEP Recovery could not be printed due to IFMS failure at the time of assessment: 1.GENERAL FUND ACCOUNT (Stanbic Bank) JUNE 2022 Opening balance: Shs. was Shs.751,694 Closing balance as at 30/6/2022 was Shs.2,629,413 JULY 2022: Opening balance: Shs. 2,529,413 Balance as per cash book as at 31/7/2022: Shs. 54,779,306 AUGUST 2022: Opening balance: Shs. 54,779306 Closing balance as at 31/8/2022: Shs. 64,129, 404 | 2 |
|----|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG produced all the quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY as evidenced below:</p> <p>Q1 Internal audit report was produced on 23/11/2021 Ref. 252/2</p> <p>Q2 Internal audit report was produced on 26/1/2022 Ref. 252/2</p> <p>Q3 Internal audit report was produced on 26/4/2022 Ref. 252/2</p> <p>Q4 Internal audit report was produced on 27/7/2022 Ref. 252/2</p> | 2 |
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG through the quarterly internal audit reports (section of "Review of Previous Audit") of the previous FY provided information to the Chairperson and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY as evidenced below:</p> <p>It was only Q3 review of Q2 internal audit findings as reported in Q3 Internal audit report dated 26/4/2022 which provided a status that SFG Inventory was still lacking and that uncompleted Kitayunjwa SEED SS was not yet completed.</p> | 0 |
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>All the Quarterly Internal Audit Reports for the previous FY were submitted to CAO and LGPAC as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 report was submitted to CAO on 25/4/2022 LGPAC on the same day of 15/3/2022 Ref. 252/2</p> <p>Q2 report was submitted to CAO and LGPAC on the same day of 25/4/2022 Ref. 252/2</p> <p>Q3 report was submitted to CAO and LGPAC on the same day of 9/6/2022 Ref. 252/2</p> <p>Q4 report was submitted to CAO and LGPAC on the same day of 29/7/2022 Ref. 252/2 as per records in the LG.</p> <p>However, there was no evidence of review and follow-up of all the 4 quarterly internal audit reports by LGPAC.</p> | 1 |

Local Revenues

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 18 | <p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The LG original budget for local revenue was Shs. 545,891,000 as on page 13 of the draft AFS for the previous FY.</p> <p>Actual local revenue collected was Shs. 448,663,068 as on page 13 of the draft AFS for the previous FY.</p> <p>The budget realization was</p> <p>-17.8% above the recommended limit of -10%.</p> <p>Workings: $448,663,068/545,891,000 \times 100 = 82.2\%$</p> <p>$82.2\% - 100\% = -17.8\%$</p> <p>The low local revenue performance was attributed to Covid -19 prolonged lock down which affected business licenses.</p> | 0 |
| 19 | <p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. | <p>The OSR collected in the previous FY but one (excluding sale of assets) was Shs.408,037,983 as on page 34 of the audited AFS for FY 2020/2021 whereas actual OSR collected in the previous FY was Shs.448,663,068 as on page 13 of the draft AFS registering an increase of Shs. 40,625,085 representing 10%</p> <p>Workings: $448,663,068 - 408,037,983 = 40,625,085$ (increase)</p> <p>$40,625,085/408,037,983 \times 100 = 10\%$</p> <p>The increase was due to relaxation of Covid -19 restrictions.</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>Not all LG local revenue collected was eligible for sharing with LLGs e.g. Property Tax and Bidding fees were ineligible. However, LST was eligible and the total collected as on page 34 of the draft AFS for the previous FY was Shs 131,757,322 and was shared with LLGs as evidenced below:</p> <p>The LG remitted Shs.42,461,969 representing 32.2% to the LLGs below the required 65% as evidenced below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shs. 21,856,999 remitted to LLGs on 20/9/2021 2. Shs. 16,482,080 remitted to LLGs on 26/10/2021 3. Shs. 562,890 remitted to Namwendwa Sc on 17/12/2021 4. Shs. 2,500,500 remitted to Bulopa Sc on 14/1/2022 5. Shs. 1,059,500 to Bulopa Sc on 24/3/2022 <p>TOTAL: Shs.42,461,969</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 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 awarded contracts and amounts for FY 2021/2022 were available, endorsed by CAO and Senior Procurement Officer, published on the procurement Notice Board in front the Council Hall. The sampled awarded contracts were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kidiki P/S was awarded to Zach Construction (U) Ltd at 79,815,141/= display date was 17th Mar 2022. • Construction of a 2-Unit staff house block at Kasambira SDA P/S was awarded to Bazira consultants Ltd at 75,573,425/= display date was 22nd Dec 2021 • Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kinu P/S was awarded to Pakasa Construction & General Contractors Ltd at 79,547,571/= display date was 29th Sep 2021 | 2 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LGPA results for 2020 as indicated hereunder were posted on the LG Website; www.kamuli.go.ug and the LG Notice board on 24/5/2022.</p> <p>Crosscutting MCs: 35%</p> <p>Education MCs: 70%</p> <p>Health MCs: 34%%</p> <p>Water & Env. MCs: 56%</p> <p>MSI: 70%</p> <p>Cross cutting PMs: 50%</p> <p>Education PMs: 57%</p> <p>Health PMs: 56%</p> <p>Water & Env. PMs:56%%</p> <p>MSI PMs: 7%</p> <p>Overall Ranking: 49th</p> | 2 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG used RDC air time.to conduct a series of sensitization talk shows on KBS FM and SSEBO FM on 4/7/2021, 14/7/2021 and 15.5/2022 respectively providing a feed back to the community on the status of activity implementation on cooperative development, implementation of PDM and home-based care approach.</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>No evidence was availed at the time of assessment</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

The LG did not have cases of alleged fraud and corruption to cause IGG investigations and reporting during the previous FY.

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 | <p>The LG PLE pass rate was 2 % between 2020 and 2019;</p> <p>In 2020 a total of 5853 pupils passed in Division 1, 2 and 3 out 9912 who sat accounting to 59%</p> <p>In 2019 a total of 5615 pupils passed in division 1,2 and 3 out of 9843 who sat accounting to 57%</p> <p>% Pass rate =59% - 57% = 2%</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 | <p>The LG UCE pass rate increased by 11% between 2020 and 2019;</p> <p>In 2020 a total of 1454 students passed in Division 1, 2 and 3 out of 3192 accounting to 45%</p> <p>In 2019 a total of 1233 students passed in division 1, 2 and 3 out of 3557 students accounting to 34%</p> <p>Percentage increase = 45% - 34%= 11%</p> | 3 |
| 2 | <p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p> | <p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 | Not Applicable | 0 |

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

a) If the education development grant has
been used on eligible activities as defined
in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else
score 0

The Education development grant of Shs
2,129,521,000 in the approved 2021/22
financial year budget on page 10 was
spent on projects which were in line with
sector guidelines on page 24 which
clearly stated the eligible projects that
included; construction of sanitary facilities,
classrooms among others.

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

1. Construction of a 2-classroom block
at Kidiki P/S at Shs 80,000,000
2. Construction of a 2-classroom block
Kinu P/S at Shs 80,000,000
3. Construction of a 2-classroom block
Izanyiro P/S at Shs 80,000,000
4. Construction of a 3-classroom block
& lightening arrester at Iyingo P/S Shs
92,368,000
5. Construction of a five stance vip
latrine at Kayembe P/S at Shs 23,000,000
6. Construction of a five stance vip
latrine at Namaira P/S at Shs 23,000,000
7. Construction of a five stance vip
latrine at Busandla P/S at Shs 23,000,000

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0

The DEO, Environment Officer, and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY as evidenced in the 3 sampled contracts below:

1. Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Mpakitanyi P/s by M/s Bensa Investment Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs.79,894,660 on 13/4/2022

DEO certified works for payment on 29/4/2022

DE certified certificate No. 1 dated 29/4/2022 for payment of Shs.67,695,608 on 24/14/2022

Environment officer and CDO certified the works on the same day of 9/5/2022

The Contractor was paid Shs. 67,695,608 on 12/5/2022 vide EFT No. 3277580.

2. Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Kasambira SDA P/s by M/s Bazira Consultant Ltd.

DEO certified works for payment on 17/6/2022

DE certified Completion certificate dated 17/6/2022 for payment of Shs.64,057,474.10 on 17/6/2022

Environment officer and CDO certified the works for payment on the same day of 20/6/2022

The Contractor was paid Shs. 23,567,316 on 23/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44517855.

3. Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Izaniro P/s in Kisozi Sunder SFG by M/s G.K.K General Contractors & Civil Engineers Ltd.

DEO certified works for payment on 13/1/2022

DE certified certificate No. 2 dated 12/1/2022 for payment of Shs.36,269,494 on 12/1/2022

Environment officer and CDO certified the works for payment on the same day of 18/1/2022

The Contractor was paid Shs. 37,785,385 on 20/1/2022 vide EFT No. 41114490.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled projects were as follows:</p> <p>Variation = 100% ((Contract Price – Engineers Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00015 Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kidiki P/S – was budgeted at UGX 80,000,000/= actual contract price was 79,815,141/= with a variation of UGX 184,859/= represented by - 0.23% • KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00007; Construction of a 2-Unit staff house block at Kasambira SDA P/S – was budgeted at UGX 70,000,000/= actual contract price was 75,573,425/= with a variation of UGX 5,573,425/= represented by +7.96% • KAMU 517/wks/21-22/00005 Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kidiki P/S – was budgeted at UGX 80,000,000/= actual contract price was 79,547,517/= with a variation of UGX - 452,483/= represented by -0.56% <p>In conclusion,</p> <p>The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual.</p> | 2 |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | <p>There was no SEED School constructed in FY 2021/2022.</p> | 1 |
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 | <p>The LG had recruited 1592 teachers against the required 1920 as per the staff ceiling for the 164 primary schools which represented 82.9%</p> <p>1592/1920*100 = 82.9% staffing</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 | <p>91% of the schools in the LG met the met the basic minimum requirements and minimum standards set by DES.</p> <p>Of the 164 primary schools and 12 secondary school in the LG assets register</p> <p>a total of 150 schools had Classes accommodating each learning group from P1 to P7</p> <p>$150/164*100=91\%$</p> | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>There was accurate reporting on teachers observed on the deployment list 2022 and the corresponding staff lists at the three sampled schools as indicated below;</p> <p>Nawansaso P/S had 19 teachers on its staff list as witnessed on the deployment list, the teachers were found present at the school as observed in the arrival book on the page dated 24th November 2022 and they included; Mukyala Jesca, Mutabiro Edward, Mutasa John and others.</p> <p>Balawoli P/S teachers on the school staff list were 25 as on the deployment list, these had all signed in the school teacher attendance book dated 24th November 2022 and they included; Mwanga Ronald, Isabirye Stephen, Ecakara Peter and Others.</p> <p>Kasambira P/S had 21 teachers on the school staff list as on the deployment list. All teachers had signed in the attendance book as indicated below; Bakisasa Johnson, Mbooli Wilson, Mulumbi Paul and others.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>There was accuracy in reporting on infrastructure in the LG assets register as evidenced in the 3 sampled schools below;</p> <p>Kasambira P/S had on ground 16 classrooms, 7 latrine stances, 387 desks and 10 staff teacher houses</p> <p>Balawoli P/S had 16 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 397 desks and 4 teacher accommodation</p> <p>Nawansuso P/S had on ground 13 classrooms, 19 latrine stances, 258 desks</p> <p>All these infrastructures aligned well with the assets register report.</p> | 2 |
| 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"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 | <p>All the three sampled Primary Schools submitted their annual reports in compliance with MOES Annual Budgeting and Reporting Guidelines indicated below;</p> <p>Naminage Primary school submitted its annual report on 10th August 2021 signed by the Head teacher Muwereza Christopher and Rev Kawangwa the SMC</p> <p>Kasambira Primary school submitted its annual report on 2nd December 2021 signed by the head teacher Bakisasa Johnson and SMC Kasamizi M.K</p> <p>Naluwoli Ps submitted the report on 30th November 2021 signed by Oboth Valentine Jamwa the Head master and Bamutegeirerwa Ronald the SMC</p> | 4 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 | <p>All the 3 sampled primary schools in the LG that included Nawansuso, Kasambira and Balawoli P/S had School Improvement plans for 2022 in place signed by the Head teachers of the respective schools, School management Committee Chair persons and approved by the DEO.</p> <p>$3/3 * 100 = 100\%$</p> <p>In line with implementing the Sips especially in the area of improving academic performance in schools, on 29th May SMCs and PTA members of various primary schools were oriented about their roles and responsibilities in ensuring effective performance of schools at Kinu Primary School.</p> | 4 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 | <p>The list of schools on PBS and OTIMS corresponded well with each having 164 primary and 12 USE schools which was 100%</p> | 4 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>The district budgeted Shs 13,309,126,665 for 160 headteachers and 1592 teachers in 164 primary schools of the District approved budget 2022/23 FY</p> | 4 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

Teachers had been deployed as required by the sector guidelines with a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per class for schools with classes reaching P7 as evidenced from the sampled 3 schools below;

Balawoli P/S had a headteacher Mwangi Ronald and 24 teachers deployed.

Kasambira P/S had a head teacher Bakisasa Johnson and 21 teachers

Nawansaso P/S had a head teacher Mukyala Jesca Olivia and 18 teachers deployed as required.

3

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,

score: 1 else, score: 0

Teacher deployment data for the year 2022 had been publicized in all the sampled 3 Primary schools Nawansaso P/S had 19 staff with 7 male and 12 female, Balawoli P/S had 25 staff with 12 female and 13 male and Kasambira Primary School had 21 staff with 8 male and 13 female on the staff list.

1

8

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence that all Primary School H/T were appraised. However, majority had their appraisal done after the time frame as shown below;

1. Mpehera Sarah (Bugondha P/S) was appraised on 22/11/2022
2. Babirye Harriet (Galinadha P/S) was appraised on 12/08/2022
3. Aliyinza Angella (Bulogo P/S) was appraised on 13/12/2021
4. Wambuzi Samson (Ndalike P/S) 31/10/2022
5. Nakate Reginah (Kinu P/S),
6. Mutalya Grace (Nahango P/S)
7. Lyagoba Fred (Kayembe P/S)
8. Mugala Edith (Makoka P/S)
9. Erigya Moses (Kyeeya P/S) were all appraised on 31/10/2022
10. Kasuswa Rebecca (Busuuli P/S) had only a performance agreement dated 30/05/2022

0

8

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

During the assessment, it was difficult to confirm if they were appraised since the HRM informed me that their appraisal was being handled by MoPS and not at the DLG

0

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that all Education Department staff were appraised. However, some were appraised after the time frame.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bamwange Florence (Sports officer) was appraised on 04/07/2022 2. Lyada Dennis (Inspector) was appraised on 07/07/2022 3. Mulondo Simon (Education Officer) was appraised on 30/06/2022 4. Kyamwine Mabel (Data Clerk) was appraised on 30/06/2022 5. Kisa Alitwala Annet (Inspector) and 6. Nabiryo Robinah (Office Typist) lacked the current appraisal forms for FY 2021/2022 | 0 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

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

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>The district spent Shs 64,939,729 on monitoring and inspection of 164 primary schools Q4 report 2021/22 FY which was in line with the sector guidelines page 14 that stipulate that at a minimum, inspection must be allocated a fixed rate of Uganda shillings 4 million per LG, plus Shs 112,000 (3 inspections at Shs 37,333) per school for the 3 terms.</p> | 2 |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p> | <p>The LG was unable to trace the dates of quarterly uploading of the cash limits and warrants for school's capitation in the previous FY due to IFMS failure at the time of assessment rendering it not possible to establish warranting of school's capitation within 5 working days as required.</p> <p>IFMS was off through the two days of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>The LG communicated all the capitation transfers for the Q3 and Q4 of the previous FY to schools as evidenced below but compliance within 3 working days could not be established due to the LG failure to trace the dates of uploading the cash limits on IFMS at the time of assessment:</p> <p>Q3 UPE Capitation grant transfer of Shs.608,937,333 was communicated to all the 164 primary schools on 11/1/2022 Ref.CR/163/1.</p> <p>Q4 UPE Capitation grant transfer of Shs. 608,937,333 was communicated to all the164 primary schools on 12/5/2022 Ref. CR/163/1</p> <p>There were no capitation releases in Q1 and Q2 as schools were closed during the Covid-19 lock down.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 | <p>The LG had an inspection plan for 2021 /2022 FY drawn to cover a total of 164 primary schools and 6 secondary school in Kamuli District</p> <p>Meetings to plan for school inspections had been organized</p> <p>On 2nd July 2021 under minute 3 /inspection work plan/2021 in which schools had been allocated to inspectors by sub county With Mr Waibi Joseph getting Bulopa sub county and Ms Bamwange Florence being assigned Magogo and Kisozi sub counties.</p> | 2 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 | <p>All the 164 primary schools had been inspected in each of the three required school terms accounting to 100% total inspection as indicated below;</p> <p>In the inspection reports of term 1, 2 of 2021/22 FY a total of 164 schools had been inspected out of the required 164 inspections for the 164 primary schools in each term</p> <p style="text-align: center;">$164/164 * 100 = 100\%$ inspection rate</p> <p>In term 3 2021, 164 schools had been inspected.</p> <p>In term 1 2022, 164 schools had been inspected</p> <p>In term 2 2022, 164 schools had been inspected.</p> | 2 |

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

Inspection reports had been discussed by the Education department on 22nd May 2022 in minute 4/inspection/2022 The issues arising from inspection involved lack of enough pit latrines in schools and Lack of adequate furniture in schools.

To these, a recommendation to lobby development partners for funding, and mobilizing learners back to school was reached min5/ inspection /2022

On 22nd February 2022, in Minute 4/ inspection/ 2022 the issues discussed involved; Inadequate housing facilities for teachers, uncooperative parents towards supporting schools

The resolutions on mobilization of learners had been implemented on 30th April 2022 at Kinu Bukose in Bunyirwa LC1.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Inspection findings had been presented to the three sampled and visited primary schools that included, Balawoli Nawansaso and Kasambira P/S

On 5th March 2022 inspection findings had been shared with Kasambira P/S these included the need to address key school concerns with the SMC.

On 1st June 2022 inspection findings like inadequate seats for learners had been shared with Nawansaso Primary

On 9th March 2022 inspection findings that included teachers need to undertake lesson planning. Had been shared with Balawoli P/S

However only Term 3 inspection report 2022 had been submitted and received by DES on 26th September 2021

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 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 (Finance, Planning & Administration Committee) met and discussed service delivery issues in the previous FY as evidenced below:</p> <p>Finance, Planning & Administration Committee committee met on 8/2/2022 Agenda 5 under Min. No. 11/February/2022 discussed and resolved on inspection of schools to establish their status in preparation for rehabilitation, transfer of head teachers and deputy head teachers, repair of vehicles for field work in education department, impregnated and the mothers be allowed back to school among others.</p> <p>Finance, Planning & Administration Committee committee met on 13/5/2022 Agenda 5 under Min. No. 18/May/2022 discussed and resolved to withhold salaries for teachers who resist transfers, planning to rebuild some of the collapsing schools in FY 2022/2023, rehabilitation of Henry Van one of the dormitories which got burnt at Bupadhengo P/s the among others</p> <p>Council meeting held on 24/2/2022 Agenda 6 (a) under Min.N34/KDLC o. which approved visiting Bupadhengo P/s to establish the cause of the fire outbreak in the school, completion of the infrastructure at Kitayunjwa SEED SS among others.</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>Activities of Mobilization to attract and retain children at school for the year 2022 had been conducted on 30th April 2022 at Kinu Primary School when the DEO called upon parents to continuously support their children by bringing them to school</p> <p>On 14th – 17th September 2021 during a talk show on Ssebo FM Kamuli.</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*

An up to-date assets register was available for the year 2022 listing all assets within all the sampled 3 schools in line with format 1 of the Education Sector guidelines.

Balawoli Primary School had 397 desks, 14 classrooms, 21 Latrines and 5 teacher accommodation.

Kasambira Primary School had 387 desks, 16 classrooms, 7 latrines and 12 teacher accommodations.

Nawansaso Primary School had 258 desks, 13 classrooms, 19 Latrines and 1 teacher accommodations.

The facilities met the basic requirements since every school had at least a class for each learning group, latrine stances that could cater for both male and female separately and a staff accommodation on ground.

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 District conducted a desk appraisal on all the 9 (nine) education sector grant funded projects for the previous FY as per report dated 29/3/2021 Ref. CR/103/1.

The desk appraisal identified that the education sector prioritized projects were derived from the LGDP III and eligible for funding either under DDEG or sector grants as evidenced below:

1. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Busandha P/s was derived from LGDP III as on page 130 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 Code 078181 of the implementation guidelines.

2. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at was derived Namaira SDA P/s from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for funding under DDEG funding as on page 7 Coded 078181 of the implementation guidelines.

3. Construction a 2-classroom block at Bulimira P/s was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for education sector development grant funding.

4. Construction of a 4-classroom block at Izanyiro P/s was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for education sector development grant funding.

5. Construction of a 4-calssroom block at Kinu P/s was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for education sector development grant funding as on page 31 of the budget.

6. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Buwala P/s was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for education sector development grant funding.

7. Construction of a twin teachers' house at Mpakitonyi P/s was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for education sector development grant funding

8. Construction of a laboratory at Kagumba and Nabwigulu SEED schools were derived from LGDP III as on page 130 and was eligible for education sector development grant funding.

9. Construction of SEED schools at Kagumba and Nabwigulu were derived from LGDP III as on page 130 and was eligible for education sector development grant funding.

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p> | <p>The LG conducted field appraisal as per report dated 11/1/2022 to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs as evidenced in the 3 sampled projects below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Namaira SDA P/s complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report. 2. Construction of a 4-classroom block at Izanyiro P/s complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report. 3. Construction of seed schools at Kagumba and Nabwigulu complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report. | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was Evidence that the LG Education department had budgeted for SEED Secondary Schools and ensured that, the planned infrastructure projects were approved and incorporated into the procurement plan for the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>As per the copy of the consolidated approved annual procurement plan (page 3 Sn. 36) approved by the CAO on 04th July 2022;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nabirumba and Kagumba SEED Secondary schools were planned for, approved and incorporated. | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was no school infrastructure that was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General. Some of the projects approved by the contracts committee included;</p> <p>Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kidiki P/S at 79,815,141/=</p> <p>Construction of a 2-Unit staff house block at Kasambira SDA P/S at 75,573,425/=</p> <p>Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kidiki P/S at 79,547,517/=</p> <p>The cost of each of the projects was below the threshold of 200m/= and therefore did not require clearance by the Solicitor General.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | 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> | There was evidence of an established Project Implementation team, appointment made on 08th Oct 2021 by the CAO, but the team appointed was not according to the guidelines in the manual. Below was the Project implementation team appointed for FY 2021/22 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mufumba Daniel (DE) • Musenero Richard (DPO) • Dr. Duku Fred (DHO) • Waibi Joseph (DEO) | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i> | There was no SEED School constructed in FY 2021/2022. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | There was no SEED School constructed in FY 2021/2022. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | There was no evidence that the LG carried out joint technical supervision of works for Education infrastructure projects by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs. | 0 |

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, *score: 1, else score: 0*

The Education sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes in the previous FY as evidenced in the 3 sampled contracts below:

1. Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Mpakitonyi P/s by M/s Bensa Investment Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs.79,894,660 on 13/4/2022

DEO certified works for payment on 29/4/2022

DE certified certificate No. 1 dated 29/4/2022 for payment of Shs.67,695,608 on 24/4/2022

Environment officer and CDO certified the works on the same day of 9/5/2022

The Contractor was paid Shs. 67,695,608 on 12/5/2022 vide EFT No. 3277580 within 29 days.

2. Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Kasambira SDA P/s by M/s Bazira Consultant Ltd.

DEO certified works for payment on 17/6/2022

DE certified Completion certificate dated 17/6/2022 for payment of Shs.64,057,474.10 on 17/6/2022 within 6 days.

Environment officer and CDO certified the works for payment on the same day of 20/6/2022

The Contractor was paid Shs. 23,567,316 on 23/6/2022 vide EFT No. 44517855.

3. Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Izaniri P/s in Kisozi Sunder SFG by M/s G.K.K General Contractors & Civil Engineers Ltd.

DEO certified works for payment on 13/1/2022

DE certified certificate No. 2 dated 12/1/2022 for payment of Shs.36,269,494 on 12/1/2022

Environment officer and CDO certified the works for payment on the same day of 18/1/2022

The Contractor was paid Shs. 37,785,385 on 20/1/2022 vide EFT No. 41114490 within 8 days

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i> | The LG Education department submitted its procurement plan on 08th April 2021 in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the Procurement Unit. | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i> | There was no SEED School constructed in FY 2021/2022. | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework. <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i> | Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, <i>score: 3, else score: 0</i> | LG had no grievance recorded under education sector for FY 2018/2022 by the time of assessment but the grievance log book was available as of 2018/2019 | 3 |
|----|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery. <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i> | Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i> | Environmental guidelines had been issued to all the three sampled schools on 10th August 2021. the key issues included management of environmental issues in schools through panting grass, tree planting in schools. | 3 |
|----|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i> | <p>LG had a costed ESMP incorporated in the BoQs, for example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Items C-H of the BoQs for the proposed construction of a 2 classroom block at Izanyiro P/S with Procurement Reference KAMU517/WRKS/21-22/00006 signed on 08/10/2021 • Items C-H of the BoQs for the proposed construction of a 23 classroom block at Guwula P/S with Procurement Reference KAMU517/WRKS/21-22/00027 signed on 11/02/2022 | 2 |
|----|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i> | LG had proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects by the time of assessment as evidenced below; • Consent Agreement for St Patrick Guwula P/S dated 21/03/2021 • Consent Agreement for Bugonda-Butaaga P/S dated 03/03/2021 | 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> | DEO and DCDO conducted quarterly not monthly support supervision and monitoring as required; for example; • E&S Monitoring report for quarter 4 proposed construction of DDEG projects by the DEO&DCDO on 16/06/2022 • E&S Monitoring report for quarter 3 proposed construction of DDEG projects by the DEO&DCDO on 30/03/2022 | 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> | The E&S certifications were prepared and signed by the DEO and DCDO prior to executing the project contractor payments as evidenced below; • Costed ESMP of 6,180,000/= for the proposed construction of a 3 in 1 classroom block at Izaanhiro P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 13/09/2021 • Costed ESMP of 5,030,000/= for the proposed rehabilitation of 3 classroom block at Bugondha-Butaaga P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 01/10/2021 • Costed ESMP of 5,030,000/= for the proposed rehabilitation of 3 classroom block at Guwula P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 30/09/2022 | 1 |

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|--|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 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"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 | <p>The sampled health facilities conducted deliveries as follows:</p> <p>FY2020/21</p> <p>Balawoli HC III 717</p> <p>Namwendwa HC IV1867</p> <p>Kitayunjwa HC III 440</p> <p>Total 3024</p> <p>FY2021/22</p> <p>Balawoli HC III 776</p> <p>Namwendwa HC III 2091</p> <p>Kitayunjwa HC III 646</p> <p>Total 3493</p> <p>Percentage change $(3493-3024)/3024*100 = 12\%$.</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>The LG budgeted Shs. 593,929,000 for Health development grant as indicated on page 30 of the approved budget for the previous FY which was spent on 16 prioritized investments as evidenced below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Construction of an Antenatal Shade at Kamuli General Hospital at a cost of Shs. 18m as on page 36 of the budget. 2.Completion (Retention) of the Maternity Ward at Kasambira HC II at a cost of Shs. 8m as on page 36 of the budget. 3.Expansion of laboratory at Namwendwa HC IV at a cost of Shs. 36m as on page 36. 4.Construction (Retention) of a latrine at Kinawampere HC II at a cost of Shs. 1m as on page 36 of the budget. 5.Construction of staff house at Kgumba HC III at a cost of Shs. 135m as on pages 36 of the budget. 6. Construction of a water borne toilet at Kamuli General Hospital at a cost of Shs. 36m as on page 36 of the budget. | 2 |

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

1. Upgrade of Bubago HCII – HC III by M/s Skylight General Services Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 99,202,600 on 4/5/2022

DHO recommended for payment on 25/5/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 4 dated 20/5/2022 for payment of Shs.30,692,156 on 20/5/2022.

Certification by both the Environment officer and CDO was done on the same day of 3/5/2022.

The contractor was paid Shs. 61,840,185 on 30/5/2022 vide EFT No. 43716666.

2. Construction of a staff house at Kagumba HC III under Health department by M/s LUNGO Engineering Services Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs.62,682,376 on 17/6/2022

DHO recommend for payment on 17/6/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 1 dated 23/5/2022 on 25/5/2022 on 25/5/2022. Certification by Environment officer and CDO was done concurrently on 19/5/2022.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 55,975,362 on 7/6/2022 vide EFT No. 43801249.

3. Completion of Maternity Ward at Kasambira HC II in Bugulumba Sc by M/s LYANA Investment Ltd.

DE certified certificate No. 3 dated 19/4/2021 for payment of Shs.6,359,297.

DHO recommended for payment on 13/12/2021.

Certification by both Environment officer and CDO was done on the same day of 11/10/2021.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 5,678,852 on 16/3/2022 vide EFT No. 42165747.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The variation in the contract price and the Engineer's estimate of the sampled project was above +20% as evidenced below:</p> <p>KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00009 Construction of a 2 Unit staff house at Kagumba HC III. Budgeted at UGX 135,000,000/= actual contract price was 162,489,606/= with a variation of UGX -27,489,606/= represented by +20.4% which was above the recommended +20%</p> <p>In conclusion, the variation was beyond +20% by 0.4%.</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>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 | <p>The LG did not have HCII upgraded to HCIII</p> | 2 |
| 4 | <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 | <p>The LG recruited 330 out of 343 staff required for all HC IIIs and HC IVs as follows:</p> <p>Nakandulo HC IV 45 out of 48</p> <p>Namwendwa HC IV 48 out of 48</p> <p>Bulopa HC III 20 out of 19</p> <p>Bugulumbya HC III 16 out of 16</p> <p>Namasagali HC III 19 out of 19</p> <p>Nabirumba HC III 19 out of 19</p> <p>Balawoli HC III 19 out of 19</p> <p>Butansi HC III 20 out of 19</p> <p>Mbulamuti HC III 17 out of 19</p> <p>Bupadhengo HC III 21 out of 19</p> <p>Kiyunga HC III 11 out of 19</p> <p>Lulyambuzi HC III 20 out of 19</p> <p>Kagumba HC III 18 out of 19</p> <p>Kitayunjwa HC III 17 out of 19. The total recruited were 330 out of 343 = $330/343 \times 100 = 96\%$.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <p>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG did not have HCII upgraded to HCIII</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The information on positions of health workers filled was accurate. Namwendwa HC IV had 48 H/Ws on the list dated 1/11/2021 so was the District. Kitayunjwa HC III had 17 H/Ws on the list dated 11/11/2022 so was the District. Balawoli HC III had 19 H/Ws on the list FY2022/23 so was the District.</p> | 2 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The health facilities submitted the Annual Workplans FY2022/23 late as follows:</p> <p>Balowoli HC III 28/03/22</p> <p>Kitayunjwa HC III 5/03/22</p> <p>Namwendwa HC IV 10/03/22</p> | 2 |
|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> | <p>The health facilities did not submit the Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY2021/22.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | | |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> | <p>The health facilities did not submit their facility improvement plans.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 | | |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> | <p>Namwendwa HC IV submitted the monthly and quarterly reports timely. Kitayunjwa HC III submitted April 2022 report on the 9/05/2022 and Bulowoli HC III submitted May 2022 report on 8/06/2022 which was after the deadline. The facilities submitted as follows:</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 | <p>July 2021 Namwendwa HC IV 7/08/21 Kitayunjwa HC III 6/08/2021 Bulawoli HC III 4/08/2021 August 2021 Namwendwa 7/09/2021 Kitayunjwa HC III 6/09/2021 Bulawoli HC III 3/09/2021</p> | |

September 2021

Namwendwa HC IV 7/10/21

Kitayunjwa HC III

6/10/2021

Bulawoli HC III

4/10/2021

October 2021

Namwendwa HC IV 7/11/21

Kitayunjwa HC III

5/11/2021

Bulawoli HC III

7/11/2021

November 2021

Namwendwa HC IV 7/12/21

Kitayunjwa HC III

7/12/2021

Bulawoli HC III

7/12/2021

December 2021

Namwendwa HC IV 7/01/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

5/01/2022

Bulawoli HC III

7/01/2022

January 2022

Namwendwa HC IV 7/02/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

5/02/2022

Bulawoli HC III

4/02/2022

February 2022

Namwendwa HC IV 5/03/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

7/03/2022

Bulawoli HC III

4/03/2022

March 2022

Namwendwa HC IV 7/04/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

6/04/2022

Bulawoli HC III

7/04/2022

April 2022

Namwendwa HC IV 6/05/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

9/05/2022

Bulawoli HC III

5/05/2022

May 2022

Namwendwa HC IV 6/06/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

8/06/2022

Bulawoli HC III

8/06/2022

June 2022

Namwendwa HC IV 6/07/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

7/07/2022

Bulawoli HC III

7/07/2022

Quarterly 2021/2022

1st Quarter 2021/2022

Namwendwa HC IV 7/10/21

Kitayunjwa HC III

6/10/2021

Bulawoli HC III

4/10/2021

2nd Quarter 2021/2022

Namwendwa HC IV 7/01/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

5/01/2022

Bulawoli HC III

7/01/2022

3rd Quarter 2021/2022

Namwendwa HC IV 7/04/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

6/04/2022

Bulawoli HC III

7/04/2022

4th Quarter 2021/2022

6/07/22

Kitayunjwa HC III

7/07/2022

Bulawoli HC III

7/07/2022

6

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

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

The sampled health facilities submitted the RBF invoices as follows: Kitayunjwa HC III 22/07/2022, Namwendwa HC IV 22/07/2022 and Balawoli HC III 21/07/2022. This was after the deadline of 15/07/2022.

0

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0

The LG submitted RBF invoices for 18 health facilities to the MOH on the 23/07/2022.

1

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG compilation and submission of Q1 and Q4 Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY to the District Planner for consolidation was made after end of the first month of the following quarter as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 was submitted on 18/11/2021</p> <p>Q2 was submitted on 19/1/2022</p> <p>Q3 was submitted on 19/4/2022</p> <p>Q4 was submitted on 19/8/2022</p> | 0 |
| <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG did not develop the Performance Improvement Plans for the weakest performing health facilities.</p> | 0 |
| <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no plan to implement.</p> | 0 |
| <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG budgeted for 622 out of 698 health workers required at 13,274,314,000= which was 76%.</p> | 2 |
| <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |
| 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>a) Evidence that the LG has: ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had 17 out of 34 health facilities that had at least 75% of staff required. Some of the compliant facilities were: Kamuli General Hospital 107%, Nankandulo HC IV 94%, Namwendwa HC IV 100%, Bulopa HC III 105% and Bulumbya HC III 84%.</p> | 0 |
| <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |
| 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>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p> | <p>The health workers were working in the health facilities where they were deployed. Namwendwa HC IV had 48 H/Ws dated 1/11/2022 and were in the attendance register. Kitayunjwa HC III had 19 H/Ws dated 11/11/2022 and were in the attendance register. Bulowoli HC III had 19 H/Ws FY2022/23 and were in the attendance register.</p> | 3 |
| <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |
| 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>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>Namwendwa HC IV displayed 48 H/Ws dated 1/11/2022 on the notice board. Kitayunjwa HC III displayed 19 H/Ws dated 11/11/2022 on the notice board. Bulowoli HC III displayed 19 H/Ws FY2022/23 on the notice board.</p> | 2 |
| <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | | |

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

- a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:
 - i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that all 37 Health Facility Workers were appraised. However, some were appraised after the time frame as shown below;

1. Dr.Duku Fred (Namwandwa HC IV) was appraised on 22/07/2022
2. Muluka Agnes-Enrolled Midwife (Kinawampere) HC II was appraised on 30/06/2022
3. Mwebaza Esther (SCO) Bupadengo HC III lacked an updated appraisal form
4. Naika Vincent (SMCO) was appraised on 30/06/2022
5. Tenywa Paul (SCO) Lulyanguzi HC III was appraised on 17/06/2022
6. Kawala Harriet (ANO) Namaira HCII was appraised on 08/06/2022
7. Lamba Irene Hellen (Enrolled Nurse) Nabirumba HCIII was appraised on 2/07/2022
8. Babirekere Miria (ANO) was appraised on 30/06/2022
9. Gabula Karungi Olivia (ANO) Kasambira HCII was appraised on 13/06/2022
10. Igaga Herbert Richard (SCO) was appraised on 30/06/2022

0

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

- 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

There was evidence that Health Facility Workers were appraised. However, some were appraised after the time frame as shown below;

1. Namukose Flavia (Enrolled Midwife) Kamuli Gen Hospital was appraised on 13/07/2022
2. Waiswa Cipriano (Porter) Kamuli Gen Hospital was appraised on 7/07/2022
3. Mugaya Ronald (Porter) Nakandulo HC IV was appraised on 2/07/2022
4. Namwaya Suzan (Enrolled Nurse) Kamuli Gen Hospital was appraised on 17/07/2022
5. Arinaitwe Jacqueline (Enrolled Nurse) kamuli Gen Hospital was appraised on 5/07/2022
6. Kuberwa Brenda (Porter) Nabirumba HC III was appraised on 21/06/2022
7. Kisubi Sadat (Askari) Lulyambuzi HCIII was appraised on 30/06/2022
8. Elol Boniface (Askari) and
9. Balyegisawa Living (Askari) were all appraised on 30/06/2022

0

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>No evidence of corrective action taken.</p> | 0 |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG trained 30 H/Ws on 28/07-1/08/2021 in two groups of 15 people each at Bugabula Guest House and Kamuli General Hospital on Antenatal Care, Child birth and Postnatal Care. The participants were ADHO/MCH, 7 Nurses and 22 Midwives facilitated by PNO MOH and MO WHO.</p> | 1 |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The training of 30 H/Ws on 28/07/2021 in two groups of 15 H/Ws each at Bugabula Guest House and Kamuli General Hospital activity was entered into the computerized training database.</p> | 1 |

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the CAO communicated to the MOH about the health facilities receiving PHC NWR.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The LG allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District Health services was Shs. Shs. 99,927,277 remained at DHO's office.</p> <p>15% of Shs. 99,927,277 was Shs. 14,989, 091 for monitoring and supervision activities which included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Travel inland. 2. Fuel and lubricants. 3. Staff training | 2 |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG was unable to trace the dates of quarterly uploading of the cash limits and warrants for PHC NWR for HFs in the previous FY due to IFMS failure at the time of assessment rendering it not possible to establish warranting of PHC NWR within 5 working days as required.</p> <p>IFMS was off through the two days of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG communicated all the PHC NWR transfers for the previous FY to HFs as evidenced below but compliance within 5 working days could not be established</p> <p>at the time of assessment due to failure to trace the dates of uploading the cash limits on IFMS:</p> <p>Q1 PHC NWR transfer of Shs. 403,465,500 was communicated to all the 45 HFs on 20/10/2021.</p> <p>Q2 PHC NWR transfer of Shs. 402,374,250 was communicated to all the 45 HFs on 21/1/2022.</p> <p>Q3 PHC NWR transfer of Shs. 403,465,500 was communicated to all the 45 HFs on 2/2/2022</p> <p>Q4 PHC NWR transfer of Shs. 402,431,750 was communicated to all the 45 HFs on 12/5/2022</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG publicized the PHC NWR financial releases for the previous FY to all HFs as evidenced below but compliance within 5 working days could not be established due to the LG failure to trace the dates of uploading the cash limits on IFMS at the time of assessment:</p> <p>Q1 PHC NWR financial release of Shs. 403,465,500 was publicized to all HFs on 20/10/2021</p> <p>Q2 PHC NWR financial release of Shs. 402,374,250 was publicized to all HFs on 21/1/2022</p> <p>Q3 PHC NWR financial release of Shs. 403,465,500 was publicized to all HFs on 2/2/2022</p> <p>Q4 PHC NWR financial release of Shs. 402,431,750 was publicized to all HFs on 12/5/2022</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence provided to that effect.</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The meeting that sat on 21/10/21 at the DHOs office was attended by among others Senior Assistant Accountant, Chairperson Health and Water and PHRO. The one held on 9/12/21 at Bugabula Guest House was attended by officials from Hold Uganda, Family Connect and Baylor Uganda. The LG held a meeting on 2/03/22 which was attended officials from Family Connect, USAID, Baylor, District Planner, Secretary for Health. The fourth quarter FY2021/22 performance review meeting held on 20/06/2022 was attended by the Secretary for Health and a member from Kamuli Broadcasting Service.</p> | 1 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p> | <p>The LG supervised Namwendwa HC IV and Nankandulo HC IV (9-14/09/21, 8-21/12/21, 1-7/03/22 and 23-27/06/22)</p> <p>Kamuli General Hospital and Kamuli Mission Hospital were supervised (1-7/03/22 and 23-27/06/22).</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p> | <p>Bugabula South HSD supervised Kitayunjwa HC III, Bitansi HC III among others (22-25/11/21, 7-10/09/21, 7-10/06/22).</p> | 1 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The DHT recognized a vacancy of a SNO during supervision of Namwendwa HC IV on 26/11/21 who was posted there on 1/09/22.</p> | 1 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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>According to the report by the DMMS written on 7/04/22, Bulopa HC III, Buluya HC HC III and Namasagali HC III were supported in ordering, prescribing and storing of medicines and health supplies.</p> | 1 |
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The DHO'S budget was Shs. 99,927,277.</p> <p>The LG allocated 30% of Shs. 99,927,277 equivalent to Shs. 29,978,183 which was utilized on health promotions and prevention as indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Workshops and seminars 2. Fuel and travel | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 11 | Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities | b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0 | The DHE held a Radio Talk show on Safer sex practices including prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse among adolescents at NBS FM from 8-9.30PM on 21/04/22. The talk was attended by the DHE and AHE. | 1 |
|----|--|---|--|---|

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 11 | Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities | c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0 | The Senior Environmental Health Officer reported to CAO on 28/01/22 on the Community Led Total Sanitation follow up activities conducted in 30 villages of 5 parishes in Namwendwa S/C (Bugondha, Bulange, Bulogo, Kinu & Namwendwa) in 2nd Quarter 2021/22. | 1 |
|----|--|---|--|---|

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines. | a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0 | The LG had an updated Asset register which set out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. Namwendwa HC IV had BP machine, Thermometer and Theater equipment. Kitayunjwa HC III had BP machine, Artery forceps and Thermometer. Bulowoli HC III had BP machine and Thermometer. | 1 |
|----|---|---|--|---|

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III);

(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and

(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));

score 1 or else score 0

The District conducted a desk appraisal on all the 16 (sixteen) health sector development grant funded projects for the previous FY as per report dated 29/3/2021 Ref. CR/103/1. The desk appraisal identified that the education sector prioritized development projects were derived from the LGDP III and eligible for funding either under DDEG or sector development grants as evidenced below:

1. Expansion of laboratory at Namwendwa HC IV was derived from LGDP III as on page 132 and was eligible for DDEG funding as on page 7 Code 088283 of the implementation guidelines.

2. Construction of antenatal shade at Kamuli General Hospital from LGDP III as on page 133 and was eligible for funding under DDEG funding as on page 7 Coded 088182 of the implementation guidelines.

3. Construction a water borne toilet at Kamuli General Hospital was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for health sector development grant funding.

4. Construction of placenta pit at Namaira HC II was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for health sector development grant funding.

5. Construction of a placenta pit at Kasambira HC II was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for health sector development grant funding.

6. Renovation of Maternity Ward at Nawankofu HC II was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for health sector development grant funding.

7. Renovation of OPD at Nawankofu HC II was derived from LGDP III as on page 131 and was eligible for health sector development grant funding.

Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

The LG conducted field appraisal as per report dated 11/1/2022 to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs as evidenced in the 3 sampled projects below:

1. Expansion of laboratory at Namwendwa HC IV complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report.

2. Construction of a water borne toilet at Kamuli General Hospital complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report.

3. Construction of antenatal shade at Kamuli General Hospital complied with technical feasibility, environmental and social safeguards and customized designs as on pages 2-7 of the field appraisal report.

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>LG health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist evidenced by the following screening forms by the DEO & DCDO as evidenced below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E&S Screening form for the proposed construction of 2 in 1 doctor's house at Kamuli General Hospital by the DEO&DCDO on 25/04/2022 • E&S Screening form for the proposed expansion of a male ward at Namwendwa HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 05/04/2022 • E&S Screening form for the proposed construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Bubago HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 21/04/2022 | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG Health department timely submitted all its infrastructure requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan,</p> <p>As per a copy of the health sector procurement plan for FY 2022/23 prepared by the DHO, date of submission to PDU was 12th April 2022 which was before 30th April as required by PPDA laws.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU, but submission was made late on 23rd Nov 2022 which was 2nd Quarter.</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>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no health infrastructure that was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General. The contracts committee approved one project; i.e. Construction of a 2 Unit staff house at Kagumba HC III at 162,489,606/=. The cost of the project was below the threshold of 200m/= and therefore did not require clearance by the Solicitor General.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>There was evidence of an established Project Implementation team, appointment made on 08th Oct 2021 by the CAO, but the team appointed was not according to the guidelines in the manual. Below was the Project implementation team appointed for FY 2021/22</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mufumba Daniel (DE) • Musenero Richard (DPO) • Dr. Duku Fred (DHO) • Waibi Joseph (DEO) | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>The LG did not have HCII upgraded to HCIII</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the Clerk of Works appointed to do daily supervision of site works. They claimed that it wasn't necessary to hire a clerk of works because the one project they had was small.</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>The LG did not have HCII upgraded to HCIII</p> | 1 |

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

There was no evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at the health infrastructure project by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, they claimed that there was limited funding for supervision.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors but beyond the specified time frames after receiving payment requests from contractors as evidenced below:

1. Upgrade of Bubago HCII – HC III by M/s Skylight General Services Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 99,202,600 on 4/5/2022

DHO recommended for payment on 25/5/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 4 dated 20/5/2022 for payment of Shs.30,692,156 on 20/5/2022.

Certification by both the Environment officer and CDO was done on the same day of 3/5/2022.

The contractor was paid Shs. 61,840,185 on 30/5/2022 vide EFT No. 43716666 after 14 working days (2 weeks).

2. Construction of a staff house at Kagumba HC III under Health department by M/s LUNGO Engineering Services Ltd.

The contractor claimed for payment of Shs.62,682,376 on 17/5/2022

DHO recommend for payment on 17/5/2022.

DE certified certificate No. 1 dated 23/5/2022 on 25/5/2022 on 25/5/2022. Certification by Environment officer and CDO was done concurrently on 19/5/2022.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 55,975,362 on 7/6/2022 vide EFT No. 43801249 after 14 working days (2 weeks)

3. Completion of Maternity Ward at Kasambira HC II in Bugulumbya Sc by M/s LYANA Investment Ltd.

DE certified certificate No. 3 dated 19/4/2021 for payment of Shs.6,359,297.

DHO recommended for payment on 13/12/2021.

Certification by both Environment officer and CDO was done on the same day of 11/10/2021.

The Contractor was paid Shs. 5,678,852 on 16/3/2022 vide EFT No. 42165747 after 10 months

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. Examples include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00009 Construction of a 2 Unit staff house at Kagumba HC III. Approval of the evaluation report by the contracts committee was on 19th April 2021 under MIN: KDCC 128/2022/4 The contract was awarded to Lungo Engineering Services Ltd as the contractor and contract signed on 19th April 2022 | 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>LG had not recorded any grievance under health in the FY 2021/2022 by the time of assessment but the central grievance log was available as of 2018/2019</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>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>The LG disseminated guidelines on health care/medical waste guidelines. Waste segregation charts guidelines, WASH IN HEALTH CARE FACILITIES 2022 and Approaches to Health Care Waste Management 2013 guidelines were found in Namwendwa HC IV, Kitayunjwa HC III and Balawoli HC III.</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>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>The LG had in place a functional system for medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste. Green Label Services LTD a Registered waste management provider signed Waste Transfer Forms with the ADHO/MCH on several occasions (19/10/22, 18/11/22). Namwendwa HC IV, Kitayunjwa HC III and Balawoli HC III had bin liners to segregate waste, waste pits and placenta pits.</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>The Senior Environmental Health Officer held a meeting with 32 H/W in the District Board Room on 30/08/21 where she created awareness and disseminated guidelines on safe waste management. The participants included the ADHO/MCH, SEHO, 2 ANOs, 6 HIs, 16 HAs and 4 SMCOs.</p> | 1 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that LG had incorporated costed ESMP into BoOs for health infrastructure projects in FY 2021/2022 as evidenced below;</p> <p>Items E & F of the BoQs for the proposed construction of staff house and 2 stance pit latrine at Kagumba and Mbulamuti HC III on unspecified page with Procurement Reference MOH-UgIFT/WRKS/2018-19/0001-20 signed January 2022</p> | 2 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was proof that all health sector projects were implemented on land where LG had ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.) as evidenced below;</p> <p>Land title for Kamuli DLG (Mbulamuti Sub County Headquarters) of P.O.Box 88, plot 57, block (road) at Buwanana covering 12.1210 hectares issued on 25/09/2018 for Mbulamuti HC III</p> | 2 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>DEO and DCDO conducted quarterly not monthly support supervision and monitoring as required, for example;</p> <p>E&S Compliance Monitoring Report for the proposed construction of health projects by the DEO&DCDO on 30/06/2022</p> | 0 |

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

Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the DEO and DCDO. prior to payments of contractor as evidenced below;

- E&S Certification form of 162,489,606/= for the proposed construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Kagumbs HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 23/03/2021
- E&S Certification form of 38,612,700/= for the proposed partial completion of 4 staff house at Mbulamuti HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 28/02/2022
- E&S Certification form of 29,996,778/= for the proposed fencing of Kiyunga HC II in Kisozi Sub County by the DEO&DCDO on 28/06/2022

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|---|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | <p>From the Ministry MIS, the Percentage of functional rural water sources = 89%</p> | 1 |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | <p>From the Ministry MIS, the Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees = 92%</p> | 2 |
| 2 | <p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p> | <p>The LLG assessment results were under verification at the time of assessment and hence performance could not be determined</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

The LG implemented 55% of the budgeted water
projects in the FY 2021/2022 in the sub counties with
safe water coverage below the district average in the
FY 2020/2021

Page 3 of 3 excel sheet attachment (budget line-
Development) of the annual progress report approved
on 17/08/2022 indicated that the total budgeted water
projects implemented in the LG for the FY 2021/22 = 42
(Drilling and installation of 22 deep boreholes,
Construction of the piped water supply system and
rehabilitation of 19 old borehole)

Sub counties that were below the district average (38%
access) in the previous FY but one include;

Balawoli S/c at 73%

Bulopa S/c at 72%

Kagumba S/c at 40%

Kisozi S/c at 73%

Nabwigulu S/c at 72% and

Namwendwa S/c 68%

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

Three (3) new borehole and one old borehole
rehabilitation in Balawoli S/c

Six (6) new boreholes and three (3) old borehole
rehabilitations in Kagumba S/c,

Three (3) new boreholes and three (3) old borehole
rehabilitations in Namwendwa S/c,

Two (2) new boreholes in Nabwigulu S/c and

One (1) new borehole and a piped water supply
system in Namasagali S/c

Total number of implemented projects in sub counties
below the average = 23

Percentage of budgeted projects implemented in sub
counties with safe water coverage(Access) below the
district average = $23/42 \times 100 = 55\%$

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

The percentage contract price variations for all the
three project contracts sampled were all within -+20%
as indicated below;

Deep boreholes sitting, drilling, pump testing, casting
and installation of 11 boreholes Lot 1

Proc.Ref no. KAMU517/WRKS/21-22/00002

Engineer's estimate = 208,600,898

Contract sum = 198,044,847

Percentage contract price Variation = -5% equivalent to

Shs. 10,556,051

Construction of Bugobi solar powered piped water
system phase II

Proc.Ref no. KAMU517/WRKS/21-22/00004

Engineer's estimate = 179,885,277

Contract sum = 179,438,891

Percentage contract price Variation = -0.25%
equivalent to

Shs.-446,386

Construction of a 2 –stance Ecosan latrine in
Namasagali

Proc.Ref no. KAMU517/WRKS/21-22/00040

Engineer's estimate = 37,163,433

Contract sum = 37,269,14 5

Percentage contract price

Variation = 0.3% equivalent to

Shs. 105,712

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 2 | <p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <p>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p> | <p>The LG completed 100% of the planned WSS infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Page 3 of 3 excel sheet attachment (budget line-development) of the AWP for the previous FY approved on 26/08/2021 indicated that the LG planned to drill twenty two (22) new boreholes, Rehabilitate 19 old boreholes, construct a 2-stance lined Ecosan latrine , Construct a piped water supply system phase II and conduct a water quality testing on 80 water sources and from page 3 of 3 of the annual progress report approved on 17/08/2022, all the twenty two (22) new boreholes ,the piped water supply system phase II , the 80 water source quality testing, the construction of the 2-stance lined Ecosan latrine and the rehabilitation of the 19 old bore holes were implemented and completed to 100% in the FY 2021/22 as per the work plan.</p> <p>Percentage of projects completed as per the AWP = 100%</p> | 2 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p> | <p>The Ministry MIS indicated that there was no increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/21 and 2021/22.</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2020/21 = 89%</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2021/22 = 89%</p> <p>Percentage change = 0%</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p> | <p>The Ministry MIS indicated that there was an increase of 1% in the percentage of rural water and sanitation facilities with functional committees.</p> <p>Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committee in the FY 2020/21 = 91%</p> <p>Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committee in the FY 2021/22 = 92%</p> <p>Percentage increase = 1%</p> | 1 |

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> | <p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p> | <p>The DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities was as reported.</p> | 3 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p>Page 3 of 3 of the excel attachment to the annual progress report approved on 17/08/2022, the DWO drilled and installed 22 deep boreholes, Rehabilitated 19 old bore holes, constructed a 2-stance lined Eco san latrine, conducted the quality water testing on 80 water sources and constructed a piped water supply system in the FY 2021/2022</p> | |
| | | | <p>Findings from the field visit of the three sampled projects showed that all projects were in place and functional, boreholes were well protected with no deep latrines in the radius of 30m, trees were planted around, water yield and water quality was visually good and all had functional WUCs.</p> | |
| | | | <p>The 3 sampled projects include</p> | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Busuuyi village borehole (DWD. 78894) completed on 23/05/2022 and found in Nabwigulu S/c. • Buvumbi village community borehole (DWD 86390) completed on 28/05/2022 and found in Balawoli S/c. • Bugulu -2 village borehole (DWD 78889) completed on 04/6/2022 and found in Kagumba S/c. | |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG Water office collected and compiled quarterly information on sub- county water supply and sanitation as evidenced below.</p> | 2 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p>Quarter 1 report was submitted to the ministry on 26/01/2022 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on page 5 to 7 of the report.</p> | |
| | | | <p>Similarly quarter 2 report was submitted on 28/01/2022 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on page 5 to 6 of the report.</p> | |
| | | | <p>Quarter 3 report was submitted on 23/05/2022 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on page 5 to 6 and page 13 of the report..</p> | |
| | | | <p>Quarter 4 report was submitted on 17/08/2022 and the information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement was found on page 6 and 7</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG Water Office updated the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities. The DWO MIS was last updated in quarter 4 on 07/07/2022 with the new boreholes implemented in the FY 2021/2022 and new functionality percentages.</p> | 3 |
| 5 | <p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p> | <p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The assessment had just been concluded in the current FY 2022/2023 and therefore there was no performance improvement plans for the lowest performing LLGs</p> | 0 |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p> | <p>DWO budgeted for 3 staff totaling to Ugx. 103,800,000 and the staff included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kaliisa Joel (Assistant Engineering Officer-water) 2. Waiswa Tom (Assistant Engineering Officer) 3. Mufumba Daniel (Ag. Civil Engineering -Water) | 2 |
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p> | <p>The Environment and Natural Resources Officer budgeted for 5 staff totaling Ugx. 400,000,000 and they include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Isabirye Robert (District Natural Resources Officer) 2. Bakaki Samuel (Senior Environment Officer) 3. Mutyabule Charles Naluswa (Environment Officer) 4. Babirye Bridget (Forest Officer) 5. Igadube Festo (Ag. Senior Lands Management Officer) | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p> | <p>No evidence</p> | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the District Water Office identified Capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and submitted the capacity needs to the PHRO.</p> | 0 |

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Page 3 of 3 of the excel sheet attachment (Budget line) to the AWP for the FY 2022/2023 approved on 17/08/2022 indicated that the DWO allocated only 43% of the budget to the six sub counties below the average district safe water coverage.

Sub counties that were below the district average(79%) in the FY 2021/2022 include;

Bulopa S/c at 72%

Kagumba S/c at 49%

Nabwigulu S/c at 77%

Namwendwa S/c at 69%

Namasagali S/c at 65% and

Kisozi S/c at 72%

The DWO allocated two (2) new boreholes (53,048,196), one borehole rehabilitation (5,089,313) to Bulopa S/c all totaling to 58,137,509, 3 new boreholes amounting to 78,572,294 and one old borehole rehabilitation amounting to 5,089,313 was allocated to Kagumba S/c, Two (2) borehole rehabilitations amounting to 10,178,626 was allocated to Nabwigulu S/c, Namasagali S/c was allocated one production well (37,943,116), one new deep borehole (26,524,098), one piped water supply system design (73,700,000) and one old borehole rehabilitation (5,089,313) all totaling to 143,256,518, Namwendwa S/c was allocated one production well (37,943,116), two new deep borehole (53,048,196), one piped water supply system design (73,700,000) and two old borehole rehabilitations (10,178,626) all totaling to 174,869,938 and lastly Kisozi S/c was allocated one old borehole rehabilitation amounting to 5,089,313

Total project budget for sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average = 430,359,264

Total project Budget for all the sub counties = 1,005,435,247

Percentage budget allocation to sub counties below the district average = $(430,359,264)/(1,005,435,247)*100 = 43\%$

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY and the communication was displayed on the district and sub county notice boards on 08/09/2022.

The allocations were as below;

The DWO allocated two (2) new boreholes (53,048,196), one borehole rehabilitation (5,089,313) to Bulopa S/c all totaling to 58,137,509, 3 new boreholes amounting to 78,572,294 and one old borehole rehabilitation amounting to 5,089,313 was allocated to Kagumba S/c, Two (2) borehole rehabilitations amounting to 10,178,626 was allocated to Nabwigulu S/c, Namasagali S/c was allocated one production well (37,943,116), one new deep borehole (26,524,098), one piped water supply system design (73,700,000) and one old borehole rehabilitation (5,089,313) all totaling to 143,256,518, Namwendwa S/c was allocated one production well (37,943,116), two new deep borehole (53,048,196), one piped water supply system design (73,700,000) and two old borehole rehabilitations (10,178,626) all totaling to 174,869,938, Kisozi S/c was allocated one old borehole rehabilitation amounting to 5,089,313, Balawoli S/c was allocated 4 new deep boreholes (106,096,392) and one old borehole rehabilitation amounting to 5,089,313

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

- If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

The District Water Office monitored on average 47% WSS facilities quarterly as follows;

From the List of water and sanitation projects (form 4), and DWO MIS, Kamuli district had a total of 1235 water facilities and 20 sanitation facilities.

From the first Quarter monitoring report dated 28/10/2021, the DWO monitored 750 facilities out of the total LG facilities equivalent to 60%.

In the second (2) quarter monitoring reports dated 07/01/2022 and 12/01/2022, the DWO monitored a total of 674 facilities equivalent to 54%.

In the third (3) quarter monitoring report dated 12/04/2022, the DWO monitored 758 facilities out of the total equivalent to 60%

In the fourth (4) quarter monitoring report dated 12/07/2022, the DWO monitored 165 WSS facilities equivalent to 13%.

Average = $(60+60+54+13)/4=47\%$

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p> | <p>There was no sufficient evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and discussed the key issues presented in the monitoring reports. Only two quarterly DWSCC minutes was availed for assessment and these were as follows;</p> | 0 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p>1. Quarter 2 DWSCC minutes dated 22/06/2022 with key issues discussed under Min.5</p> <p>2. Quarter 2 DWSCC minutes dated 16/12/2022 with key issues discussed on under Min.04</p> <p>Quarter 4 DWSCC minutes was missing at the time assessment</p> <p>Quarter 3 DWSCC minutes was missing</p> <p>The remedial actions of borehole rehabilitations were incorporated in the approved current FY AWP and 18 new boreholes and 16 old borehole rehabilitations were to be implemented in FY 2022/2023 together with training of the water user committees.</p> | |
| 9 | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> | <p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p> | <p>The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the FY 2022/2023 to LLGs as it was displayed on the district and sub county notice boards on 08/09/2022.</p> | 2 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p> | | <p>The allocations were as below;</p> <p>The DWO allocated two (2) new boreholes (53,048,196),one borehole rehabilitation (5,089,313) to Bulopa S/c all totaling to 58,137,509, 3 new boreholes amounting to 78,572,294 and one old borehole rehabilitation amounting to 5,089,313 was allocated to Kagumba S/c , Two (2) borehole rehabilitations amounting to 10,178,626 was allocated to Nabwigulu S/c, Namasagali S/c was allocated one production well (37,943,116),one new deep borehole (26,524,098), one piped water supply system design (73,700,000) and one old borehole rehabilitation (5,089,313) all totaling to 143,256,518, Namwendwa S/c was allocated one production well (37,943,116),two new deep borehole (53,048,196), one piped water supply system design (73,700,000) and two old borehole rehabilitations (10,178,626) all totaling to 174,869,938 ,Kisozi S/c was allocated one old borehole rehabilitation amounting to 5,089,313, Balawoli S/c was allocated 4 new deep boreholes (106,096,392) and one old borehole rehabilitation amounting to 5,089,313</p> | |
| 10 | <p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> | <p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> | <p>The DWO allocated 47.8% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget greater than 40% to mobilization activities.</p> | 3 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 | <p>Page 2 of 3 of the excel sheet budget line attachment to the AWP approved on 26/08/2021</p> <p>,the DWO allocated 51,505,694/= equivalent to 47.8% of the total NWR rural water and sanitation budget (107,705,920/=) towards mobilization activities</p> | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 10 | Mobilization for WSS is conducted <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3. | The DWO in liaison with the Community Development Officer established and trained WSCs on their roles on O &M of WSS facilities as evidenced below; Page 2 of 3 of the software report excel attachment to AWP for the FY 2021/2022 approved on 26/08/2021 and page 11 (item 4.43) and page 12 (item 4.4.4) of the APR indicated that 26 new WSS committees were formed and trained. For the sampled WSS in Nabwigulu S/c, Balawoli S/c and Kagumba S/c, the sampled members of the WSCs were able to remember the training that was given to them about the O & M including daily cleaning of the water source, fencing the water sources and collection of the water user fees of 1000 per household. | 3 |
|----|--|---|---|---|

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 11 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> | a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0 | There was evidence of existence of an updated LG asset register which set out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG. The DWO presented an updated asset register that was last updated on 07/07/2022 in the last quarter of the FY2021/2022 with new water and sanitation facilities implemented in the previous FY 2021/2022. The 22 new boreholes and the 2-stance Eco san latrine implemented in the FY 2021/2022 were seen in the asset register. | 4 |
| 11 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> | 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: Score 4 or else score 0. | There was no evidence that the LG had conducted field and desk appraisals for the FY 2022/23 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p> | <p>The DWO did not present all the applications at the time of assessment. Only four applications out of over 10 applications were available for assessment and these include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application for a borehole by Bulado village community in Mbulamuti S/c dated 09/01/2019 • Application for a borehole by Kisaikye zone village community in Namasali S/c dated 07/07/2022 • Application for a borehole by Tibwamulala village community in Butansi S/c dated 07/02/2020 • Application for a borehole by Busikwe village community in Namwendwa S/c dated 18/08/2022 | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG conducted field appraisals for all the current FY 2022/23 water projects.</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p> | <p>LG had screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts for the FY 2022/2023 as evidenced below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E&S Screening form for the proposed construction of ecosan toilet at Bugobi Village for the water and sanitation sector by the DEO&DCDO on 28/05/2021 • E&S Screening form for the proposed extension of Bugobi piped water system by the DEO&DCDO on 28/05/2021 • E&S Screening form for the proposed drilling, casting and installation of a borehole at Buwanuka Village by the DEO&DCDO on 08/02/2022 • E&S Screening form for the proposed drilling, casting and installation of a borehole at Busanga Village by the DEO&DCDO on 18/02/2022 | 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>There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure investments for previous FY were incorporated in the LG procurement plan approved on 04th July 2022 by CAO and Sampled projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting, Design, drilling, Pump testing and Platform casting of 4 Production wells. • Supply of assorted borehole spare parts. • Consultancy services for supervision of siting, designing, drilling, test pumping and platform casting of 18 boreholes • Siting, Design, drilling, Pump testing and Platform casting of 9 boreholes LOT 1 & 2. • Consultancy services for feasibility study for Piped water supply system at 4 sites in Kamuli district. | 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>There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure projects for the previous FY were approved by the contracts committee before commencement as indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOT 1 Drilling, Test Pumping & Casting of 11 No. boreholes Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00002 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/4 • LOT 2 Drilling, Test Pumping & Casting of 11 No. boreholes Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00003 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/5 • Construction of Bugobi Piped water supply system Phase II. Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00004 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/5 | 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 an established Project Implementation team, appointment made on 08th Oct 2021 by the CAO, but the team appointed was not according to the guidelines in the manual. Below was the Project implementation team appointed for FY 2021/22</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mufumba Daniel (DE) • Musenero Richard (DPO) • Dr. Duku Fred (DHO) • Waibi Joseph (DEO) <p>The team lacked the CDO, and the Environmental officer.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p> | <p>There was evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs. The three (3) sampled projects include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Busuuyi village borehole (DWD. 78894) completed on 23/05/2022 and found in Nabwigulu S/c. • Buvumbi village community borehole (DWD 86390) completed on 28/05/2022 and found in Balawoli S/c. • Bugulu -2 village borehole (DWD 78889) completed on 04/6/2022 and found in Kagumba S/c. <p>All projects were in place and functional, boreholes were well protected with no deep latrines in the radius of 30m, trees were planted around, water quality and yield was generally good and it had a functional WUCs.</p> <p>For the sampled borehole drilling contract specifications, it was seen that the contractor adopted the open well design method.</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>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p> | <p>The relevant technical officers carried out joint monitoring of WSS infrastructure projects as evidenced by the following supervision/monitoring reports by the CDO, Environment officer, DWO and District Engineer;</p> <p>Supervision report dated 13/07/2022 for LOT 1(11 Boreholes), LOT 2 and a piped water supply system</p> <p>Supervision report dated 24/03/2022 for LOT 1(11 Boreholes), LOT 2 and a piped water supply system</p> <p>Supervision report dated 13/07/2022 for LOT 1(11 Boreholes), LOT 2 and a piped water supply system</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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>The DWO verified works and initiated payments of contractors but beyond the specified time frames after receiving payment requests from contractors as evidenced below:</p> | 0 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0</p> | <p>1. Additional work on Phase II Bugobi Water Supply System by M/s Relief line Uganda Ltd.</p> | |
| | | | <p>The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 37,221,920 on 4/5/2022</p> | |
| | | | <p>DWO recommended for payment on 17/6/2022 after 30 working days.</p> | |
| | | | <p>2. Construction of Bugobi Piped Water Supply System Phase II in Namasagali Sc by M/s Relief line Uganda Ltd.</p> | |
| | | | <p>The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 108,083,446 on 2/3/2022</p> | |
| | | | <p>DWO recommend for payment on 2/3/2022 on the same day of payment request.</p> | |
| | | | <p>3. Construction of ECOSAN Toilet at Bugobi Water Supply System in Namasagali Sc by M Ltd.</p> | |
| | | | <p>The contractor claimed for payment of Shs. 24,892,711 on 27/5/2022</p> | |
| | | | <p>DWO recommended for payment on 27/5/2021 on the same day of payment request.</p> | |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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>The DLG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;</p> | 2 |
| | <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p> | <p>Sampled contracts</p> | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOT 1 Drilling, Test Pumping & Casting of 11 No. boreholes Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00002 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/4. The contract was awarded to KLR (U) Ltd and contract signed on 09th Feb 2022. | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOT 2 Drilling, Test Pumping & Casting of 11 No. boreholes Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00003 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/5. The contract was awarded to Mama Borewells Africa Ltd and contract signed on 09th Feb 2022. | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of Bugobi Piped water supply system Phase II. Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00004 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/5. The contract was awarded to Relief Line (U) Ltd and contract signed on 11th Oct 2021. | |

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 13 | <p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>LG had not recorded any grievances under water for FY 2021/2022 but the central grievance log book existed as of 2018/2019</p> | 3 |
| 14 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>DWO and DEO had disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs evidenced by the minutes of CDOs meeting on 19/11/2021 held in the CBS Boardroom, item 4 on the agenda, minute no. 04</p> | 3 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>LG had not prepared the water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the FY 2021/2022 as required</p> | 0 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that all WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent.</p> | 0 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p> | <p>E&S Certification forms were not completed and signed by DEO and DCDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/ certificates at interim and final stages of projects as required.</p> | 0 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p> | <p>The DCDO and DEO undertook quarterly not monthly monitoring as required, that is to say;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E&S Monitoring Report for the proposed drilling, casting and installation of Lot 1 and 2 boreholes and extension of piped water system at Bugobi Village by the DEO&DCDO on 24/032022 | 0 |

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries(7 acres-demo sites) and non-beneficiaries(136acres-private installations) evidenced from the report dated 02/mar/22 and approved by DPO – Musenero Richard.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 | <p>The LG had increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one where;</p> <p>The irrigated land in the previous FY but one (2020/2021) was 131 acres and previous FY(2021/2022) was 143acres,there was 9.2% increase because more farmers had enrolled due to awareness and sensitization activities on micro-scale irrigation program</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>The development component of micro-scale irrigation grant was not used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment) because the supplier failed to execute the contract in time FY 2021/2022 but requested for a contract extension which was honored by the district to FY2022/2023 thus micro-scale irrigation grant transferred back to the consolidated A/C.</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The approved farmers did not sign acceptance form confirming that the equipment was working well because no micro scale irrigation equipment was installed and no payments were made.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>From the 3 sampled planned farmer installations, there was evidence that the variations in the contract price was within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates as below;</p> <p>Farmer1 (Namboira M. Rose) from Nawanyago T/C</p> <p>Engineers estimate was 12,800,000/=</p> <p>Supplier quote was 11,714,600/=</p> <p>Percentage variations in the contract price was 8.5%</p> <p>Farmer 2(Nakato Annet) From Kitayunjwa S/C</p> <p>Engineer's estimates was 17,600,000/=</p> <p>Supplier quote was 15,133,800/=</p> <p>Percentage variation in the contract price was 14.01%</p> <p>Farmer 3 (Mutobani Sanoni) from Nawanyago S/C</p> <p>Engineer's estimates 14,700,000/=</p> <p>Supplier quote was 14,818,880/=</p> <p>Percentage variation in the contract price was 0.8%</p> <p>The engineer's estimates for the irrigation equipment was generated by irritrack app thus relatively high compared to open market price.</p> | 1 |
| 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>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | <p>No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame)</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 | The LG recruited 37 LLG extension workers which was 56%. According to the approved structure, extension workers were supposed to be 66 but only 37 were recruited as indicated below; 1. Vet/Animal Production Officer (10) 2. Assistant Vet Officer (6) 3. Agriculture Officer (16) 4. Assistant Agric Officers (2) 5. Fisheries officer (3) | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 | No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame) | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 | No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame) | 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 | There was evidence that position of extension workers filled was accurate. The 3 LLG sampled and visited confirmed that. 1. In Kisozi S/C, Muwereza Yona was deployed as the Agriculture Officer 2. In Balawoli S/C, Bagabo Micheal was deployed as Agriculture Officer 3. In Kitayunjwa S/C, Kyoziira Faith was deployed as Agriculture officer The total number of extension workers were 37 both at the DLG offices and LLGs | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information | b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0 | No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame) | 0 |
| | Maximum score 4 | | | |
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | 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 | Information was collected annually on newly irrigated land, Information was collected Quarterly on functionality of irrigation equipment installed during FY2019/2020. | 2 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | <p>There was evidence that complementary services were provided Quarterly like as Q1;</p> <p>There was project awareness report for local leaders dated 27/oct/21 which was carried out in 3 sub-counties. Nawango S/C, Bugulumbya S/C, and Kitayunjwa S/C . 157 people attended according to 11 attendance sheets.</p> <p>There was a facilitation expense (transport refund and meals) of 50,000 per head according to the payment voucher No:39818754 dated 12/Nov/21.</p> <p>Q2</p> <p>Awareness raising on MSI program at parish level which was targeting farmers from 6 parishes (Matumo, Kakira, Lwanyama, Magogo, Nankandulo and Buteme) report dated 15/01/22.</p> <p>243 farmers attended according to 25 attendance sheets. This was conducted by AO who was facilitated with fuel (652,500/=) and allowance 360,000/=</p> <p>Where; 1 day-5liters fuel</p> <p>SDA- Safari Day Allowance-12,000/=</p> <p>Information on farmer Expression of Interest was also collected quarterly as below</p> <p>Q1-788 farmers were successful (79% male and 21% female)</p> <p>Q2: No EOI registered</p> <p>Q3: 463farmers were registered.</p> <p>Totaling to 1251 farmers</p> <p>Q4 1326 farmers registered.</p> <p>Where 21.5% females and 78.5% males.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had entered up to- date LLG information into MIS evidenced by the last farmer registered on 30/03/22 out of 1328 interested farmers.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | | |
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs(80 parishes and 20 sub counties). in the MIS for example</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | <p>During Q1 from the 3 sampled sub counties</p> | |
| | | | <p>Kagumba S/C -211 submitted their interest</p> | |
| | | | <p>Kisozi S/C- 33 submitted their interest.</p> | |
| | | | <p>Bulopa S/C 16 submitted their interest</p> | |
| | | | <p>During Q3</p> | |
| | | | <p>Kagumba S/C- 59 submitted their interest</p> | |
| | | | <p>Kisozi S/C -16 submitted their interest</p> | |
| | | | <p>Bulopa S/C -2 submitted their interest</p> | |
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had not developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 6</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had not Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs at the time of assessment.</p> | 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>The LG had budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms were 25% (453,745,338) was allocated to complementary services/extension workers as evidenced by the work plan approved by CAO.</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 LG had deployed extension workers as per guidelines evidenced by the deployment form dated 20/July/22, arranged according to the LLGs as below.</p> <p>From the 3 sampled LLGs staff lists, it was confirmed that the deployed workers were as per the staff structure</p> | 1 |
|---|---|--|---|---|

Balawoli sub-county

Bagabo Michael-Agricultural Officer

Kasinga Wasswa-Fisheries Officer

Kisozi sub-county

Muwereza Yona- Agricultural Officer

Kangume Kereb-Veterinary Officer

Bulopa sub-county

Mukungu Isaac- Agricultural Officer

Babirye Daphine- Animal production officer.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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>There was evidence that extension workers were working in LLG's where they were deployed. For instance according to staff attendance,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Kitayunjwa S/C, Kyoziira Faith (AO) reported for duty at 8:31am on 28/11/2022 2. In Balawoli S/C, Bagabo Micheal (AO) reported for work at 8:00am on 29/11/2022 3. In Kisozi S/C, Mugabi Ashirafu (AO) reported for duty at 8:02 am on 7/11/2022 | 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>Maximum score 6</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>It was only found at Balawoli Sub County but other LLGs like Kisozi and Kitayunjwa didn't have evidence</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that all were appraised but some were appraised beyond timelines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Muwereza Yona (AO) Kisozi was appraised on 07/07/2022 2. Kipwapwa Emmanuel (AAO) Nawanyalwe was appraised on 30/06/2022 3. Mwesigwa Apollo (Vet Officer) Kayumba was appraised on 21/06/2022 4. Kapere Peter (AVO) Nawanyango was appraised on 30/06/2022 5. Mugabi Ashirafu (AO) Kisozi was appraised on 30/06/2022 6. Nakintu Doreen (AO) Namasagali was appraised on 22/04/2022 7. Boyi James (AAO) magogo was appraised on 22/06/2022 8. Nassali Christine (AO) Nawanyago was appraised on 30/06/2022 9. Naika Vincent (APO) kagumba was appraised on 21/06/2022 10. Kasiira Gerald (AFO) Namasagali was appraised on 22/06/2022 | 0 |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence</p> | 0 |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level evidenced by the report dated 15/oct/2021.</p> <p>During quarter 2, the production staff was trained on how to conduct farmer field schools as an extension service delivery methodology where 50 staff attended as evidenced by 3 attendance sheets. There was a facilitation expense (meals, transport and facilitators allowance) of 5,207,000/=</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> | <p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The training activities were documented in the training database. The training plan involved activities like - awareness of local leaders and farmers which was achieved as evidenced by the training report dated 27/Oct/21</p> <p>Training on Farmer field school approach which was achieved according to activity report dated 15/oct/21 and more.</p> | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Actual received (from Central Government) was Shs. 2,030,077,959</p> <p>Capital Development (for MSI equipment) was Shs. 1,576,332,626 representing 77.6%</p> <p>Complementary Services was Shs. 453,745,333 representing 22.5%</p> | 0 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> | <p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>Complementary Services was Shs. 453,745,333</p> <p>Enhancing LG Capacity was Shs. 146,149,738 representing 32.2%</p> <p>Awareness raising for local leaders was Shs: 70,817,738 representing 15.6%</p> <p>Procurement Monitoring and supervision was Shs. 75,332,000 representing 16.6%</p> <p>Enhancing Farmer Capacity was Shs. 307,595,595 representing 67.8%</p> <p>Awareness raising of farmers: was Shs. 43,738,600 representing 14.2%</p> <p>Farm visit was Shs. 79,998,000 representing 26%</p> <p>Demonstrations was Shs. 77,595,000 representing 25.2%</p> <p>Farmer Field Schools was Shs. 106 263,995 representing 34.5%</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) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>10 farmers co-funded Shs. 40,008,441 but was not provided for in the approved budget for FY 2021/2022</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 10</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) 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>Ten farmers co-funded Shs.40, 008,441 but it was not utilized instead it was just deposited on General Fund Account.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 10</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 disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding evidenced from the minute to meetings between DPO and DPTCs dated 05/Dec/21 where farmers were advised to contribute 25% of the cost of equipment and deposited on the district general fund A/C.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum score 10</p> | | | |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</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> | <p>No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame).</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 | <p>There was evidence that the DPO monitored on the monthly basis the installed micro irrigation equipment for the FY 2019/2020 as per the standards</p> <p>Reference was made to the monitoring reports on several demo sites dated 3/August/21 at Kagumba demo, 5/Sept/21 at southern Division Kamuli MC where all were found functional.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8 | b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0 | No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame). | 0 |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8 | c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0 | There was evidence that LG had provided hands- on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY for example, as reported on 15/10/21(Activity report for FY 2021/2022 on conducting technical backstopping of field staff on farmer field school concept). This involved the office of DPO and PAO with the extension staff trained and farmer field schools were implemented in a stable training setting to help the farmers address specific issues within their farming system, which was attended by 111farmers and extension workers attended according to 7attendance sheets | 2 |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8 | d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 | The LG had established and run farmer field schools but had not received the guidelines from MAAIF at the time of assessment. The LG conducted the training on farmer field schools using other interventions like farmer field school approach by Gaica other than the guidelines. | 2 |
| 11 | Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 | There was evidence LG had conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines where reference was made to the report dated 13/July/22 on exhibition show. This aimed at exposing farmers to the various technologies available on market to enable them make informed decisions on the choice of equipment to install on his/her site, 510 people at all levels participated according to 30 attendance sheets with a total expenditure of 20,484,000/= | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 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>Training was done at LLGs as evidenced by the report dated 27/10/21 on awareness raising event. This targeted sub-county council, technical staff at S/C, farmers and opinion leaders. The training was attended by 171 people according to 9 attendance sheets. The expenditure was 9.5M according to the approved requisition form dated 02/sept/21.</p> | 2 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

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>No installations were done for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame).</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>There was no evidence LG had kept an up-to—date database of applications at the time of the assessment.</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>Farm visits were carried out to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (Eol) and the agreement to proceed for quotation forms was made. Eg Bamulange George and Mukobi Malitini signed the agreement on 05/04/22</p> | 2 |
|----|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The list of approved eligible farmers was available and only displayed at Balawoli Sub County noticeboard. The others lacked it</p> | 0 |
|----|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the FY 2022/23 endorsed by the CAO on 04th July 2022. The Projects Included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supply and installation of Micro-scale irrigation Systems at approved farmer sites under micro-irrigation Project (Page 3, Sn. 31) • Supply, Installation of irrigation demo-sites on Kitanyunjwa SEED secondary school and one at Nawangango Vocational institute. (Page 3, Sn. 32) | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): this included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nec Agro SMC Ltd • Davis and Shirtliff • W & S Consults International • Karf Aqua Engineering solutions • Innovation Africa Ltd <p>Received 29th May 2021 by PDU and request for Quotations was on 02nd Nov 2022</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The DLG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;</p> <p>Sampled contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOT 1 Drilling, Test Pumping & Casting of 11 No. boreholes Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00002 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/4. The contract was awarded to KLR (U) Ltd and contract signed on 09th Feb 2022. • LOT 2 Drilling, Test Pumping & Casting of 11 No. boreholes Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00003 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/5. The contract was awarded to Mama Bore-wells Africa Ltd and contract signed on 09th Feb 2022. • Construction of Bugobi Piped water supply system Phase II. Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00004 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/5. The contract was awarded to Relief Line (U) Ltd and contract signed on 11th Oct 2021. | 2 |
| 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>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The DLG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;</p> <p>Sampled contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOT 1 Drilling, Test Pumping & Casting of 11 No. boreholes Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00002 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/4. The contract was awarded to KLR (U) Ltd and contract signed on 09th Feb 2022. • LOT 2 Drilling, Test Pumping & Casting of 11 No. boreholes Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00003 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/5. The contract was awarded to Mama Bore-wells Africa Ltd and contract signed on 09th Feb 2022. • Construction of Bugobi Piped water supply system Phase II. Proc Ref: KAMU 517/Wrks/2021-22/00004 approved on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/5. The contract was awarded to Relief Line (U) Ltd and contract signed on 11th Oct 2021. | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution:</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced</p> | 2 |

The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines

Maximum score 18

irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0

technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier. From the Comparison of the Quotations, the LG budget was 1,576,332,626/=

Lot 1 5 Firms placed in their quotations as follows;

Quotation for Nec Agro SMC Ltd was 1,394,010,445/=

Quotation for Davis and Shirtliff was 1,167,275,445/=

Quotation for W & S Consults International 365,395,728/=

Quotation for Karf Aqua Engineering solutions was 842,948,340/=

Quotation for Innovation Africa Ltd was 497,358,200/=

Since all the other firms apart from NEC Agro failed in preliminary and detailed technical evaluation and they didn't reach the Financial Evaluation, NEC Agro was chosen as the Contractor to take on implementation of projects for 51 farmers.

Lot 2 Four Firms placed in their quotations as follows;

Quotation for Nec Agro SMC Ltd was 804,982,600/=

Quotation for Davis and Shirtliff was 739,087,655/=

Quotation for Karf Aqua Engineering solutions was 1,083,612,880/=

Quotation for Innovation W & S Consults International was 349,934,221/=

Since all the other firms apart from NEC Agro failed to comply in preliminary and detailed technical evaluation and they didn't Proceed to the Financial Evaluation, NEC Agro was chosen as the Contractor to take on implementation of projects for 25 farmers.

Lot 3 Four Firms placed in their quotations as follows;

Quotation for NEC Agro SMC Ltd was 900,691,700/=

Quotation for Davis and Shirtliff was 1,119,179,851/=

Quotation for Karf Aqua Engineering solutions was 987,775,640/=

Quotation for Innovation W & S Consults International was 248,305,938/=

Since all the other firms apart from NEC Agro failed to comply in preliminary and

detailed technical evaluation and they didn't Proceed to the Financial Evaluation, NEC Agro was chosen as the Contractor to take on implementation of projects for 46 farmers.

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 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 | No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame) | 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 | No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame). | 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 | No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame). | 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 | No installations were made for FY 2021/2022 (the contractor failed to meet the time frame). | 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 | The LG did not make any payment to suppliers because there were no deliveries and hence no installations were made. | 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>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</p> <p>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for the contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law as shown below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proc Ref: Kamu 517/Wrks/21-22/00013 Design, Supply and Installation of Micro-scale Irrigation Equipment in Kamuli District, approval of evaluation Report by the contracts committee was on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/3/1 Lot 1. The contract was a warded to NEC Agro SMC Ltd and Signed on 07th April 2022. • Proc Ref: Kamu 517/Wrks/21-22/00014 Design, Supply and Installation of Micro-scale Irrigation Equipment in Kamuli District, approval of evaluation Report by the contracts committee was on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/3/2 Lot 2. The contract was a warded to NEC Agro SMC Ltd and Signed on 07th April 2022. • Proc Ref: Kamu 517/Wrks/21-22/00015 Design, Supply and Installation of Micro-scale Irrigation Equipment in Kamuli District, approval of evaluation Report by the contracts committee was on 31st Dec 2021 Under MIN: KDCC 125/2021/3/3 Lot 3. The contract was a warded to NEC Agro SMC Ltd and Signed on 07th April 2022. | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>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</p> <p>LG had not displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance on the production department notice board as required</p> | 0 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p> | <p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | LG had no grievance investigated under micro irrigation in FY 2021/2022 but the grievance log existed as of 2018/2019 | 1 |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | LG had no grievance responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework under micro irrigation in FY 2021/2022 but the grievance log existed as of 2018/2019 | 1 |
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6 | b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 | LG had no grievance reported on in line with the grievance redress framework under micro irrigation in FY 2021/2022 but the grievance log existed as of 2018/2019 | 1 |

Environment and Social Requirements

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0 | The guidelines were in place but there was no evidence of dissemination. At the time of assessment. No MoUs were not signed LG and farmers because the farmers could not commit themselves before the micro scale equipment was delivered. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0 | LG had not incorporated costed ESMP into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents prior to installation of irrigation equipment as required. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0 | LG had not conducted monitoring of irrigation impacts as required because the contractor failed to install the equipment in FY 2021/2022. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0 | LG had no E&S Certification forms completed and signed by DEO prior to payments of contractor invoices certificates at interim and final stages of projects as required | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6 | iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0 | LG had no E&S Certification forms completed and signed by DCDO prior to payments of contractor invoices certificates at interim and final stages of projects as required | 0 |

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|---|-----------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p> | <p>The Senior Agriculture Engineer Musoke David was substantively appointed by CAO on 26/05/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.395/KDSC/2017</p> | 70 |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |
| 2 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p> | <p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p>score 30 or else 0.</p> | <p>LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening of micro-irrigation projects in FY 2021/2022 as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• E&S Screening form for the proposed procurement and installation of micro-irrigation equipment for Mr Mbulugu George of Magogo Sub County by the DEO&DCDO on 10/05/2021• E&S Screening form for the proposed procurement and installation of micro-irrigation equipment for Mr Muwaya Stephan of Magogo Sub County by the DEO&DCDO on 15/10/2021• E&S Screening form for the proposed procurement and installation of micro-irrigation equipment for Mr Mitala Waira Moses of Namwendwa Sub County by the DEO&DCDO on 13/10/2021• E&S Screening form for the proposed procurement and installation of micro-irrigation equipment for Mr Mpanso Kamiyat of Namwendwa Sub County by the DEO&DCDO on 10/05/2021 <p>None of the E&S Screening Forms recommended for the development of ESMPs</p> | 30 |

Water & environment minimum conditions

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|---|--|-------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 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 was not substantively appointed at the time of assessment but Mufumba Daniel was the Ag. Civil Engineer (Water) effective 1/07/2022 | 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> | b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0. | Kaliisa Joel (Assistant Engineering Officer-Water) was substantively appointed by CAO on 26/10/2010 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 203/2010 (3) | 10 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i> | c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0. | The position was not substantively appointed because it wasn't on the approved staff structure | 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. | The position was not substantively appointed because it wasn't on the approved staff structure | 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. | Mutyabule Charles Naluswa (Environment Officer) was substantively appointed by CAO on 10/10/2013 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 93/KDSC/2013 (1) | 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. | Babirye Bridget (Forest Officer) was substantively appointed by CAO on 9/07/2020 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 39/KDSC/2020-2021 | 10 |

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.

LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all water infrastructure projects for 2021/2022 FY as follows;

- E&S Screening form for the proposed construction of ecosan toilet at Bugobi Village for the water and sanitation sector by the DEO&DCDO on 28/05/2021
- E&S Screening form for the proposed extension of Bugobi piped water system by the DEO&DCDO on 28/05/2021
- E&S Screening form for the proposed drilling, casting and installation of a borehole at Buwanuka Village by the DEO&DCDO on 08/02/2022
- E&S Screening form for the proposed drilling, casting and installation of a borehole at Busanga Village by the DEO&DCDO on 18/02/2022

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.

All water projects that were in FY 2021/2022 did not require ESIAs given their small scope, hence Costed ESMPs were prepared by the DEO&DCDO as follows;

- Costed ESMP of 2,230,000/= for the proposed construction of ecosan toilet at Bugobi Village for the water and sanitation sector by the DEO&DCDO on 28/05/2021

- Costed ESMP of 4,290,000/= for the proposed extension of Bugobi piped water system by the DEO&DCDO on 28/05/2021

- Costed ESMP of 9,200,000/= for the proposed drilling, casting and installation of borehole in Lot 1 and 2 by the DEO&DCDO on 02/02/2022

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

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

The LG implemented a piped water supply system but there was no evidence of existence of an abstraction permit obtained from the contractor issued by DWRM

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|--|---|-------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 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. | Waako James (DHO) was substantively appraised by CAO on 16/03/2022 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.87/KDSC/2021/2022 (B) | 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 | Lyagoba Moses (ADHO) was substantively appointed by CAO on 3/01/2019 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 89/KDSC/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. | Mulindwa Alex (ADHO) was substantively appointed by CAO on 29/04/2015 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.119/KDSC/2015 (c) | 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. | Kaiza Winfred (Senior Environment Health Officer) was substantively appointed by CAO on 26/05/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 390/KDSC/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> | e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0. | The position wasn't substantively filled because it wasn't on the approved staff structure | 0 |
| 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. | Namwase Rehema (Biostatistician) was substantively appointed by CAO on 16/03/2022 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.77/KDSC/2021/2022 | 10 |

1 New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0. Kalyoki Joseph was substantively appointed by CAO on 7/07/2014 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 357/KDSC/2014 (1)

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1 New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

1 New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

1 New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

Environment and Social Requirements

2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change evidenced by the E&S Screening forms for Health project below;

- E&S Screening form for the proposed construction of 2 in 1 doctor’s house at Kamuli General Hospital by the DEO&DCDO on 25/04/2022
- E&S Screening form for the proposed expansion of a male ward at Namwendwa HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 05/04/2022
- E&S Screening form for the proposed construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Bubago HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 21/04/2022

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.

All education projects executed in FY 2021/2022 under DDEG did not required ESIAs given their small scope according to the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019, hence costed ESMPs were prepared by the DEO and DCDO as follows;

- Costed ESMP of 1,750,000 for the proposed construction of 2 in 1 doctor's house at Kamuli General Hospital by the DEO&DCDO on 25/04/2022
- Costed ESMP of 2,300,000/= for the proposed expansion of a male ward at Namwendwa HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 05/04/2022
- Costed ESMP of 2,050,000/= for the proposed construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Bubago HC III by the DEO&DCDO on 11/04/2022

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|---|-------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 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. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0 | Waibi Joseph (DEO) was substantively appointed by CAO on 20/06/2022 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.160/KDSC/2021/2022 | 30 |
| 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. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0. | All inspector of schools were recruited as below; 1. Kisa Alitwala (Senior Inspector) of schools was substantively appointed on 20/06/2022 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.159/KDSC/2021/2022 2. Lyada Dennis (Inspector) of schools was substantively appointed by CAO on 5/08/2020 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.186/KDSC/2020 (E) | 40 |
| Environment and Social Requirements | | | | |
| 2 | Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) <i>The Maximum score is 30</i> | If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. | LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening of all education projects prior to commencement of all civil works, that is to say; • E&S Screening form for the proposed construction of a 3 in 1 classroom block at Izanhiro P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 13/09/2021 • E&S Screening form for the proposed rehabilitation of 3 classroom block at Bugondha-Butaaga P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 01/10/2021 • E&S Screening form for the proposed rehabilitation of 3 classroom block at Guwula P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 30/09/2022 | 15 |

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

All DDEG projects that were implemented in FY 2021/2022 did not require ESIAs given their small scope, according to the National Environment Act N0. 05 of 2019, hence costed ESMPs were prepared by the DEO and DCDO as follows;

- Costed ESMP of 6,180,000/= for the proposed construction of a 3 in 1 classroom block at Izanhiro P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 13/09/2021
- Costed ESMP of 5,030,000/= for the proposed rehabilitation of 3 classroom block at Bugondha-Butaaga P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 01/10/2021
- Costed ESMP of 5,030,000/= for the proposed rehabilitation of 3 classroom block at Guwula P/S by the DEO&DCDO on 30/09/2022

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|---|--|-------|
| Human Resource Management and Development | | | | |
| 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 | Kifuse Alex (CFO) was substantively appointed by CAO on 16/04/2022 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 118/KDSC/2021/2022 (A) | 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 was not substantively filled. However, Kalamu Allan was the Ag. District Planner effective 25/01/2022 | 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. | c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0 | The position was not substantively filled as told by HRM but still this couldn't be confirmed since the file was found missing | 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 | Isabirye Robert (DNRO) was substantively appointed by CAO on 4/10/2013 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 85/KDSC/2013 (1) | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0 | Musenero Richard (DPO) was substantively appointed by CAO on 31/05/2012 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 81/JDSC/2012/KML | 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 | Mmerewoma Leo (DCDO) was substantively appointed by CAO on 11/02/2013 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 206/KDSC/2013 (1) | 3 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>Talugende Moses (District Commercial Officer) was substantively appointed by CAO on 16/04/2022 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 131/KDSC/2021/2022</p> | 3 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p> | <p>Mwiru Emmanuel (Senior Procurement Officer) was substantively appointed by CAO on 31/05/2012 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 113/JDSC/2012/KML</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Mugomba Samuel (Procurement Officer) was substantively appointed by CAO on 15/03/2018 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.154/KDSC/2018 (B)</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Kasiko Prossy (PHRO) was substantively appointed by CAO on 16/03/2022 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.87/KDSC/2021/2022 (A)</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Bakaki Samuel (Senior Environment Officer) was substantively appointed by CAO on 4/10/2013 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 85/KDSC/2013 (2)</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The position was not substantively filled. However, Igadube Festo was the Ag. Senior lands management officer effective 22/07/2022</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Murangira Pius (Senior Accountant) was substantively appointed by CAO on 9/07/2020 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.19/KDSC/2020-2021</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The position was not substantively filled but Murangira Pius was the Ag. Principal Internal Auditor effective 26/04/2022</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Makoosi Barker (PHRO-DSC) was substantively appointed by CAO on 19/06/2019 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 571/KDSC/2019</p> | 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 LG had 14 LLGs which were operational in the previous FY. However, due to Poor Records Management, the HRO presented only 11 files for SAS to be reviewed. She claimed that some files had been misplaced at the registry. However, all the 11 files confirmed that the SAS were substantively recruited and they included the below;

1. Tidhomu Moses B.W (Butansi) was substantively appointed by CAO on 15/11/2006 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 145/2006 (ii)

2. Weyale Andrew (Namasagali) was substantively appointed by CAO on 24/04/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 311/KDSC/2017 (E)

3. Kirya George (Kisozi) was substantively appointed by CAO on 15/11/2006 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 145/2006 (ii)

4. Mirembe Dinah (Namwendwa) was substantively appointed by CAO on 10/07/2003 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 160/2003 (v)

5. Namwase Juliet (Kisozi) was substantively appointed by CAO on 14/12/2009 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 160/2009 (1)

6. Tumwebaze Denis (Kasambya) was substantively appointed by CAO on 14/08/2008 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 133/2008 (1)

7. Kiyimba Paul (Nawanyago) was substantively appointed by CAO on 10/07/2003 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 160/2003 (v)

8. Mawerere Grace (Balawoli) was substantively appointed by CAO on 4/07/2013 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.241/KDSC/2013 (a)

9. Sentongo Simon (Kitanyunjwa) was substantively appointed by CAO on 17/10/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 490/KDSC/2017

10. Kijumba Simon (Bulopa) was substantively appointed by CAO on 10/07/2003 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 160/2003 (v)

11. Mutyaba Irene Grace (Mbulabuti)

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

Maximum score is 15

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

All the CDO were substantively appointed as indicated below;

1. Nambi Irene (Kitayunjwa) was substantively appointed by CAO on 17/10/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 488/KDSC/2017 (v)

2. Babirye Eva (Butansi) was substantively appointed by CAO on 9/07/2020 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 24/KDSC/2020-2021 (ii)

3. Ababiri Ronald Reagan (HQ) was substantively appointed by CAO on 17/10/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 488/KDSC/2017 (i)

4. Anyago Dona (Balawoli) was substantively appointed on 9/07/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 24/KDSC/2020-2021 (i)

5. Namasoga Lydia (Bugulumbya) was substantively appointed by CAO on 24/05/2011 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 98/2011 (2)

6. Nabirye Babra (Butanzi) was substantively appointed by CAO on 17/10/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.488/KDSC/2017 (ii)

7. Namukose Suzan (HQ) was substantively appointed by CAO on 11/04/2019 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.249/KDSC/2019

8. Nsooli Justine (HQ) was substantively appointed by CAO on 14/02/2022 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 30/KDSC/2021/2022

9. Kagodo Samuel (Bulopa) was substantively appointed by CAO on 9/07/2020 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.9/07/2020 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.24/KDSC/2020-2021 (iii)

10. Kasiri Mwajuma (Kagumba) was substantively appointed by CAO on 17/10/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 488/KDSC/2017 (iii)

11. Nabunyo Hellen Esther (Nawanyago) was substantively appointed by CAO on 17/10/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 488/KDSC/2017 (iv)

12. Mudondo Winnie (Namwendwa) was substantively appointed by CAO on 9/07/2020 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.24/KDSC/2020-2021 (iv)

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

Maximum score is 15

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

All the SAA/Accounts Assistants were substantively appointed by CAO as indicated below;

1. Kyebakola Paul (Balawoli) was substantively appointed by CAO on 30/08/2006 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 47/2006
2. Njaye Jesse (Mbulabuti) was substantively appointed by CAO on 4/02/1995 under MIN NO. DSC.MIF.12/98
3. Bukobero David (HQ) was substantively appointed by CAO on 26/05/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.404/KDSC/2017
4. Kandha Cissy (Wankole) was substantively appointed by CAO on 20/10/2004 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 74/2004 (F)
5. Wakabi Micheal (Namwendwa) was substantively appointed by CAO on 14/02/1998 under MIN NO. DSC.MIF.12.98
6. Mugimba Phoebe (Nawanyago) was substantively appointed on 25/07/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 491/KDSC/2017 (i)
7. Akoye Paul (Bugulumbya) was substantively appointed by CAO on 5/10/1995 under MIN NO/ NAF.3
8. Bazira Richard (HQ) was substantively appointed on 30/06/2006 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.47/2006
9. Musenze Felix (Kagumba) was substantively appointed on 25/07/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.491/KDSC/2017 (ii)
10. Waziko Ronald (kitanunjwa) was substantively appointed by CAO on 25/07/2017 CR/156/1 under MIN NO.491/KDSC/2017 (iv)
11. Ndikola Phillip (Kamuli General Hospital) was substantively appointed by CAO on 13/05/2019 CR/156/1 under MIN NO. 473/KDSC/2019

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 3 | Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY. Maximum score is 4 | If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to: a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0 | The allocated funds for Natural Resources department in the previous FY were Shs. 296,115,479 as on page 13 of the draft AFS for FY 2021/2022. Actual funds released were Shs. 286,336,226 as indicated on page 13 of the draft AFS representing 96.7%. | 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 allocated funds for Community Based Services department in the previous FY were Shs. 526,700,593 as on page 13 of the draft AFS for FY 2021/2022. Actual funds released were Shs. 525,654,956 as indicated on page 13 of the draft AFS representing 99.8%. | 2 |
| 4 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works. Maximum score is 12 | a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0 | LG had carried out Environment and Social Screening of DDEG projects for FY 2021-2022 evidenced by the following E&S Screening Forms by the DDEO & DDCDO as follows; • E&S Screening form for the proposed completion of new administration block in phase four right wing by the DEO&DCDO on 02/07/2021 • E&S Screening form for the proposed renovation of Kamuli district Service Commission by the DEO&DCDO on 08/10/2021 | 4 |
| 4 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works. Maximum score is 12 | b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0 | All DDEG projects that were implemented in the FY 2021/2022 did not require ESIAs given their small scope according to the National Environment Act No. 05 of 2019, hence costed ESMPs were prepared and signed by the DDEO & DDCDO as detailed below; • Costed ESMP of 11,850,000/= for the proposed completion of new administration block in phase four right wing by the DEO&DCDO on 02/07/2021 • Costed ESMP of 3,200,000/= for the proposed renovation of Kamuli district Service Commission by the DEO&DCDO on 08/10/2021 | 4 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p> | 4 |
| | | | <p>LG had prepared Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) by the DDEO & DDCDO as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costed ESMP of 11,850,000/= for the proposed completion of new administration block in phase four right wing by the DEO&DCDO on 02/07/2021 • Costed ESMP of 3,200,000/= for the proposed renovation of Kamuli district Service Commission by the DEO&DCDO on 08/10/2021 |

Financial management and reporting

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p> | <p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p> | 10 |
| | | | <p>The LG had a clean audit opinion "Unqualified" for FY 2021/2022.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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>The LG provided information to PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General's findings for FY 2020/2021 on 28/3/2021 after the mandatory deadline of 28/2/2022 as in the PFMA 2015 11 2g</p> | 0 |
| | <p>maximum score is 10</p> | <p>score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>The IAG findings which were responded to include the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaccounted for Administration advances for Shs. 262,178,407 • Inadequately supported expenditure of Shs. 32,996,488 • Illegal contracting of sub county land to grow sugar cane in Bulaga Sc. | |
| | | | <p>In addition, responses to PS/ST on findings of the Auditor General for FY 2020/2021 were belatedly submitted on 28/3/2022 beyond the mandatory date of 28/2/2022 contrary to provisions of PFMA 2015 section 11 2 g</p> | |
| | | | <p>The findings of the AG which were responded to by the Accounting Officer included the following:</p> | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unpaid salaries of Shs. 1,352,004,495. • Over/under payment of salary of Shs. 16,604,611 • Over/under payment of pension /gratuity of Shs. 789,022,349 | |
| 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 LG made the submission of the Annual Performance Contract to MoFPED through pbs@ifmis.go..ug to www.budget.go.ug on 13/7/2022 within the mandatory deadline of 31/8/2022 as evidenced on the inventory of LGs submissions to MoFPED</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 LG made the submission of the Annual Performance Contract to MoFPED through pbs@ifmis.go..ug to www.budget.go.ug on 19/8/2022 within the mandatory deadline of 31/8/2022</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 LG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for all the quarters of the previous FY to MoFPED as evidenced below:

1st QBPR was submitted on 18/11/2021

2nd QBPR was submitted on 28/1/2022

3rd QBPR was submitted on 30/4/2022

4th QBPR was submitted on 18/8/2022 within the recommended deadline of 31/8/2022.