



LGMSD 2021/22

Mayuge District

(Vote Code: 535)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	87%
Education Minimum Conditions	60%
Health Minimum Conditions	50%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	64%
Educational Performance Measures	47%
Health Performance Measures	52%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	36%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	40%

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>Evidence from the list of 26 DDEG funded projects for the FY 2020/2021, indicate that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s).</p> <p>Infrastructural projects sampled are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completion of the second phase of the administration block at Mayuge District HQ at a cost of UGX 29,997,960. It houses the district board room, office of CAO, DCAO e.t.c; 2. Construction of the 5-stance pit latrine at Kyando tourist site at a cost of UGX 19,999,855. Was used during Bishop Hannington day; 3. construction of a 3-stance latrine with urinals at Buyemba P/S at a cost of UGX 15,044,929- Used by the school (Ref page 17 of the of the budget performance report. 	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 	Not applicable in 2020 assessment	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>Evidence from the annual budget performance report indicates that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract, as listed below;</p> <p>Proc ref no. MAYU 535/WKS/19-20/00067 CONSTRUCTION OF 2 stance latrine and urinal at bufulubi HCIII started on the 22/04/20, Request was 08/06/2020 and payment was done 25/06/2020 and completion certificate dated on the 11/06/202;</p> <p>Proc ref no. MAYU 535/WKS/20-21/00042 CONSTRUCTION OF 5 stance pit latrine at kyanda tourist site, started on the 07/01/2020, Request was done on the 26/11/2020 and payment done 30/03/2021 and the completion certificate dated on the 23/01/2021.</p>	3

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	As per DDEG Grant Budget and Implementation Guidelines and as per the evidence of the list of DDEG projects presented to the assessor, 21 projects were undertaken and all conform and are eligible as per the guideline.	2
---	--	--	---	---

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that the variations of the three sampled DDEG funded projects for the FY 2020/2021 were within the +/-20% of the LG engineers estimates as follows;</p> <p>Project: Completion of council hall toilet under DDEG; MAYU535/WKS/20-21/00056</p> <p>Contractor: Strategic Brothers (U) limited</p> <p>Award Amount = Ugx. 7,000,000</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 7,000,000</p> <p>Variation = 0%;</p> <p>Project: Construction of a parking yard at the District headquarters; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00058</p> <p>Contractor: Hivan General Investments Limited</p> <p>Contract Amount = Ugx.18,635,150</p> <p>Engineers estimate = Ugx. 19,000,000</p> <p>Variation = +1.92%; and</p> <p>Project: Completion of Administration Block at Mayuge District Headquarters; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00057</p> <p>Contractor: Wazibas General Contractors and Designers Limited Contract Amount = Ugx.29,997,960</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx.30,000,000</p> <p>Variation = +0.0068% among others</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	As per evidence presented and reviewed from Mayuge TC, Magamaga TC and Byayitabomge SC (the 3 selected LLGs) evidence shows that information on positions filled are accurate as per minimum staffing. In each LLG, list of staff deployment, staff numbers, staff name and gap in staffing were all clearly indicated.	2
---	--	--	--	---

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0	There were no reports from the LG to indicate that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced.	0
---	--	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence provided to show that LG consolidated and Submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY2021/2022 to MoPs.	0
---	--	---	---	---

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	No evidence was provided to show that the district has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as per MoPs guidelines. Reasons provided was because of COVID – 19 Pandemic which limited access to offices and some staff were working from home.	0
---	--	--	---	---

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0	Evidence provided shows that all HODs were not appraised, however, all of them had Annual performance agreement signed by their Supervisor.	0
---	--	---	---	---

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	In the evidence provided there was no implementation of any rewards and sanctions as provided for in the guidelines. Both staff personal files, Sanctions and Rewards files were reviewed to ascertain this.	0
---	--	--	--	---

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	After reviewing CC files and Minutes of meetings held, there was evidence to shows that the LG has established a consultative committee which is functioning, much as its' establishment is not as per guidelines provided.	1
---	--	--	---	---

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.	As per staff recruitment List of February and March 2021, evidence provided shows that not all the 100% of newly recruited accessed payroll on time. Most of the staff accessed payroll after more than 2 months of assumption of duty;- Example. those recruited in February accessed payroll in May and staff recruited in March 2021 accessed payroll in July 2021.	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.	Evidence provided shows that above 90% of retired staff (18) during the previous FY2020/2021 have not accessed Payroll and have pending arrears as per the Internal Memo dated on 29/July/2021:"Pensioners who retired 20/21 and access on Payroll (Changed from active to Pension Payroll). Only one staff ; Ms.Namuganza Elizabeth, Education Assistant under Computer Ref No: Computer 363400 was fully paid.	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	DDEG transfers to LLGs budget was UGX 557,814,000 as per the LLG Budget estimates in the annual work plan on page 67. From the annual work plan and budget and documents for fund transfer analysed and reviewed, it was evident that direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in 3 equal installments as outlined below; 1st Quarter transfer of UGX 185,937,667 was On 10th /8/20; 2nd Quarter transfer of UGX 185,937,667 was on 19/10/20; 3rd Quarter transfer of UGX 185,938,667 was on 27/01/21; Total UGX 557,814,001.	2
----	--	--	---	---

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED): Score: 2 or else score 0	From the evidence gathered and presented to the assessor the LG lacked receipts of expenditure date as well as warranting date as indicated below; 1st quarter, warranting was done on July 2020; 2nd quarter, warranting was done on October 2020; 3rd quarter, warranting was done on Jan 2021; 4th quarter, warranting was done on April 2020;	0
----	--	---	---	---

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter: Score 2 or else score 0	No evidence was provided to indicate that all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was done within 5 working days from date of receipt of funds released in each quarter.	0
----	--	---	---	---

11	Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0	From the evidence obtained, and the field monitoring reports presented, it is concluded that all LLGs have been supervised or mentored at least Quarterly as follows; 1st Quarter 31/08/2020; 2nd Quarter 15/12/2020; 3rd Quarter 31/3/2021; and 4th Quarter 14/6/2021	2
----	--	---	--	---

11	Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up: Score 2 or else score 0	From the evidence obtained and made available to assessor, reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the DTPC, and used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions as follows; 1st Quarter meeting minutes on 25/08/2020 for monitoring and DTPC on 16/9/2020; 2nd Quarter meeting minutes on 10/12/2020 for monitoring and DTPC on the 16/2/2021; 3rd Quarter meeting minutes on 15/03/2021 for monitoring and DTPC on the 5/3/2021; and 4th Quarter meeting minutes on 20/05/2021 for monitoring and DTPC on the 27/5/2021.	2
----	--	--	--	---

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: Score 2 or else score 0 Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0	The asset registers physically presented, checked and reviewed conforms to the format in the accounting manual, contains all significant assets and is up-to-date. All major assets including the Land, Building, vehicles, computers, equipment among others are all included as per the accounting manual.	2
----	--	--	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the evidence obtained by way of reviewing the board of survey report which was signed by the CAO on the 30/08/2021 and submitted to the Accountant General on the 31/08/2021. The report formed a basis to which guidance was sought on procurement, maintenance and disposal of Assets.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>No evidence of the minutes submitted to MoLHUD, because there is no PDP..</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects; Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the Evidence of the desk appraisal reports and minutes of the desk appraisal committee, all prioritised investments are derived from the LG Development Plan. Desk appraisal were conducted for all the 58 projects. Desk appraisal report was done on 09/March/2020 and presented to CAO on 13/March/2020.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects: 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>Evidence from the three sampled projects, technical feasibility, Environmental and social acceptability are done and indicated on page 1&2 of the desk appraisal report on 09/03/2020; The 3 sampled projects are indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitation of 20 boreholes at a cost of UGX 154,797,403; 2. Completion of OPD at Kitovu HC II at a cost of UGX 52,171,744; and 3. Supply of 238 three-seater desks at a cost of UGX 28,560,000. 	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>From the evidence of the district project profiles for the FY 2021/2022 presented to the assessor, all the below project profile were discussed in the DTPC meeting that sat on 29/4/2021, agenda no. 004/DTPC/04/21- presentation of project profiles indicates that all the project profiles for Investment were discussed by the TPC and check whether they adhere to the formats in the LG Planning Guidelines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completion of staff house at bishop Hannington p/s- UGX 60,997,613; 2. construction 2 classroom block at Bukagabo p/s – UGX 58,988,790; 3. construction of 2 stance/section water borne toilet and extension of drug store- UGX 55,000,375. 	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures before being approved for construction using checklists as evidenced by appraisal/screening reports signed by Environment Officer and DCDO on the 09/March/2020.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the infrastructure projects under DDEG for FY2021-2022 were incorporated in the LG approved work plan on 21st June and received by PDU on 1st September 2021.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all infrastructural projects to be implemented in the FY2021/2022 using DDEG were approved by contracts committee before commencement of construction. The contracts committee meeting held on 5th October 2021 under minute, Min 04/02/10/21/MDCC confirmed the same.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Mayuge LG established a proper project implementation team as detailed in a memo dated 5th October 2021 referenced CR/214/15; The memo nominated project teams headed by the project manager, Mr. Mudibo Tom.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that most of the infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG engineers; the site supervision and technical payment reports prepared by the district technical teams support the same. This was also confirmed through random site visit jointly conducted by the assessor and the engineers on 5th November 2021 to the following 3 sampled sites; Completion of Administration Block at Mayuge District Headquarters, Construction of a parking yard at the District headquarters and Completion of council hall toilet under DDEG among others.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the technical staff of Mayuge LG provided supervision and work completion reports for their infrastructural projects prior to verification and certification of works in the FY2020-2021. There was a summary report for the construction of a parking yard at the District headquarters and Completion of council hall toilet prepared by Wako rogers, Senior Civil Engineer; dated 6th September 2021	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that Mayuge LG had verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames for FY2020/2021; Most of the procurement files availed had complete documentations and reports clearing them for payments as demonstrated by the 2 sampled projects as follows; For the project of Completion of Administration Block at Mayuge District Headquarters, an amount of Ugx. 29,997,960/= was paid to the contractor on 26th May 2021. In addition, the project for Completion of council hall toilet under DDEG, an amount of Ugx. 7,000,000/= was paid to the contractor on 8th January 2021 among others	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that Mayuge LG had complete procurement files for FY2020-2021 in place dated 30th June 2021. The files had evaluation reports approved by the contracts committee, works contracts and minutes of contracts committee decisions	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. Score: 2 or else score 0	There was evidence availed that shows that the District designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints as evidenced by the Letter of appointment dated 29th March 2021. The centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) was established with relevant departmental heads/staff. This was evidenced by the availed Committee members' appointment letters dated 29th March 2021.	2
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. If so: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence provided to show that the LG had a specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances. There was no evidence of a centralized complaints log book with clear information and reference for onward action and public display of information at district notice board.	0
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the District publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	From the evidence of the LG development plan, annual working plan, budgets and enhanced DDEG guidelines reviewed, Environment Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated. The sampled projects are listed below; 1. construction of 5 stance line pit latrines at Bugulu P/S – UGX 19,999,820; 2. construction of stance line pit latrine at Kyando tourist site- UGX 19,999,855; 3. construction of 5 stance VIP latrine for rural growth center in Namugongo-UGX 33,972,141. UGX 3 million was provided to do E&S from all projects on page 53 of the approved budget estimates 2020/21	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management	From the minutes and attendance lists reviewed and assessed, DDEG guidelines have been disseminated to LLGs. Evidence has been obtained from the meeting on the 5/3/21, DTPC agenda item 5 and minute no. 005/DTPC/03/21 on page 4- "Presentation on DDEG guideline and the new programming on LGDP III"	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 costing Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:	There was no evidence provided to show that the costing Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure	0
		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. Score 3 or else score 0	There were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence provided to show that all DDEG projects were implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability without any encumbrances.	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	There was evidence availed to show that environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs. This is evidenced by availed Environmental and Social Mitigation Monitoring Certification for Local Government Projects For example . Completion of Administration Block at Mayuge district Headquarters certification report dated 11/June/2021, signed/stamped by Environment Officer and DCDO; Construction of a 5-stance lined at Bukatabira primary school certification report date 20th April 2021, signed/stamped by Environment Officer and DCDO,	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence provided to show that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates on 11/06/2021.	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	Bank reconciliations reviewed by way of physical documentation are up-to-date and a sample of the two major selected accounts can confirm this. The 2 accounts selected are the Single Treasury Account and the General fund Account.	2
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90 Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	Physical evidence of the quarterly internal audit reports was presented and verified as follows; 1st Quarter IA report was on 15/12/2020; 2nd Quarter IA report was on 24/02/2021; 3rd Quarter IA report was on 24/5/2021; and 4th Quarter IA report was on 05/10/2021. Therefore, all quarterly reports were produced for the previous FY.	2
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90 Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	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. Score 1 or else score 0	Despite the fact that the LG had produced all quarterly IA reports for the previous FY, there was no evidence provided to the assessor that information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports was provide to Council or LG PAC.	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>No evidence was provided that previous FY IA reports were submitted to LG Accounting Officer.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The local revenue collection ratio of planned Vs actual collection is 40.1% in 2020/2021</p> <p>The Budget estimates were UGX 774,321,519</p> <p>Actual collection was UGX 310,721,583 on Page 30 of the Annual Financial statements 2020/2021</p> <p>Difference is UGX 463,600,417</p> <p>LG revenue collection ratio was -59.9% short of revenue target.</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>From the evidence by way of reviewing the Audited financial statements in the FY 2019/2020, own revenue sources generated UGX 305,685,608 and review of the Annual Financial Accounts in the FY 2020/2021, it was UGX 310,721,583, indicating there was an increment in collection of UGX 5,055,975 (Appx 1.6% growth).</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

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>From the evidence on page 21 of the Annual financial statements 2020/2021, a total of UGX 6,441,060,149 was transferred to the LLGs. A sample of 2 LLGs reviewed below indicate compliance;</p> <p>On the 25/5/21, 65% was transferred to Imanyiro sub-county as 65% of the UGX 5,000,000 collection.</p> <p>On the 3/5/21, 65% was transferred to Baitambogwe sub-county as 65% of the UGX 2,000,000 collection.</p>	2
----	--	--	--	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all the amounts for FY2020-2021 were published on the PDU notice board on 4th August 2020;</p> <p>Also some contract awards were published on the departmental notice boards such as health department notice boards and education department notice boards</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence the LG performance assessment results and implications are published on the website – www.mayuge.go.ug in August 2021.</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>Evidence from the “Script for a radio talk show on community awareness on district projects under implementation for the FY 2020/2021” on the 21/05/2021 indicate that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation.</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>There were no tax rates, collection procedures and appeal procedures published on the notice boards.</p>	0
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No IGG issues raised to date.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the pass rates have decreased between the previous school year but one and the previous year by -0.2%.</p> <p>Evidence from 2019 PLE Performance Summary Report signed by DEO on 4/Nov/2021 shows that 5,689 candidates passed in Divisions 1-3 out of the 9566 who sat, representing 59.5% pass rate.</p> <p>Evidence from 2020 PLE Performance Summary Report signed by DEO on 4/Nov/2021 shows that 5,477 candidates passed in Divisions 1-3 out of the 9243 who sat, representing 59.3% pass rate.</p>	0
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the pass rates between the previous school year but one and the previous year have increased by 1.5%.</p> <p>Evidence from 2019 PLE Performance Summary Report signed by DEO on 4/Nov/2021 shows that 1,438 candidates passed in Divisions 1-3 out of the 3529 who sat, representing 40.7% pass rate.</p> <p>Evidence from 2020 PLE Performance Summary Report signed by DEO on 4/Nov/2021 shows that 1,302 candidates passed in Divisions 1-3 out of the 2,759 who sat, representing 42.2% pass rate.</p>	2
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 in the 2020/2021 assessment	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the MOES Sector Guidelines (2021/2022) 5.1.5 Activities to be funded under the program 0784 – Education and Sports Management (p.16) sector guidelines; and the budget performance report availed indicated that District Education Officer had used the education development grant on eligible activities such as Higher LG Services (e.g. Salaries), Capital Purchases (e.g. Classroom Construction and Rehabilitation) as availed in the Quarterly Performance Report signed by the CAO (27/08/21).</p> <p>The same guidelines were followed by the Schools to budget for Instructional Materials, Co-Curricular Activities, Management, and Administration in FY 2020/21.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to indicate that 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.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the variations of the three sampled contracts for education infrastructure projects for the FY 2020/2021 were within the +/-20% of the MoES engineers estimates as follows:</p> <p>Project: construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at St. Matayo Primary School; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00028</p> <p>Contractor: Bannac Limited</p> <p>Contract amount = Ugx. 20,000,000=/-</p> <p>Engineers Estimate: Ugx. 20,000,000=/-</p> <p>Variation = 0%</p> <p>Project: Renovation of verandah of a classroom block at Kasozi P/S under SFG; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00043</p> <p>Contractor: Bannac Limited</p> <p>Contract amount = Ugx 6,000,000=/-</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 6,000,000=/-</p> <p>Variation = 0%</p> <p>Project: Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Jaguzi Island P/S under SFG; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00018;</p> <p>Contractor: Hivan General Investments Limited</p> <p>Contract sum = Ugx. 31,996,880=/-</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 32,000,000=/-</p> <p>Variation = 0.00975% (+ve)</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 evidence that the education project (Mpungwe seed secondary school) that was planned in FY2020-21 was implemented as per the work plan; the work contract that was awarded to M/s Mercy Commercial Agencies Ltd., MOES/WRKS/2018-19/00119-LOT 27 on 23rd April 2019, was executed starting on 17th May 2019 and was handed over on 29th September 2021</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>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>Evidence provided shows that out of 127 staff to be recruited in the FY2020/2021, only 61 were recruited standing at a 48.3%. " Minutes of the 27th Meeting of Mayuge District Service Commission held on 18/19 and 20 January 2021 at Commissions' Boardroom" , Appointment of Education staff Min: 164/2021. Advisement of recruitment was published in the New Vision of 18/October/2021 (Job Mart Sec. 27/9/21) for recruitment of Staff who were not recruited in the current FY2021/2022.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There was evidence that schools in the LG met basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines. In the 3 sampled schools, i.e. Magamaga Army PS, Buluba PS and Bishop Hannington PS, basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines such as school signpost, infrastructure, Mission Statement, Motto, Vision, Annual Work Plan, Management Structure displayed on the Notice Boards of each school.</p>	3

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2
- Else score: 0

Evidence obtained on teacher deployment from the LG Education Office Staff List for June 2021 signed by the DEO on 4/Nov/2021 and from the 3 Sample Schools showed the following details on teacher deployment: -

a) Magamaga Army PS: the LG Staff List had a total of 21 teachers {10 Female, 11 Male} while the School Notice Board displayed a total 21 teachers {12 Female, 09 Male}. All teachers appeared on the School Notice Board as at 4/Nov/2021;

b) Bishop Hannington PS: the LG Staff List had a total of 10 teachers {4 Female, 6 Male} while the School Notice Board displayed a total 10 teachers {5 Female, 5 Male}. All teachers appeared on the School Notice Board as at 4/Nov/2021; and

c) Rural: Buluba PS: the LG Staff List had 30 teachers {13 Female, 17 Male} while the School Notice Board displayed a total 25 Teachers {10 Female, 15 Male} as at 4/Nov/2021. The following teachers were missing on the School Notice Board were but listed on the LG Staff Deployment List: Nabirye Brenda CF95007100IDEL, Kagoya Bayati CF93016104KWYD; Namukose Mirika CF8900810687TG; Mudambada Joseph CM83008106CQKE; and Kafuko John CM87013108RTCD.

There was evidence on the Notice Boards in the Sample Schools of teacher deployment, e.g. on time tables and on various Committees. However, based on the above inaccuracies in the DL and in some School Lists, the DL did not comply.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2
- Else score: 0

Evidence availed from the LG Education Office showed that that LG has a school asset register for FY 2020/2021, signed by the DEO on 30/06/21, accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.

Evidence as at 5/Nov/2021 on the notice boards from the respective sample schools in the LG showed the following: -

a) Urban: Magamaga Army PS: infrastructure and equipment is in place as per the consolidated asset register. These included the classroom blocks, pupil and staff latrines (disaggregated by sex), and desks.

b) Semi-urban: Bishop Hannington PS: infrastructure and equipment is in place as per the consolidated asset register. These included the classroom blocks, pupil and staff latrines (disaggregated by sex), and desks; and

c) Rural: Buluba PS: infrastructure and equipment is in place as per the consolidated asset register. These included the classroom blocks, pupil and staff latrines (disaggregated by sex), and desks.

However:

a) the assets, i.e., classrooms and latrines need face lift, and furniture needs repair.

b) although the MoES Asset Register template provides for Laboratories in Primary Schools, there are no laboratories in primary schools.

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>There was no evidence availed at the LG and in the sample schools, i.e. Magamaga Army PS, Buluba PS and Bishop Hannington PS to show that schools had submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by the 30th January 2021.</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was no evidence from the District and Sample School, i.e. Magamaga Army PS, Buluba PS and Bishop Hannington PS to show that the schools were supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations. Although the Schools had the SIPs pinned on their Notice Boards, there was no evidence (e.g. for instance in the reviewed minutes for FY 2020/21) of support in their preparation and implementation, apart from at Bishop Hannington PS (DIS School Feedback Report, 10/03/20).</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>Evidence from OTIMS data FY 2020/2021 accessed, and from the lists of Government Aided Primary and Secondary Schools FY2020/2021 availed by the LG in the performance contract, the LG had collected and compiled return forms for all (100%) registered schools for the FY 2020/2021. The LG school lists were stamped and signed by the DEO on 30/06/2021. Evidence showed a total of 142 government-aided primary schools including Ansaar PS, Buwaaya PS, Isikiro PS, Mpungwe PS, and Ndaiga PS. Evidence showed a total of 10 government-aided secondary schools including Bufulibi SS, Bunya SS, Kigandalo SS and Wante Muslim.</p>	4

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision	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:	Evidence from the LG (the Approved Performance Contract, p. 15, p. 75-6, FY 2021/2021, signed by CAO 14/06/21; Education Department Workplan 2020/2021, p.3, signed by DEO 30/06/20; from the Quarterly Performance Report Quarter 4, p. 70, FY2020/2021, signed by CAO on 27/08/21; from the List of Schools FY2020/2021) showed that the LG had 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.	4
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Score 4 or else, score: 0		
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	b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,	Evidence showed that the LG had deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY 2021/2022, which spell out that a Head Teacher and minimum of seven teachers per school (or a minimum of one teacher per class for a school which does not cover all grades up to primary seven) for Primary Schools; and a head teacher, and one subject teacher per class for secondary schools (Draft MoES Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments FY 2021/2022; Subsection 4.1 Budgeting Requirements for the Wage Grant, p.12).	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Score 3 else score: 0	<p>However, evidence obtained on teacher deployment from the LG Education Office Staff List for June 2021 signed by the DEO on 4/Nov/2021 showed inaccurate reporting on teachers and where they are deployed in 1 out of the 3 Sample Schools, i.e. Magamaga Army PS, Buluba PS and Bishop Hannington PS: -</p> <p>Rural: Buluba PS: 30 teachers {13 Female, 17 Male} appeared on the LG Notice Board, while 25 Teachers {10 Female, 15 Male} appeared on the School Noticeboard. Missing on the School Notice Board as at 4/Nov/2021 were: Nabirye Brenda CF95007100IDEL, Kagoya Bayati CF93016104KWYD; Namukose Mirika CF8900810687TG; Mudambada Joseph CM83008106CQKE; and Kafuko John CM87013108RTCD, meaning that these were not deployed in the School.</p>	
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	c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,	Evidence showed that teacher deployment data had been publicized on LG and on the notice boards of the 3 sample schools i.e. Magamaga Army PS, Buluba PS and Bishop Hannington PS, as at the 5/Nov/2021. The lists on the LG notice board were stamped, signed by the DEO, and dated the 5/Nov/2021.	1
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	score: 1 else, score: 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>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence provided does not show that Primary School Head teachers were appraised neither were their appraisal report submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There were no evidence provided to show that all Secondary School head teachers were appraised by D/CAO, staff appraisal performance plans were developed and submitted to HRM, however, no evidence of submission of appraisal reports were presented.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>Out of 5 staff scheduled in the department for appraisal evaluation, evidence provided shows that only 4 LG education staff (exclusive of the DEO) were appraised. However, all of them submitted their appraisal plan for the FY 2020/2021.</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence was not availed to show that the DEO had developed a training plan for FY 2020/2021.</p> <p>However, the trainings had been incorporated in the DL Education Departmental Workplan for FY 2020/2021 stamped, dated 30/06/20 and signed by the DEO, p. 89-92, and budgeted for in the Department's Workplan FY 2020/2021, p. 3, signed by DEO (30/06/20).</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by 15/Dec/2020.</p> <p>Evidence availed (CR/157/1) signed by the CAO was dated 19/09/20, therefore, the LG was non-complaint.</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>Evidence showed that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines, as per the LG Education Quarterly Performance Report for Quarter 4 FY2020/2021 signed by the CAO as at 27/08/21 under Vote 535; an extract from the annual sector work plan for the FY2020/2021 (Q4 Report, pages 71-77). The expenditures on the inspection and monitoring functions highlighted in the Annual Sector Workplan showed that the activities, e.g. support supervision in syllabus coverage, implementation of DES Standards, schools' adherence to COVID-19 SOPs, schools' re-opening, etc., (p. 77) that were conducted complied to the MoES: Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments FY2020/2021 subsections 5.1.4 Management and Oversight, p.15 and 5.1.5 Activities to be funded under the program 0784 – Education and Sports Management (p. 16), and 5.2 Budget Implementation Requirements for the Non-wage Recurrent Grant (p.16).</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>There was no evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters.</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>There was no evidence that LG invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED in FY 2020/2021.</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>Evidence was availed in form of minutes of preparatory inspection and monitoring meetings and from DIS School Inspection List that 3 visits FY 2020/2021 had been carried out although terms had not been indicated. Further, there was evidence in the Departmental minutes and other documentation of preparatory inspection and monitoring meetings, e.g., signed and stamped Internal Memos to CAO from DEO dated 20/Oct/2020, 15/Oct/2020, 15/Dec/2020; and from minutes, e.g. Mayuge District Headteachers' Meetings with the Education Dept Staff on 23/Oct/2020 (Item MADIPHA 09/Oct/2020), 2/11/20 (Item MADIPHA 02/Nov/2020).</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>Evidence from DIS School inspection list availed showed that all (100%) of the UPE schools had been inspected and monitored in the three school terms FY 2020/2021, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report {signed and stamped Internal Memos to CAO from DEO dated 20/Oct/2020, 15/Oct/2020, 15/Dec/2020; and from minutes, e.g., Mayuge District Headteachers' Meetings with the Education Dept Staff on 23/Oct/2020 (Item MADIPHA 09/Oct/2020), 2/Nov/2020 (Item MADIPHA 02/Nov/2020)}.</p>	2

10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up, Score: 2 or else, score: 0	There were no reports or minutes availed at the LG and in the 3 sample schools, i.e. i.e. Magamaga Army PS, Buluba PS and Bishop Hannington PS to show evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up during FY 2020/2021.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0	Evidence from the DEO's list of primary schools and from the sample 3 schools (i.e. urban - Magamaga Army PS, semi-urban-Bishop Hannington PS and rural-Buluba PS) to establish whether copies of the inspection reports from the previous three terms were left behind showed that only reports of one quarter, i.e. Term 1 were left behind in the schools but not for all the previous 3 terms. The reason was that inspection was done in Term 1 (FY 2020/2021) before COVID-19 lockdown. Evidence from DES showed that Mayuge DLG had submitted all the school inspection reports for the previous 3 terms FY2020/2021. However, there was no evidence of letters of acknowledgment from DES.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0	Evidence from the minutes obtained from the Clerk to Council on the 22/02/2021 indicate that Committee responsible for Education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results on page 7 of the 1st quarter standing committee report, and 2nd quarter on the 09/03/2021, page 5.	2
11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, score: 2 or else score: 0	There was no evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school in FY2020/2021.	0

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Evidence of an up-to-date LG asset register FY 2020/2021 (signed by DEO on 30/06/21) which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards was availed. The asset registers pinned on notice boards as at 5/Nov/2021 in the 3 sample schools, i.e. Magamaga Army PS, Buluba PS and Bishop Hannington PS had assets similar to those highlighted in the LG Register, including Classroom Blocks, Classrooms, Latrines, Desks and Teacher Accommodation.	2
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>From the evidence of the desk appraisal reports and minutes of the desk appraisal committee, all prioritised investments for education are: (i) derived from the LGDP III; and (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG)</p> <p>Desk appraisal report was done on 09/03/2020 and presented to CAO on 13/03/20.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for Technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs over the previous FY.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. There was evidence that Wairasa seed secondary school was incorporated in the work plan for FY2021/2022 and planned for Ugx. 344,283,866/=</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the education infrastructure Investments for FY2020/2021 have been approved and cleared by solicitor general.</p> <p>There was evidence that Mpungwe Seed Secondary school was approved and cleared by solicitor general before the commencement of construction for the FY2020-2021 on 05/march/2021 under reference MBL065/258/01/05</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the projects constructed in the FY2020/2021 were overseen by an implementation team as demonstrated by the letter dated 29th march 2019, entitled Appointment of project management team for U-gift education projects by the Chief Administrative Officer under reference CR164/1.</p> <p>The Letter entitled; Appointment of project management team for U-gift education projects, spelt out clear roles and key responsibilities of each stakeholder that constituted the team leader (District Engineer), Secretary (DEO), and other key members included the senior environment officer, senior community development officer, senior engineer in-charge buildings and planner among others</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was sufficient evidence that the standard technical designs and detailed drawings provided by MOES were followed, this was confirmed during the physical inspection visit on Friday, 5th November 2021 to Mpugwe seed secondary school, the assessor noted that the work was well done and supervised and good standards were noted on the doors, windows, floor, concrete slabs at the laboratories, chalk boards among others.</p> <p>Also, there was evidence captured in the joint monitoring report entitled, Technical inspection report for Mpugwe seed secondary school, dated 2nd July 2021, the engineer noted that all structures including substructure, building frame, walls, rod structure, windows, and external doors, wall finishes excluding painting and floor finishes were all of good quality and required standard.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for Mpungwe seed secondary school in the FY2020-21; the last recorded meeting was conducted on 2nd August 2021.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that all engineers, environment officers and CDOs participated at the critical stages of construction as indicated by the joint monitoring reports dated 25th August 2020, 10th December 2020, 15th March 2021 and 20th May 2021 among others.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Evidence from the reviewed contracts below indicates that payment requests for sector infrastructure projects were initiated and executed as per Contract and implementation results. The only two contracts reviewed are indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MAY535/WKS/20-21/00018 in regard to the construction of Pit latrine at Jaguza P/S under SFG at a contract price of UGX 31,996,880 on 02/10/2020. The payment was done 100% on 21/12/2020; and 2. MAY535/WKS/20-21/00021 in regard to the construction of 2 classroom blocks at Lwandra P/S under SFG at a contract price of UGX 59,850,000 on 07/09/2020. The payment was done on 28/06/2021. 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of a timely submission of the sector procurement plan for FY2021-2022 from the District Education Officer to PDU and it was submitted on 15th April 2021 before the deadline date of 30th April 2021</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the procurement files for Mpunge seed secondary school are complete with all the reports and payment certificates. The work contract was awarded to M/S EGISS Engineering Contractor Limited; MOES/UGIFT/WRKS/18-19/00119 LOT 28 at Ugx. 2,675,268,246 with award decision Min. 04/02/03/19/MDCC dated 20th march 2019; there after the Contractor then tendered in an acceptance letter for the same on 25/March/2019.</p> <p>The payment report and payment certificate for the same project were prepared on 2/July/2021</p>	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, <i>score: 3, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that showed that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework in education projects</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

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>	Evidence showed that the Education guidelines were available in all the 3 sample schools, i.e. Magamaga Army PS, Buluba PS and Bishop Hannington PS, these included: 1) the Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards Indicators for Education Institutions, March 2010 2) MOES Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines (FY 2020/21) 3) Education Act 2008 4) School Manual on Teacher Effectiveness and Learner Achievement 5) Talking Compounds with Environment-related messages, e.g. 'Keep the School Clean.'	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>	There was evidence provided that LG had in place a costed ESMP ; however there was no evidence provided that the costed ESMPs were fully incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents	0
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>	No proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects was provided	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There was no 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.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was evidence provided that showed that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates on 15/02/2021.	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>There was insufficient evidence to assess 3 Sampled health facilities for FY2020/2021 to determine the utilization of services,</p> <p>There was no sufficient evidence to show that the LG has registered increased utilization of Health Care Services (Baitambogwe HC IV, Kityerera HG IV and Buswaiwa HC III).The evidence provided show that 107 HMIS forms were incomplete.</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>From the evidence presented and reviewed by the assessor, Health Development Grant for the previous FY was used on eligible activities as per the Health grant and budget guideline. For example, sector health development grant was UGX 1,168,010,000 and this was used on eligible activities like repainting of OPD at Waburungu HC III, completion of OPD at Kitovu HC II etc. All included within the LG health grant and budget guidelines.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to establish whether certification of works was done by District Health Officer, Community Development Officer and Environment Officer before the LG made payments to the suppliers.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the variations of the three sampled Health Infrastructure projects for the FY 2020/2021 were within the +/-20% of the MOH engineers estimates as detailed herein below;-

Project: Construction of a two stance/section water borne toilet and extension of drug store; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00025

Contractor: SONSOLE General Contractors Limited

Contract amount = Ugx. 55,000,375/=

Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 50,000,000/=

Variation = -10%;

Project: Completion of OPD at Kitovu HC II; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00024

Contractor: SONSOLE General Contractors Ltd.

Contract amount = Ugx.52,171,744/=

Engineers Estimate = Ugx.52,171,594/=

Variation = 0%;

Project: Renovation and Fencing of Wabulungu HC III; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00027

Contractor: Sunland General Investments (U) Limited

Contract amount = Ugx. 51,599,040/=

Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 52,000,000/=

Variation = +0.77% among others

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY

- If 100 % Score 2
- Between 80 and 99% score 1
- less than 80 %: Score 0

There was evidence that the health project (Nkombe HC II Upgrade) that was planned in FY2020-21 is still under construction. The construction contract that was awarded to M/s Skylight General Contractors Limited on 29th March 2021 was intended to be completed on 29th September 2021 under a period of 6 months. The works are not yet complete with the physical progress at 85%;

The contractor has completed the superstructure and is currently doing terrazzo on the building and finishing works.

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>As per the HSC guidelines: "Guidelines for recruitment of Health workers in LG, 3rd Edition June 2020", and Submission of Staff list as of 20th September 2020" evidence provided shows that 89/133 of staff at HCIII were recruited representing 69% and 52/144 staff at HCIV representing 36% were recruited. This therefore, brings the total percentage of staff recruited to 51% staff recruited all combined in HCIII&HCIV.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There is evidence that Nkombe Health Centre II upgrade project was conforming to the approved designs as confirmed by the physical joint inspection visits on 5th November 2021 by the assessor and the engineering team.</p> <p>The Steel trusses and blue iron sheets were of the right quality and gauge, terrazzo floor was well done to standard, external doors were steel framed, internal doors were wooden doors with mort locks as per the specifications, the general Maternity Ward, placenta pit, Septic tank and Medical waste pit were all conforming to the standards as per the drawings and BOQs.</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 current (FY2021/2022 staff list obtained from the District HO matched with the lists at the sampled facilities; Kityerera HC IV, Buswaiwa HV III and Baitambogwe HC IV .</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>No facility was recently constructed and operational.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>Annual Work Plan and Budget for FY2021/22 for Baitambogwe HC IV, Kityerera HC IV and Buswaiwa HCIII reviewed indicated that they prepared following the recommended formats. However they were submitted late.</p> <p>Baitombogwe HC IV submitted to the DHO on 6/7/2021 and CAO approved on 01/10/2021</p> <p>Buwaiswa HC III submitted to the DHO on 28/8/2021 and CAO approved on 28/8/2021</p> <p>Kityerera HC IV submitted to DHO on 15/7/2021 and CAO approved on 01/10/2021.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence obtained to assess whether the sampled facilities Baitambogwe HC IV, Kityerera HC IV and Buswaiwa HCII Health had prepared and submitted their annual performance reports as per guidelines.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>Health sector performance reports of 20th October 2020, 26th Jan 2021, 21 st April 2021 were reviewed and there is no evidence to link the performance improvement plans for Baitambogwe HC IV, Kityerera HC IV and Buwaiswa HCIII for 2021/2022 and the issues in the reports included in the plans. However, some DHMT recommendations made during the supervision visits were implemented in the implementation period.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>In addition to unavailability of all the HMIS forms for Baitambogwe HC IV, Kityerera HC IV and Buwaiswa HMIS 106 for Buswaiwa HCIII, were submitted late.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Evidence: All the HMS 105 for the 3 facilities were submitted in time including for the month of July 2020 submitted by Buwaiswa on 6/8/2020; Baitombongwe on 6/8/2020 and Kityerera on 6/8/2020.</p>	
			<p>While HMIS 106 reports for Kityerera HC IV and Baitambogwe HC IV were submitted all in time, Buwaiswa HC III submitted only 2 HMIS 106 reports for 1st quarter submitted on 12/10/2020 and for 3rd quarter on 4/4/2021 which were both late. Reports for the 2nd and 3rd quarter periods were not available for assessment.</p>	
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>The sampled facilities submitted their RBF to the DHO in time.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>		<p><i>for Quarter 4 of FY 2020/21</i></p>	
			<p>Buwaiswa HC III was on 7/7/2021</p>	
			<p>Baitambogwe HC IV on 5/7/2021</p>	
			<p>Kityerera HC IV was on 4/7/2021</p>	
			<p><i><u>For Q1 FY 2021/22.</u></i></p>	
			<p>Buwaiswa HC III was on 7/10/2021</p>	
			<p>Baitambogwe HC IV on 5/10/2021</p>	
			<p>Kityerera HC IV was on 4/10/2021</p>	
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that RBFs were submitted late.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>FY 2020/21 RBF was acknowledge by the Ministry of Health on 4th Jan 2021,</p>	
			<p>Q2 was acknowledged on 17th Feb 2021</p>	
			<p>Q4 was acknowledged by the Regional Hospital on 28 July 2021</p>	

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Evidence presented to the assessor by way of the health department quarterly performance budget reports; submission were as follows;</p> <p>1st Quarter on the 23/12/2020</p> <p>2nd Quarter on the 16/2/2021</p> <p>3rd Quarter on the 4/4/2021</p> <p>4th Quarter on the 27/8/2021</p> <p>All Quarter were submitted more than a month after each quarter due system challenges.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>All facilities had approved PIPs including the lowest performers including Buwaiswa HC IV which was one of lowest performing facilities including the poorest performing facilities were; Wabulungu HC III score 70% and Buwaiswa HC III score 78% one of the 3 sampled facilities for assessment. The had PIPs for both FY 2020/21 and FY 2021/22 and implemented the FY 2020/21.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>All the sampled HC Baitambogwe HC IV, Kityerera HC IV and Buswaiwa HCIII developed PIPs them.</p>	1
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kityerera HC IV, Baitambogwe HC IV and Buwaiswa HCIII had established staff budgeted for and deployed..</p> <p>FY 2021/22 staffs budgeted for and deployed were at staffing levels HC IV of 85.7% at Kityerera, 95% at Buswaiwa HC II and 100% at Baitambogwe HC IV .</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The staff lists displayed at notice boards, duty roster and department notice boards of the sampled facilities Baitambogwe HCIV, Kityerera HV IV and Buwaiswa HCII matched the lists reviewed at the DHOs office. More than 75% of positions were filled at all the 3 facilities.</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The deployment of staff at the sampled facilities; Baitambogwe HCIV, Kityerera HV IV and Buwaiswa HCII were verified by the updated 2021/2022 facility staff list on notice boards, duty rosters and department lists.</p> <p>Staff sample of verified at Buwaiswa HC III.</p> <p>1.Telwanike Alupakusadi -----medical laboratory technician</p> <p>2.Yatawe Janet -----Registered Nurse</p> <p>3.Nakimera Nzirani-----Nursing officer</p> <p>At Baitambogwe HC IV sample off staff staff verified</p> <p>.1.kaguya Margaret-----enrolled Nurse</p> <p>2. kaluya Rogers -----Nursing officer</p> <p>3. Kisambu steven -----Senior Medical clinical officer</p> <p>At Kityerera HC IV i -----Senior Medical officer</p> <p>2. Namuswa irene -----enroled midwife</p> <p>3. Bukirwa Hawa -----enrolled nurse</p>	3

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>FY 2021/22 staff lists well displayed at main the notice boards and/or duty rosters and/or department notice at the sampled health facilities (Baitambogwe HCIV, Kityerera HV IV and Buwaiswa HCII).</p> <p>There were no list of recent deployment. The In charges explained when new staff are received, the facility staff list is simply updated to include new staff.</p>	2
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>In the 10 sampled health personal files evidence provided shows that Only 8 were appraised as per appraisal report of 2/14 and 17 July 2021 (CR/D/14840/13899) respectively. There was no evidence to show that the two staff were appraised</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Out of the 10 health facility in charges files sampled, evidence provided shows that 7 staff were appraised by the DHO as per agreed performance Plans and submitted their reports during the FY 2020/2021.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to show any corrective actions taken based on the appraisal reports.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no training databases available as evidence to show that the LG scheduled and conducted training.</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no training report available as evidence to show that the LG conducted training..</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence provided to the assessor that there was timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget.</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>No evidence to indicate that 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</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no 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</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>Meeting held including on 9th March 2021 at the District Board room.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the attendance list for the 9th March 2021 meeting indicate a wide representation of departments and facilities.</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>Reports available including for that of the supervision carried between 7th -11th June 2021</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</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>Biitambogwe HCIV supported Buwaiswa and Kityetera supported lower level (Busala HCII and Kitovvu HCII) facilities verified as evidenced in the supervios report at Buwaiswa and the supporting facilities</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>		
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</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>Recommendations were made by the Supervision teams including on medicines stock outs.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>At Baitambogwe the supervision team found that use of stock cards had been abandoned, recommendation was made to resume and this was done thereafter.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</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>DHT Supports Baitambogwe and Buswaisa while Kityerera was supported by NMS.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>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>Evidence form the annual budget (Ref. Page 12) indicate that the Heath and promotion budget was UGX 50,365,000.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Total Non-wage budget was UGX 1,352,906,916 less PHC hospital NWR grant of UGX 454,455,704,</p>	
			<p>Balance is UGX 898,451,212. Grant guideline indicate that at least 85% of the balance should go to lower level facilities HC II, III, & IV. For Mayuge's case, 15% of the balance is UGX 134,767,682 to be subjected to the 30% health promotion (30%*134,767,682) = UGX 40,430,304.</p>	
			<p>The LG already allocated UGX 50,365,000 more than the require percentange.</p>	

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	Records not availed.	0
----	--	---	----------------------	----------

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	Meetings were held but presented minutes were not signed.	0
----	--	---	---	----------

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	Equipment register for the 3 facilities reviewed The equipment list show adequacy for the facilities.	1
----	---	---	--	----------

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII); (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)):	From the Evidence of the desk appraisal reports and minutes of the desk appraisal committee, all prioritised investments for health are derived from the LG Development Plan. Desk appraisal report was done on 09/03/2020 and presented to CAO on 13/03/2020.	1
----	---	--	--	----------

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

score 1 or else score 0

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the field appraisal reports and seven screening notes on the 1/9/2020 indicate that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for technical feasibility, Environment and social acceptability and Customized designs over the previous FY</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence availed showed that the LG did not carry out any construction of health facilities. However, from the environmental and social screening forms availed; there was evidence that the health facility investments under renovation and upgrading were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG health department timely submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans on 15th April 2021 before April 30 2021</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 timely submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans on 15th April 2021 before April 30 2021</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Nkombe HC II Upgrade was approved by the contracts committee on 4/January/2021 under Minute no. Siro/552/005/004/CC/FY2020-2021 and was cleared by Solicitor general on 13 January 2021 under reference ADM/7/149/03/MBL</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the project implementation team was appropriately established on 29th march 2021 under reference CR164/1.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score	The Letter entitled; Appointment of project management team for U-gift Health projects, designated a team composed of the District Engineer, District Health Officer, Senior Environmental Officer, Senior Community Development Officer, Senior Civil Engineer in-charge Buildings and District Planner among others	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0	The site visit on 5th November 2021 confirmed that the foundation, walling, room sizes, roof structures among others are as per the designs	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence that weekly reports to be consolidated from the daily reports are not up to date. The most recent reports received and reviewed from the clerk of works were from 1st April 2021 to 30th April 2021.	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence that the site meetings were held monthly with one sampled meeting dated 25th march 2021 among others. In this meeting, all stakeholders participated with a signed attendance list and a detailed meeting agenda as follows; Prayer, Site inspection, Self-introduction, Communication form the chair CAO, Report from site supervisor District Engineer, Reports from project contractor, Discussion from the site inspection and closure.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the a joint monitoring site visits were conducted with one sampled visit dated 25th march 2021;</p> <p>There was evidence that all engineers, environment officers, CDOs participated at the critical stages of construction as indicated by the joint monitoring report and meeting dated 25th march 2021 among others.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the sampled contracts below indicate payment requests were certified by the DHO on time as follows;</p> <p>1 MAYU 535/WKS/20-21/00020- Construction of 2 classrooms at kinawambuzi P/S at a cost of UGX 59,850,000 on 07/09/2020. Request was put in on 27/05/2021 and payment certified on 28/06/2021.</p> <p>2. MAYU 535/WKS/20-21/00047- Construction of 2 latrines at Kinyerera HC IV at a contract price of 40m on the 07/01/2021. Payment request was put in on the 16/06/2021 and certified on the 18/06/2021.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the procurement files for Nkombe HC II Upgrade are complete with all the reports and payment certificates. The work contract was awarded to M/S Skylight General Services Limited, MOH/WORKS/20-21/00097/Lot 4 at Ugx. 613,843,112 dated 19th January 2021; there after the Contractor then tendered in an acceptance letter for the same on 4th February 2021.</p>	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that showed that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework in health projects</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities as evidenced by report dated 06/07/2020</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>There was no evidence provided that that the LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that showed that that the LG conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence showed that the ESMPs were costed but not fully incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to show that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability without any encumbrances.</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	There was no evidence to show that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence to show that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed on the 15/05/2021 by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	There was evidence obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS showing that water sources functionality in Mayuge LDG for 2020/21 is at 94%.	2
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	There was evidence obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS showing that the functional WSCs in Mayuge LDG for 2020/21 is at 97%.	2
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	This performance indicator is not to be assessed because the activities have not started in the LLG..	0

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <p>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99%: Score 1</p> <p>o If below 80 %: Score 0</p>	<p>0</p> <p>The evidence from the 4th quarter report which doubles as the annual performance report, shows that the sub counties below the district average of 54% were Wairasa (32.7%), Bukatube (47.9), Bukabooli (32.9%), Kityerera (36.7%) and Malongo (20.9%). The total investment in these sub counties was Ugx484 million against the overall amount of Ugx 910 million (53%). This is below the threshold of 80%.</p>
---	--	--	--

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>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <p>o If within +/-20% score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>2</p> <p>There was evidence that the variations of the three sampled water supply and public sanitation infrastructural projects for the FY 2020/2021 were within the +/-20% of the LG engineers estimates as follows;</p> <p>Project: Consultancy Service in feasibility study and design of Nango piped water supply scheme; MAYU/535/SRVCS/20-21/00005</p> <p>Contractor: Rok technical services Limited</p> <p>Contract amount = Ugx. 73,909,300/=</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 73,909,300/=</p> <p>Variation = 0%</p> <p>Project: Borehole drilling, casting and installation of 10 boreholes; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00003</p> <p>Contractor: MSR technologies Uganda limited</p> <p>Contract amount = Ugx. 191,798,970=</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 191,798,970=</p> <p>Variation = 0%</p> <p>Project: Rehabilitation of 20 boreholes; MAYU535/WRKS/20-21/00006</p> <p>Contractor: Sonsole General Contractors Limited</p> <p>Contract amount = Ugx. 154,797,403/=</p> <p>Engineers Estimate = Ugx. 154,797,403/=</p> <p>Variation = 0%</p>
---	--	--	--

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>From the AWP and budget, Mayuge DLG planned to construct 18 new boreholes and rehabilitate 18 old ones. The evidence from the 4th quarter report shows that 18 boreholes were completed. In the said report, however, there was no evidence on the completed rehabilitation work of the 18 boreholes although a contract document was signed..</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>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>The evidence from the Ministry of Water & Environment MIS shows that rural water sources functionality in Mayuge DLG for the year 2019/20 was at 94% and so there was no increase.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0. 	<p>The evidence from the Ministry of Water & Environment MIS shows that the functional WSCs in Mayuge DLG for the year 2019/20 was at 97% and so there was no increase.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

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><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></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 evidence from the 4th quarter report shows that 18 boreholes were constructed and the visit made to three sources in different sub counties in the field, i.e. Kabengire in Buwaya sub county (No. DWD 88611 dated 29/06/2021), Lwabala in Imanyiro sub county (No. DWD 75996 dated 19/06/2021) and Kityerera A in Kityerera sub county (No. DWD 88607 dated 23/06/2021) shows that the water sources were all completed and functional.</p>	3
---	---	--	---	---

5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance	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	There was no evidence presented to show that the DWO collects and compiles quarterly information on sub county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs and community involvement. It was reported that the absence of evidence was because the relevant files were in the custody of the external audit.	0
	<i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>			
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance	b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0	.There was no evidence presented regarding the MIS at the DWD and it was reported that even the record files on the manual forms filled at the district after data collection and then sent to the Ministry for entering into the MIS were in the custody of the Auditor General.	0
	<i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>			
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance	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	This indicator is not to be considered because the assessment of the LLGs performance has not started.	0
	<i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	<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>		

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>Evidence was provided that DWO budgeted for some staff in the department, however, for some positions which were not filled there was no budget allocation for the positions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ugx 6,240,000 was budgeted for the Civil Engineer– per year and UgX 520,080 per Month Ref: – CR/D/11200/368580; - Assistant Water Officers ((1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene) was not budgeted for reasons given was the position is not yet filled; - Evidence provided showed that Engineering Assistant (Water) EA – were recruited on contract basis and so budget was not allocated for this position; - Ugx 425,074pm/5,100,888pa was budgeted for 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician per annum and 425,074 per month :CR/D/10034 - 75565. 	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>Evidence provided shows that the following positions were budgeted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ugx 32,400,000 was budgeted for the District Natural Resources Office per year and Ugx 2,700,000 per month. Ref: CR/D/10110/807056; - Ugx 20,400,000 was budgeted for the Environment Office per year and Ugx 2,200,000 per month. Ref: CR/D/10585 - 87130; - Ugx 20,400,000 was budgeted for the position of the Forestry Officer per year and Ugx 2,200,000 per month; Ref: CR/D/10536 - 755641. 	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 was provided to show that DWO appraised DWO staff against the agreed performance plan during the FY2020/2021.</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 presented as capacity needs assessment reports, no training plans and there was no training of any sector staff in the year of assessment. The DWO reported that he has recently been promoted to the post of senior engineer so he works in an acting position as DWO.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The evidence from the annual budget of 2021/22 shows that the allocation to the low coverage sub counties of Wairasa, Malongo, Kityerera, Bukatube and Bukabooli is Ugx 770 million against a total investment budget of Ugx 1.181 billion (65%).</p>	1
---	---	---	--	---

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The evidence obtained from the notice boards of Kityerera, Busakira and Imanyiro sub counties shows that there are notices of their respective allocations for water projects as extracts from the approved budget 2021/22. The notices were not dated and did not have any forwarding communication letter.</p>	3
---	---	---	---	---

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>There was no evidence of any monitoring reports presented as these were reported to be among the documents with the external audit.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented of the DWSCC meetings and minutes as these were reported among the documents with the external audit. It was verbally reported that only two meetings were budgeted for and held in the FY.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO extracted relevant sections of the approved budget and put them on the notice boards of the identified sub counties about the particular allocation of boreholes to their sub counties and there was no evidence that the total information on the below average sub counties allocations was publicized to all the sub counties.</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The evidence from the AWP shows that mobilization activities were allocated Ugx 69 million in FY 2020/21 against a total NWR rural water and sanitation budget of Ugx 115 million (60%). This passes the minimum of 40% stipulated in the sector guidelines.</p>	3
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>The records of formation and training of the WSCs were not presented for assessment purportedly because the community mobilization files were all with the external audit. However, a field check on the WSCs of Kabengire in Buwaya sub county (No. DWD 88611 dated 29/06/2021), Lwabala in Imanyiro sub county (No. DWD 75996 dated 19/06/2021) and Kityerera A in Kityerera sub county (No. DWD 88607 dated 23/06/2021) shows that the WSCs were formed, trained and are performing their duties. There was a high recall of training content.</p>	3
Investment Management				
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented of any form of assets register for the water and sanitation investments.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG District Water Officer has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The evidence from the applications file shows that only 11 applications out of the 18 planned water sources for FY 2021/22 were available on file.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility and environmental social acceptability.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that shows that all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY(Drilling of bore holes) were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and costed ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction. For example the ESMP for construction of Lwumba borehole dated 2nd October 2020; boreholes at Nango 1 and Nango 2 villages dated 5th October 2020.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water and sanitation infrastructural projects were incorporated in the consolidated work plan because the water development department procurement plan was submitted to PDU on 4th June 2021.</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>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 no evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the FY2020/2021 was approved by the contracts committee because the procurement department files had no minutes to that effect.</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>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 no evidence availed and no document specifying any teams.</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>The DWO reported that all contracts and attendant documentation was with the external audit and could not be examined for design compliance. The water sources sampled, i.e. Kabengire in Buwaya sub county (No. DWD 88611 dated 29/06/2021), Lwabala in Imanyiro sub county (No. DWD 75996 dated 19/06/2021) and Kityerera A in Kityerera sub county (No. DWD 88607 dated 23/06/2021) show that the facilities were constructed according to the standard technical designs of the Ministry of Water and Environment as per the above ground parts that could be visually assessed.</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>There was no evidence availed and no reports demonstrating any participation.</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>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>From the sampled contracts below, there is evidence that the District Water Officer verified works and initiated payments within time frames in the contracts. Sampled contracts include;</p> <p>1 MAYU/535/SRVAS/20-21/0004 on the 28/06/2021 concerning the supervision of 23 boreholes in Mavule, request done on the 08/09/2020 and payment done on the 16/09/2020, Certificate signed on the 13/09/2020;</p> <p>2. 2020/MVG/CONSULT/DWSCDG/01- 13 Boreholes siting and construction. Request done on 21/06/2021 and payment done on the 28/06/2021, certificate signed on the 25/06/2021; and</p> <p>3. 2020/MVG/GWC/DWSCDG/02- 13 Boreholes siting and construction. Request initiated on the 21/06/2021 and payment done on the 28/06/2021 and certificate was signed on the 22/06/2021.</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed as no file was seen at PDU</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that showed that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework in water and environment projects</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0	There was evidence available to show that the DWO and the Environment Officer had disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: This is evidenced by the acknowledgement of receipt dated 10/09/2021 and Attendance list for their training before dissemination dated 10/09/2021.	3
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	There was no evidence to show that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0	The evidence available on the land issues file shows that out of the 18 constructed water sources, only 11 land agreements were presented and the remaining boreholes are reported to be located on government land belonging to seed schools and health centres.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	From the 3 sampled contracts, no evidence to indicate that the Community Development Officer and the environment officer sign. The three sampled interim certificates are listed below; 1 Interim certificate on 29/02/2021 – Borehole siting and construction; 2. Interim certificate on 21/04/2021 – Borehole siting and construction; and. 3. Interim certificate on the 19/06/2021 – borehole sitting and construction.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertake monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	There was no evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and no monthly reports were provided	0

Micro-scale
irrigation
performance
measures

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>There was evidence that the LG had up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs. Reports of FY 2019/20 and 2020/21, indicating irrigated land were availed. Data on irrigated land for both financial years were 50 acres and 116.5 acres respectively.</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>Comparison of the data on irrigated land for the past two FYs showed an increase of 133%, this is from 50 acres in FY 2019/20 to 116.5 acres in FY 2020/21.</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 evidence availed indicated that the budget performance reports (dated 15th /July/2021) prepared by Mr. Bulanga Ronald (senior agricultural engineer) showed that development component was used on procurement of irrigation equipment and establishment of demonstrations sites.</p>	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers . Below are three sampled contracts;	0
	Maximum score 6		1 MAYU 535/SURPLS/20-21/00066 signed between Mayuge LG and HIVAN General Investment Ltd of UGX 10M on the 17/05/2021;	
			2. MAYU 535/SURPLS/20-21/00065 signed between Mayuge LG and HIVAN General Investment Ltd of UGX 20M on the 17/05/2021; and	
			3. MAYU 535/SURPLS/20-21/00059 signed between Mayuge LG and HIVAN General Investment Ltd of UGX 20M on the 03/03/2021.	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Evidence availed showed that variations in the contract prices were not within +/- 20% of the agriculture engineer's estimates. The agricultural engineer's estimates for demonstration sites at Nakalanga, Musita A and Kityerera were UGX. 5,700,000, UGX. 3,900,000 and UGX. 7,800,000. On the other hand, the supplier contracts indicated UGX. 14,061,486, UGX. 20,000,000 and UGX. 30,000,000 respectively. It therefore implies that the price variations were 146.7%, 412.8% and 284.6% respectively.	0
	Maximum score 6			
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	There was evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were completed as indicated by contracts between supplier and Mayuge LG signed on 03rd /March/2021 (for the site at Baitombugwe Sub county, Musita A Village) and 02nd /October/2021 (for the site at Bukatube Sub county, Nakalanga Village). The budget performance report for FY 2021/22 (dated 15/July/2021) does not reflect establishment of microscale irrigation demonstration sites, implying that they were completed in the previous FY.	2
	Maximum score 6			

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	<p>Evidence provided shows that only 3 extension workers out of 8 were recruited in FY2020/2021, not as per staffing structure.</p> <p>Recruitment report “New recruit of production Department” FY 2020/2021 – dated 30/July/2021 (Dr. Kasadha Mathias) and New Vision of 18/October/2021 (Job Mart Sec. 27/September/21)</p> <p>Staff to be recruited 20/21: Asst. Agricultural officer (DSC/MLG/003/2021STAT).</p>	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was no evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF. This was so because no approved designs from MAAIF were availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Two demonstration sites (in Kityerera sub county and Baitombugwe sub county) were visited and tested for functionality. The two sites were tested and found to be functional except for solar powered pump at kityerera site which could not work at the time of assessment. The third site (located in Bukatube sub county, Nakalanga village) was associated with land wrangles and thus the system could not be assembled and tested for functionality.</p>	0
Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement				
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence provided shows that information provided on filled position of extension workers are accurate. No major errors or discrepancies were seen in the list provided</p> <p>Number of staff in the general staff list was accurate indicating location of deployment, minimum requirement of each, date of transfer to the LLG and titles of position filled.</p>	2
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The evidence seen showed that two sites out of three were working except for the solar system at Kityerera which was nonfunctional at the time of assessment. The third demonstration site (located in Bukatube sub county, Nakalanga village) could not be tested due to land wrangle associated with the site.</p>	2

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	There was evidence that information about functionality of demonstration sites was collected on quarterly basis as evidenced by supervision report (FY 2020/21) dated 06th/April/2021. In addition, evidence was availed on awareness creation (Attendance lists dated 27/05/2021, 10th/06/2021). Furthermore, expressions of interest by farmers from LLGs were availed (box file labelled "From Jul-20; FARMER EOI).	2
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that LG had entered up to-date LLG information into MIS. Most recent farmer was Mr. Nzigu Jamiru who was entered on 20th/09/2021 as shown in the MIS App "UgiFT Micro-Scale Irrigation Program: Improving farmers' livelihood". The target expressions of interest (EOI) were 242 however, LG had entered 533 EOIs into MIS. Of the 533 EOIs, 224 had been visited. While 167 out of 224 farmers who had been visited were approved by district technical planning committee (DTPC).	1
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that LG had prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS. The quarterly report availed showed that as of 06th /April/2021 (FY 2020/21) information from LLGs in the MIS was captured.	1
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	No Approved Performance Improvement Plans (PIP) for the lowest performing LLGs were availed at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	No reports on implementation of PIPs were availed because PIPs were never developed.	0
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that extension workers were budgeted for. This was evidenced in the budget performance report/work plan prepared by Grace Esaire and approved by the office of district production coordinator Mayuge LG on 5th /July/2021.	1
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Evidence availed (Staff register) showed that extension workers were deployed as per guidelines. For example Mr. Kasadha Peter is the Principal Agricultural Officer deployed at Mayuge district headquarters, Mr. Onzi Emmanuel is the Agricultural Officer deployed in Wairasa sub county, Mr. Kitabane Ronald is the Agricultural Officer deployed in Mpungwe sub county among others.	1
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Evidence was provided to show that extension workers are working in LLG where they were deployed: Internal Memo of 1/6/2021: SUBMISION OF MAGAMAGA STAF LIST: REF: 152/2 and MAYUGE TOWN COUNCIL STAFF LIST FOR OCTOBER 20/21.	2
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	No evidence was presented to show list of all the LLGs Extension workers was publicized and disseminated on all the LLG notice boards. Only one evidence was provided on notice board showing Extension workers in Magamaga Sub county.	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	Evidence provided doesn't show that District Production Coordinator conducted and submitted appraisal of all extension workers against their agreed performance plan apart from two staff whose appraisal reports were signed and submitted to HRO.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	For the appraised staff, no evidence was presented to show any corrective actions taken by District Production Coordinator after submission of appraisal reports.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	The evidence that training activities were conducted is shown in the training reports dated 30th /September/2021 and 25th/September/2021.	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence to show documentation of training database.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Evidence from the annual work plan and budget for micro-scale irrigation FY 2021/2022 approved on the 15/07/2021 of UGX 2,235,967,239, indicate the allocation as follows; 75% - UGX 1,669,475,429 allocated to capital development; and 25% - UGX 566,491,810 allocated to Complementary services. Therefore, the LG is compliant.	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>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>Evidence from the annual work plan and budget for micro-scale irrigation 2021/2022 approved 15/07/2021 indicate the allocation as follows;</p> <p>Awareness 15% of 25% is UGX 87,069,140;</p> <p>Monitoring and supervision 10% of 25% is UGX 56,649,181; and</p> <p>75% farmer visit is UGX 291,253,006.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG is compliant.</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>There was no evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines.</p>	0
9	<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>Co-funding not included in the budget.</p>	0
9	<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>There was evidence that LG disseminated information on use of farmer co-funding. This was evidenced by brochure 3 given to farmers (a case of farmer at Kityerera demonstration site). However, no minutes (indicating presentation of farmer co-funding) between DPO and DTPC and LLGs were availed at the time of assessment.</p>	2
9	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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.) • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0	There was evidence that DPO monitored 2 demonstration sites (Kityerera and Musita A) out of 3 during quarter 4 of FY 2020/21 (Report dated 30th /July/ 2021). Two (2) out of three (3) gives a percentage of about 67%.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that LG oversaw technical training of approved farmer (Mr. Ochieng Alex of Kityerera demonstration site) as shown in a report prepared by Senior Agricultural Engineer dated 30th / September/2021.	2
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 were no supervision reports and minutes of field meetings to show that LG over saw hands on support to extension workers.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that LG had run farmer field schools as per guidelines.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines. Attendance lists for farmer visits for the period April to July 2021 were availed. In total, 533 farmers were mobilized.	2

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that LG trained staff and political leaders at district and LLGs. This was evidenced by information in a training report titled "Report of visited farmers in Mayuge district "dated 15th /October/2020.	2
----	--	---	---	---

Maximum score 4

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	The score was zero for all LGs during the LGMSD exercise 2021 (as guided in the updated data collection checklist dated 26th/October/2021).	0
----	---	---	---	---

Maximum score 8

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that Mayuge LG keeps up to date database of EOIs as of 20th /September/2021 when a farmer named Mr. Nzigu Jamiru of Mpungwe sub county was successfully entered into MIS. In addition, LG had filed at total of 533 EOIs in a box file labeled "Farmer EOI from Jul-20".	2
----	---	---	---	---

Maximum score 8

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	Evidence availed included farm visit reports of 224 farmers who had expressed interest and agreements to proceed for quotations. The agreements which were sampled belonged to: Kafubi Isima dated 05th/June/2021, Wandera Afaan Osman dated 09th/June/2021 and Wadala Ali dated 13th /June/2021.	2
----	---	---	---	---

Maximum score 8

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	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	There was evidence provided showing that the LG District Agriculture Engineer publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on district and Magamaga Notice boards. In other 2 LLGs' notice boards, no evidence was provided	0
----	---	---	--	---

Maximum score 8

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	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.	There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. This was confirmed because the production and marketing departmental procurement plan was submitted on 12th July 2021	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that Mayuge LG had requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers prequalified by MAAIF for the FY2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that Mayuge LG has concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria for the FY2021/2022.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that micro-scale irrigations were approved by the contracts committee for the FY2021/2022	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that Mayuge LG has signed any contract with any lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the FY2021/2022	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	No design output from IrriTrack showing irrigation equipment was availed. Therefore equipment on site could not be verified to be in line with design output from IrriTrack.	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	The evidence availed were two monitoring reports by DPO and senior agricultural engineer dated 30th/June/2021 and 30th /July/2021. However, only one demonstration site out of three had a site book showing that the LG technical team conducted supervision.	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	Although Mayuge LG staff had visited Kityerera site as indicated in the site book (3rd/August/ 2021, 2nd/September/2021, 3rd /November/2021 etc.), there was no evidence that they oversaw the supplier during equipment testing. Furthermore, demonstration site at Musita A had no site book at the time of assessment and thus no evidence that LG staff oversaw supplier during equipment testing. In addition, no supervision reports showing LG staff overseeing supplier during equipment testing were availed.	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	There was no evidence to show that equipment was handed over to approved farmer. This was because no supervision reports indicating hand over of equipment to approved farmer were availed. Furthermore, the only available site book at Kityerera site had no evidence of equipment hand over. In addition, delivery notes from the supplier and goods received note from the farmer were not availed at the time of assessment.	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	There was no evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified time frames subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence availed to show that Jinja LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA law.	0
	Maximum score 18			

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Although some grievances had been captured in the MIS App, the nature and avenues to address grievances were not displayed on production noticeboard.	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence provided that showed that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence provided that showed that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework	0
	Maximum score 6			

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> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that showed that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework</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> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that showed that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Mayuge LG had disseminated Micro-scale irrigation guidelines. MoUs between LG and farmers were not prepared at the time of assessment.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided that shows costed ESMPs since the projects for the current FY had just been screened. For example ; Construction of a motorized micro-irrigation facility at Igeyero A village dated 30th September 2021; Construction of a solar powered micro-irrigation facility at Luwanula village dated 7th October 2021; Construction of a motorised micro-irrigation facility at Budebera village dated 01/11/ 2021</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that 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 was done.</p>	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	There was no evidence provided to show that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects since projects had just been screened and implementation had not taken place. For example ; Construction of a motorized micro-irrigation facility at Igeyero A village dated 30th September 2021; Construction of a solar powered micro-irrigation facility at Luwanula village dated 7th October 2021; Construction of a motorised micro-irrigation facility at Budebera village dated 01/11/ 2021	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	There was no evidence provided to show that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects since projects had just been screened and implementation had not taken place. For example ; Construction of a motorized micro-irrigation facility at Igeyero A village dated 30th September 2021; Construction of a solar powered micro-irrigation facility at Luwanula village dated 7th October 2021; Construction of a motorised micro-irrigation facility at Budebera village dated 01/11/ 2021	0

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 Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	As per staff letter of appointment availed by the HR Department, Mr.Bulanga Ronald was recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer on 23/May/2016 under Ref No: CR156/1 and confirmed in the position on 28/6/2018 under Ref No:CR/159/1.	70
---	--	--	---	-----------

Environment and Social Requirements

2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.	There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for micro-irrigation projects as evidenced by availed Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening forms signed/stamped by Environment Officer and DCDO. For example ; Construction of a motorized micro-irrigation facility at Igeyero A village dated 30th September 2021; Construction of a solar powered micro-irrigation facility at Luwanula village dated 7th October 2021; Construction of a motorised micro-irrigation facility at Budebera village dated 1st/November / 2021	30
---	--	---	--	-----------

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 staff appointment letter availed from the HR Department confirms that Rogers Wako was recruited for the position of a Civil Engineer (Water) on 7th October 2005 under Ref No: CR 153/1.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	As per the External Job Advert published on 18th October 2021 in the New Vision Job Mart Sec, 27/9/2, the position of a Assistant Water Officer for mobilization is yet to be filled.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	As shown in the appointment letter availed by the HR Department, Mr. Kalaama Juma was recruited as a Borehole Maintenance Technician on 30th January 2007 under Ref No: CR/156/1.	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>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	In the External Job Advert of 18th October 2021 published in the New Vision Job Mart Sec, 27/9/21, the position of the Natural Resources Officer is yet to be filled and therefore, it is vacant.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The HR department availed staff appointment letter to confirm that Aramu Thomas was recruited an Environment Officer on 20th August 2013 under Ref No: CR/D/10272.	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.	Mr. Kipanda Bumali was recruited the Forestry Officer. This was confirmed in the appointment letter issued on 23rd September 2005 under Ref No: CR/156/4.	10

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all borehole drilling projects. This was evidenced by individual Environment and Social screening forms signed/stamped by Environment Officer and DCDO. For example, construction of Boreholes at Lwuba and Musima villages both dated 30th September 2020.	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	From the projects availed, there was no need for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since the projects were small and their impact to the environment was minimal.	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	The LG availed drilling permits dated 22/June/2020; Number: DP11662/DW202 for KLR (U) LTD and the other issued on 22/June/2020; Number: DP23266/DW2020 for MSR Technologies Uganda LTD. There was no need for abstraction permits.	10

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>As per the letter of appointment availed, Kawala Elizabeth was given the assignment of District Health Officer on 6/November/2020 under Ref No:CR152/1. However, he was not issued letter of seconded.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The letter of appointment availed by the PHRO shows that Kawala Elizabeth was recruited Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing on 23/May/2016, under Ref No: CR/161. .</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>As per the External Advertisement in the New Vision published on 18/October/2021, Job Mart Sec; 27/September/21, Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health position is yet to be recruited.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>An External Advertisement published in the New Vision on 18/October/2021, Job Mart Sec, 27/9/21, was availed by the HR and it shows that the position of Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) is yet to be recruited.,</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>As per the appointment letter provided by the HR department, Taganhye Fred was recruited as Senior Health Educator on 16/17/2003 under Ref No: CR/156/1 and his appointment was regularized on 30/September/2020 under Ref No: CR156/6.</p>	10

1 New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0. No evidence was provided to show recruitment of a Biostatistician nor was there advertisement for the position published in the current FY 21/22

Applicable to Districts only.
Maximum score is 70

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. The position of a District Cold Chain Technician has not yet been recruited and there was no evidence availed to show that advertisement of the job has been published in the current FY 2021/2022.

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) If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0. There was evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening as evidenced by the availed Environment and Social screening forms signed/stamped by Environment Officer and DCDO all dated 01/09/2020.

Maximum score is 30

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.

From the list of projects availed, there was no need for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since the projects were small and their impact to the environment was minimal.

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.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	Nadiope William was recruited and given appointment on promotion for the position of a District Education Officer as per evidence provided in his letter of appointment issued on 23/May/2016; under Ref: CR/161/1.	30
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Evidence of staff letter of appointment availed by HR department shows that only 4 out of 5 District Inspectors of schools were recruited. No evidence of letter of assignment nor letter of seconded was provided for the 5th staff:- The following were recruited:- - Nabirye Allen Jalia, was recruited on 13/September/2010 under Ref No: CR/156/1; - Ochieng Patrick was recruited on 23/6June/2010; under Ref No: CR/D/13535; - Tebenda Margaal was recruited on 16/June/2015; under Ref No: CR/156/4 and - Ojwang Daniel was recruited on 13/June/2017; under Ref No:CR/156/1.	0
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening. The evidence availed was the Environment and Social screening forms dated and signed/stamped by Environment Officer and DCDO. For example the Environment and Social screening forms for construction of a 2-classroom Block at Mayirinya Muslim p/s dated 17th September 2020; construction of a 2-classroom Block at Buwanuka p/s dated 4th September 2020 and construction of a 5-stance –lined pit latrine at Wabulungu p/s dated 28th September 2020.	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

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

If the LG carried out:

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

There was no need for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since the projects were small and their impacts to the environment were minimal. They were mainly extensions in existing schools .

The Maximum score is
30

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	As per letter of appointment availed, Mr. Kisita James was recruited Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer on 20/April/1997 under Ref No: CR/165/6.	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	in the appointment letter provided by the HR Department, evidence shows that Baliyeya Ronald was recruited for this position and awarded an appointment letter on acceleration on 20/June/2018 under Ref No: CR/160/1.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The appointment letter availed by HR Department shows that Wanjusi Febian was recruited District Engineer on 23/May/2016 under Ref No:CR/161/1.	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.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	As per the letter of appointment availed, Lubanga Musa was recruited as District Natural Resources Officer on 13/July/2010 under Ref No: CR/D/10110.	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	As per letter of appointment provided by the HR Department, Dr. Akasadha Mathias Legson was recruited District Production Officer on 8/June/2021 under Ref No:CR/160/1.	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.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The appointment letter availed by HR Department confirms that Makooli Paul was recruited District Community Development Officer on 13/July/2010 under Ref No: CR156/1.	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.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	As per the appointment letter obtained from staff personal file, Naika Waiswa Richard Edward was recruited on 31/January/2018 as a District Commercial Officer under Ref No: CR/D/10133.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	Evidence presented in staff appointment letter shows that Babi Christopher was recruited a Senior Procurement Officer on 21/December/2007 under Ref No: CR165/1.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	As per letter of appointment availed, Etelu Joseph was recruited a Procurement Officer on 21/December/2007 under Ref No:CR156/1.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	As per evidence provided in the External job Advert No.1/2021, New Vision; published on 27th September 2021, the position of Principal Human Resource Officer is yet to be filled and, therefore, it is still vacant.	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.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Aramu Thomas was recruited as a Senior Environment Officer. The evidence provided was in his letter of appointment dated 20/August/2013 under Ref No: CR/D/10272.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The appointment letter of Ediro Moses confirms that he was recruited for the position of Senior Land Management Officer on 17/July/2018 under Ref No: CR/160/1.	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Mr. Bamwesige Paul was recruited on 3/May/2018 for the position of a Senior Accountant in the letter of appointment under Ref No: CR/160/1.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Zakusoka Emmanuel Weglo was recruited to the position of a Principal Internal Auditor in a letter dated 20/June/2018, Ref No: CR/160/1.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided to show that LG recruited for the position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC).Therefore, the position is vacant.</p>	0

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

Maximum score is 15

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).

As per customized Structure, evidence provided shows that out of 14 SAS in the district, only 11 whose personal files were provided, were recruited with appointment letters. The remaining 2 SAS had no appointment nor secondment letters in their personal files. Below were recruited staff with appointment letters:-

- Migoli Siraj, was recruited on 15/October/2007, Ref: letter CR/156/1.
- Mutesi Betty, was recruited on 23/June/2010 Ref No:CR/D/1352.
- Batambuze Richard ,was recruited on 15/October/2007.
- Lubaale Arthur ,was recruited on 23/June/2010 Ref No:CR/D/13520.
- Gimul Kimbugwe Peter , was recruited on 25/May/2018 Ref No:CR/160/1.
- Naigaga Hadija ,was recruited on 24/November/2016 Ref No:CR/161/1.
- Wajokerana Fred ,was recruited on 20/June/2018 Ref No:CR/160/1.
- Kiirya Herbert , was recruited on 29/June/2018 Ref No:CR/160/1.
- Kijanja Ismail , was recruited on 24/November/16 Ref No:CR/161.
- Kakuru Albert, was recruited on 26/March/2018 Ref:CR/161.
- Mwesigwa Joseph , was recruited on 21/May/2018 Ref:CR/160/1.

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The Staff appointment letter reviewed, confirms that Kanafu Victoria was recruited a Community Development Officer on 23/May/2016 under Ref No: CR/161.

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The staff appointment letter reviewed, proves that Mukisa Racheal was recruited for the position of a Senior Accounts Assistant on 20/June/2018 under Ref No: CR/156/16.

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	From the previous FY final accounts for the year ended 30th June 2021 availed, the Natural Resource Budget was UGX 284,379,009m, warranting for this area was UGX 263,823,009m and Actual spending was UGX 262,977,215m.	0
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	In this regard 100% was not released.	
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	Evidence from the annual report for the year ended 30th June 2021, Community Based Services Department Budget was UGX 1,257,410,116m, warranting for this area was UGX 774,762,227m and Actual spend was UGX 773,058,800m.	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	In this regard 100% was not released.	
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.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for DDEG projects. This was evidenced by Environment and Social screening forms dated 1st/september /2020 and signed/stamped by both the Environment officer and DCDO.	4
	Maximum score is 12			
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.	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	The DDEG projects did not necessitate Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since they were small with minimal impacts to the environment.	4
	Maximum score is 12			

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The evidence availed showed that the ESMPs had been Costed and signed/stamped by both the Environment officer and DCDO. For example, the ESMP for Completion of the District Administration Block dated 3rd/september /2020 ; ESMP for Completion of staff house at Bishop Hannington Kyando Primary School dated 10th September 2021 and ESMP for Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Bukatabira p/s dated 9th September 2020.</p>	4
---	---	---	--	---

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The audit opinion for Mayuge DLG for the FY ended 30th June 2021 (Page 327) communicated by the Auditor General in his report titled "Annual Report of the Auditor General to Parliament for the financial year ended 30th June 2021", was unqualified/clean audit opinion.</p>	10
---	--	--	--	----

6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of the Internal Auditor General 's findings for the previous financial year 2019/2020 on 10th February 2021 before the deadline of 28th February 2021. Likewise, the LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of the Auditor General 's findings for the previous financial year 2019/2020 on 10th February 2021 before the deadline of 28th February 2021.</p>	10
---	--	--	---	----

7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>Evidence from the approved annual performance contract indicate that it was submitted on the 14th June 2020 which is within the deadline of 31st August 2021.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Annual Performance report was submitted but inventory schedules obtained from MoFPED does not provide the actual dates of submission.</p> <p>However, from the LG verification, submission of an annual performance report of 2021/22 was on 27/August/2021 before the deadline of August 31st, 2021.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

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

Maximum score is 4

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

score 4 or else 0.

From the evidence gathered all the 4 quarterly budget performance reports were submitted within deadline of 31st August 2021 as shown in the table below;

- 1 Quarter 1- 23/12/2020;
2. Quarter 2- 16/2/2021;
3. Quarter 3- 4/6/2021;
4. Quarter 4- 27/8/2021.