



LGMSD 2021/22

Budaka District

(Vote Code: 571)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	75%
Education Minimum Conditions	60%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	85%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	74%
Educational Performance Measures	74%
Health Performance Measures	67%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	73%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	17%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

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>According to the annual performance report for FY 2021/2022 (on pages 39 and 105 respectively) the two sampled projects done using DDEG funding were completed as per the contract. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Administration block constructed for phase III at the District HQs but in use or functional ii. Renovation of Planning and Finance Blocks and the District Gate . iii. The third project of drilling a borehole at Kakwangha in Iki-Iki S/C was functional and being utilized by the public. 	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 	Awaiting LG Assessment Results	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>All the three projects implemented using DDEG funding were completed 100% as per the performance contract. The projects were reported upon on pages 39, 105 and 87 respectively of the annual performance report. : i. Administration block constructed for phase III at the District HQs ii. Renovation of Planning and Finance Blocks and the District Gate. iii. Drilling a borehole at Kakwangha in Iki-Iki S/C</p>	3
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>All the sampled DDEG projects implemented during FY 2021/2022 were eligible projects in line with the DDEG Guidelines namely i. Administration block constructed for phase III at the District HQs as noted on page 7 of the Guidelines under Administration, ii. Renovation of Planning and Finance Blocks and the District Gate as per page 7 of the Guidelines under Administration. iii. Drilling a borehole at Kakwangha in Iki-Iki S/C as reported on page 8 of the Guidelines under water and sanitation..</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variation in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled DDEG projects were as follows;</p> <p>a) Construction of a Paediatric ward at Budaka HC IV; Contract sum Ugx 159,464,287, Engineers estimate UGX160,634,000, variation=Ugx (-1,169,713), %variation=-0.7%</p> <p>b) Construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Budaka Town Council): Contract price Ugx18,541,188, Engineers estimate Ugx 20,000,000, variation Ugx -1,458,812, %variation=-7.3%</p> <p>c) Construction of a staff house at Budaka Primary school, contract sum Ugx78,206,490, Engineers estimates Ugx 80,000,000, variation Ugx -1,793,510% variation =-2.2%</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	Evidence showed that information on the positions filled in the LLGs was not accurate as per minimum staffing standards as evidenced from the (3) three sampled LLGs; for instance; Budaka Town Council workplace staff list had 30 personnel and the District staff list also had 26, Kakoli S/C workplace staff list had 10 officers the District staff list had 8 while Kabuna S/C workplace had 10 officers and the District staff list had 8. There was a delay in updating the staff list at the District to match the recent deployment list at the LLGs.	0
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	All the three projects sampled and implemented using DDEG funding were completed 100% as per the performance contract. The projects were reported upon on pages 39, 105 and 87 respectively of the annual performance report. : i. Administration block constructed for phase III at the District HQs ii. Renovation of Planning and Finance Blocks and the District Gate. iii. Drilling a borehole at Kakwangha in Iki-Iki S/C.	2

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 evidence to confirm that the LG consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for FY 2023/24 to MoPS on 1st September 2022.	2
---	--	---	--	---

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

There was evidence to confirm that the district had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as guided by the Ministry of Public Service.

For instance, for the month of June 2022 under the Finance department, the CFO (Mr. Magoola Balama) attended for 19 days, under the production department, the fisheries officer (Ms. Namboyo Catherine) attended for 17 days, under Education, the DEO (Mr. Higenyi Paul) attended for 16 days and Mr. Mugala Kanifa the (Senior Education Officer) attended for 15 days.

For the month of February 2022 under administration, the inventory Officer (Mr. Tingu Geoffrey) attended for 16 days, under Community Based Services department, the DCDO (Ms. Mpindi Pheryster) attended for 18 days and under the Procurement department, the Production Officer (Mr. Kuchana Sam) attended for 17 days.

For the month of November 2021, under the Planning Unit, Mr. Dongo Charles (the Planner) attended for 20 days the driver Mr. Mugoya Nathan) attended for 18 days under the Health Department, the DHO (MS. Mulwani Erisa Meywa) attended for 21 days.

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

There was evidence to confirm that the CAO had appraised the 8 HoDs as per the signed performance reports however some appraisals were conducted past the stipulated timelines issued by MoPS guidelines as detailed below;

1. Mpindi Pheryster, the District Community Development Officer on (15/8/2022),
2. Dr. Mulwani Erisa Meyuwa, the District Health Officer on (25/8/2022),
3. Magoola Balam, Chief Finance Officer on (15/8/2022),
4. Mugweri Charles, District Engineer on (15/8/2022),
5. Kabise Shaban, District Planner on (15/7/2022),
6. Kijali Kamwada Cyprian, Ag. District Natural Resource Officer on (15/8/2022).
7. Dambya Ambrose, the District Production Officer on 25/8/2022.
8. Mulekwa Andrew Martin, the District Commercial Officer on 1/8/2022

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

Evidence showed that the Rewards and Sanctions Committee was functional and comprised of (5) five members including;

1. Higenyi Paul, DEO (Chairperson),
2. Munolo Abudu, HRO (Secretary),
3. Mulwani Eriza Meywa, DHO (Member),
4. Muganzi Lilian, (Member),
5. Mugombe Yusuf Ag. Town Clerk (Member)

The Committee had held meetings and minutes were on file for instance, on 27th April, 2022 under Min 4/41/RSC/22 the Committee handled the case of Ms. Nakamya Sarah a Senior accountant who was charged with allegations of forgery involving withdrawing of 2,600,000.

In response, Sarah acknowledged that she withdrew the money before the requisitions were made however she blamed the senior Assistant Chief Administrative Officer for intimidating and influencing in doing this transaction.

Also Under Min. No.4/03/RSC/22, Mr. Wafula Alusi appeared before the committee and was asked to explain the mismanagement of 5,000,000 which was meant to install electricity at Katira Sub- County Administration block.

In response, Alusi did not explain himself following advise from his lawyer.

In conclusion, the Chair suggested Alusi that submits the Katira Sub county workplan to the committee members, council minutes and implementation report for further scrutiny in addition to being put under very strict supervision once he was re-instated if he was to perform his duties. And for Nakamya Sarah, she was to be given disciplinary action for forgery and altering of documents.

7

0

Performance management

iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.

There was no evidence presented to show that the consultative committee was established.

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

Score 1 or else 0

Payroll management
Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure or else score
0

a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:

Score 1.

There was evidence that 100% of newly recruited staff had accessed the pay payroll within a period not later than 2 months as per the 10 sampled officers;

1. Logose Jenna Vivian, Education Assistant II of Nanzole P/S (IPPS No. 115814) assumed duty on 23/5/2022 and accessed pay roll on 1/7/2022;

2. Logose Dorothy appointed as Education Assistant II of kameluka P/S (IPPS No. 1157960) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed pay roll on 27/6/2022;

3. Mugale Beatrice Education Assistant II of Bulumba P/S (IPPS No.1158133) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed payroll on 27/6/2022;

4. Namuzungu Betty Education Assistant II of Nangeye P/S (IPPS No.1158552) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed payroll on 26/7/2022;

5. Nagwaka Derrick Education Assistant II of Namengo boy's P/S (IPPS No. 1161785) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed payroll on 15/7/2022;

6. Adong Mariam Education Assistant II of Kodiri P/S (IPPS No. 1158587) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed payroll on 20/6/2022;

7. Okiror James Education Assistant II of kadatumi P/S (IPPS No. 1157973) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed payroll on 25/6/2022;

8. Babirye Teddy education Asst II of Namengo girl's P/S (IPPS No.1157955) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed payroll on 22/6/2022;

9. Kaminza Education Assistant II of Kameruka P/S (IPPS No.1158141) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed payroll on 12/6/2022;

10. Siliki Tonny, Education Assistant II of St. Peters Nalubembe P/S (IPPS No. 1158566) assumed duty on 17/5/2022 and accessed payroll on 20/7/2022.

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 showed that 100% of the sampled staff that retired during FY 2021/22, had accessed the pension payroll within a period of not more 2 months' as indicated below;

1. Guloba Willy, Education Assistant II Naboa P.s IPPS No. 199317 retired on 3/3/2022 and accessed on on 1/4/2022;

2. Kwiri Augustine, Education Assistant II Bugoola P.S IPPS No. 198826 retired on 2/3/2022 and accessed on 2/5/ 2022;

3. Mutege Fred, Deputy Headteacher Bulangira P.S IPPS No. 199067 retired on 12/2/2022 and accessed on 17/3/2022;

4. Nyango Joseph, Education Assistant II Lupada P.S IPPS No. 199260 retired on 6/2/2022 and accessed on 12/3/2022;

5. Naliku John, Education Assistant Kotinyanga P.S IPPS No. 195576 retired on 27/1/2022 and accessed on 10/2/2022;

6. Mahogo Kadimba Micloth, Deputy Headteacher Chaali Parents P.S IPPS No. 198732 retired on 23/3/2022 and accessed on 11/4/2022;

7. Kiire Gerald Kiyondere, District Inspector of Schools IPPS No. 198912 retired on 17/2/2022 and accessed on 3/3/2022;

8. Kaanyi Gertrude, Education Assistant II IPPS No. 198527 retired on 24/4/2022 and accessed on 25/6/2022;

9. Kirya James, Education Assistant II Kadenge P.S IPPS No. 198972 retired on 1/1/2022 and accessed on 13/2/2022;

10. Makula Stella, Deputy Headteacher IPPS No. 195722 retired on 25/5/2022 and accessed on 20/6/2022;

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	The District did direct DDEG transfers to the LLGs in accordance with the requirements of the budget. a)1st Qrt transferred on 27/7/2021 shs.302,453,099, b) 2nd Qrt transferred on 26/10/2021 shs.302,453,099 and c) 3rd Qrt in January 2022 shs.302,453,113.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):	For FY 2021/2022, the District did timely (within 5 working days) warranting of DDEG transfers to LLGs in fulfilment of the budget requirements. 1st Qrt funds released by MoFPED on 21/7/2021 and LG warranted on 23/7/2021 (2 days). 2nd Qrt released on 20/10/2021 and LG warranted on 24/10/2021 (2 days) 3rd Qrt released on 6/01/2021 and LG warranted on 10/01/2022 (2 days)	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	For FY 2021/2022, the District did not do timely (within 5 working days) communication of DDEG transfers to LLGs in fulfilment of the budget requirements. 1st Qrt funds released by MoFPED on 21/7/2021 and LG communicated on 27/7/2021 (4 days). 2nd Qrt released on 20/10/2021 and LG communicated on 26/10/2021 (4 days) 3rd Qrt released on 6/01/2021 and LG communicated on 17/01/2022 (7 days). There was a delay in communicating the 3rd release of funds to the LLGs.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>During FY 2021/2022 three mentoring exercises for LLGs were conducted and reports produced dated 30/8/2021, 2/11/2021 and 5/7/2022 (exercise done between 18/5/2022 and 30/6/2022). LLGs were taken through: i. local revenue management, ii. Update of books of accounts, iii. Planning and budgeting, iv. procurement guidelines, v. human resource management, vi. DDEG guidelines.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that 3rd quarter mentoring was not conducted as required by the guidelines. For this matter the LG was not scored over this indicator.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Four monitoring visits were undertaken and reports produced as follows: 1st Qrt report produced on 21/9/2021, 2nd Qrt report on 4/11/2021 , 3rd Qrt report on 25/2/2022 and 4th Qrt report produced on 7/7/2022.</p> <p>These monitoring visit reports were presented to TPC for discussion. For example in their meeting held on 12/10/2021, under Min. 5/SMM/10/2021 TPC discussed 1Qrt report and they observed that due to the delay in procurement process, project implementation had not started. In another meeting of 11/1/2022 under Min. 06/SMM/01/2022 they discussed 2nd Qrt report in which planner explained that implementation of education project was delayed because MoES had failed to provide timely approved contractors.</p>	2

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p>	<p>The District was using the new assets data template developed by MoFPED to update their assets register after which it would be uploaded on IFMS. It covered Land, Transport equipment, Office equipment, Medical equipment, Machinery among others. Each category had customized details it captures for example ICT equipment had: Description, Asset category class, cost, Vote No., Section, Department, Location, date placed in service and Tag No.</p>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		
		<p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>		
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>The District had a Board of survey report for year ended 30th June, 2022 which was compiled and endorsed by members of the Board including PAS, SFO, Senior Planner, Road Inspector and a Senior Labour Officer. The report was used for assets management decisions including among others: i. all unserviceable stores as indicated in the report should be boarded off, ii. The chief mechanical engineer of works and Government valuer should be requested to value all items proposed for boarding off, iii Staff with non functional motorcycles should be returned to the store, iv. Departments with non functional computers should be returned to store.</p>	1
		<p>Score 1 or else 0</p>		
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>A thirteen committee of members were appointed by CAO on a physical planning committee through a letter ref. CR/156/7 dated 7/01/2019. During FY 2021/2022 the committee held 4 meetings on 29/9/2021, 8/12/2021, 31/3/2022 and 20/5/2022. Relevant minutes were produced for the four meetings and submitted to MoLHUD via a letter ref. CR/120/1 on 8/8/2022 and acknowledged on 15/8/2022 by the Ministry by stamping.</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the 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>Desk appraisal for all projects in the budget was conducted by Planner, Engineer, Environmental Officer, CDO, PAS on 16/9/2021. The team filled the desk appraisal forms which they all endorsed. The three sampled DDEG projects were: 1. Administration block constructed for phase III was noted carried over in DDP II (for period 2014/15 –2019/2020) and on page 7 of DDEG Guidelines under Administration. 2. Renovation of planning and Finance Blocks and the District Gate under the priorities of the new District Chairman and on page 7 of the Guidelines under Administration. 3. Drilling a borehole at Kakwengha in Iki-Iki S/C provided for on page 85 of the DDP and page 8 of the Guidelines under water and sanitation.</p> <p>The team that undertook the exercise finally recommended for funding and implementation.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The field appraisal was conducted by Planner, Engineer, Environmental Officer, and Information Officer on 23/8/2021. All criteria for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customer design were positively responded to in the forms used and final all recommended for funding.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Project profiles with costing for all investments in the AWP for FY 2022/2023 were developed and endorsed by the District Planner. The profiles were discussed by TPC in their meeting of 11/01/2022 under Min. 08/SMM/01/2022 in which TPC members enormously approved the profiles.</p>	1

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that LG had screened projects for the current FY 2022/2023

The Screening for the construction of 1 block of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Budaka Helper Project Primary school in Budaka Town Council had been done by the Environment officer and DCDO as per report dated 15th August 2022. Impacts and mitigation measures identified in the screening form for example removal of debris on site, site levelling and signed by the senior Environment Officer and DCDO on 15th August 2022.

The Screening for the construction of the council chambers phase-IV at Budaka district headquarters in Budaka town council had been done by the Environment officer and the DCDO as per report dated 19th August, 2022. Impacts and mitigation measures identified in the screening form for example removal of debris on site, site leveling and signed by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 19th August, 2022

Screening for the drilling of 7 boreholes in the sub-counties of; Mugiti, Katira, Nansanga, Kakule and Kameruka was carried out on 16th /08/ 2022. The impacts and mitigation measures were identified and addressed for example digging larger soak pits to trap wastewater. The screening form prepared and signed by the Environment officer and DCDO on 16th /08/ 2022

The Screening for the Construction and protection of a spring well at Serere village in Nansanga sub-county on 22nd /08/ 2022. The impacts identified included; vegetation loss, soil erosion and surface runoff and mitigation measures such as limited clearance and backfilling made in the screening form this was prepared and approved by the Environment Officer and the DCDO on 22nd /08/ 2022.

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>Evidence for DDEG infrastructure projects incorporated in the current FY signed and approved on 15th June 2022 by Mr. Elly Piwang (CAO);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of solar dryers at Ugx 17,000,000 on page 2 • Construction of District Council Chambers phase IV at Ugx 298,000,000 on page 3 • Completion of 2 stance lined pit latrine at Kachomo Town Council at Ugx 4,000,000 on page 4 • Maintenance of Abittoir in Budaka Town Council at Ugx 10,000,000 on page 4 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for one DDEG funded project that was approved by contracts committee this current financial year 2022/2023. The Construction of District Chambers at Ugx 298,000,000 was approved for award on 23rd November 2022 minute 3/23/11/2022 at contract sum Ugx 297,991,189 to Katc Engineering Co. Ltd.</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>The project implementation team was for all health ,water and education department projects with the following members;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eng. Mugweri Charles (District Engineer) as Project Manager • Mpindi Pheryster (District Development Officer) • Nankoma Faiza (District Environment Officer) • Dida Sam (Ass Eng. Officer) as Clerk of works • Kaire Paul as Labour Officer. • Higenyi Paul (District Education Officer). 	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There evidence availed for infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the approved designs as indicates the following result findings on ground;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a staff house at Budaka primary school was as per the standard designs with 200mm thick walls, 14000mm x 7000mm overall dimensional length, no minor nor major cracks were seen running through the masonry works. 2. Construction of a paediatric ward at Budaka HCIV, works were satisfying according to scope of works for previous financial year included plastering, painting, fixtures of doors and windows, floor finishes and all these were satisfactory with all door and window handles flexibly functioning, a terrazzo floor finish was appropriately laid in different bays, electrical installations were functional and a weather guard proof paint and easy to clean was applied. 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of supervision reports prepared by the engineering assistant from inspection works prior to verification of works.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A supervision report prepared on 27th May 2022 for construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at Budaka Town council which indicated preliminary works such as site clearance, setting, setting out of the structure and provision of temporary storage facilities, all facilities, all substructure including strip foundation, plinth walling of well burnt clay bricks embedded in a cement mortar mix. works, walling frames were 100% complete 2. A completion certificate for a 4 stance line pit latrine on 27th May 2022. 3. A supervision report prepared on 14th June 2022 for construction of a paediatric ward with status for ceiling works such as fixing of branderings and joists, concrete ceiling casting, painting and internal finishes, floor finishes such as screeding, application of terrazzo were all complete . 	2

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

f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):

Score 1 or else score 0

The LG verified works for payments as listed below for respective DDEG projects;

1.Requisition for payment from the contractor after inspection of works done was on 9th June 2022 from Joner construction Company limited and a certificate no.3 issued on 14th June 2022 of Ugx 44,240,467 signed by Ass Eng Officer, District Engineer, District Health Officer, DCDO, Environment officer and CAO, with a payment voucher on 20th June 2022 under voucher number44216768 Pediatric ward at Budaka HCIV.

2.Requisition for payment from the contractor after inspection of works done was on 3rd February 2022 from Joner construction Company limited and a certificate no.1 issued on 14th February 2022 of Ugx 66,961,827 signed by Ass Eng Officer, District Engineer, DCDO, District Health Officer, Environment officer and CAO, no payment voucher attached on attached on details for this payment of Pediatric ward at Budaka HCIV.

3.Requisition for payment from Mao General Suppliers and construction Ltd was on 26th May 2022 and a certificate issued on 27th May 2022 for Ugx 15,839,820, with a payment voucher on 1st June 2022 of Ugx 15,839.820. All payment was timely made.

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

Evidence from the sampled projects indicated the LG had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA law Example of projects include;

a) Construction of a 4stance pit latrine at Budaka Town Council Procurement ref no.BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00014: A works contract signed on 18th February 2022, An evaluation report approved by the contracts committee on 17th January 2022, Minutes of contracts committee no:12/24/01/2022 on 24th January 2022.

b) Construction of a Pediatric ward at Budaka HCIV at Procurement ref no.BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00001; A works contract signed on 7th October 2021, an approved evaluation report on 4th September 2021 and contract committee minutes 06/7/09/2021-2022 on 7th September 2021

c) Construction of a staff house at Budaka primary school Procurement ref no. BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00005, a woks contract signed on 25th October 2021, an evaluation report approved by the contracts committee on 16th September 2021 and contract committee minutes 14/29/09/2021 on 29th September 2021.

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has</p> <p>i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of designating Ms. Iliotu Grace Opio - Information officer as the grievance/complaints focal point person. Through a letter dated 18th /07/2019 signed by the CAO.</p> <p>The D/CAO appointed the GRC member on 3rd /04/2022 and the members were;</p> <p>Mulekwa Andrew Martin - DCO, chairperson GRC</p> <p>Iliotu Grace Opio - Information officer, secretary GRC</p> <p>Dr. Mulwani Erisa - DHO, Member.</p> <p>Mugweri Charles - DE, member.</p> <p>Mpindi Pheryster - DCDO, member.</p> <p>Muirugazu Paul -PHRO, member</p> <p>Hingenye Paul - DEO, member</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had a specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included a centralized complaints log that was opened on 20th /07/2021 for the FY under review with clear information and reference for on-ward action at the time of assessment grievances were recorded from different sectors</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms at the district notice board at the compound, accounts department wall at the entrance, at the production department notice board and at the planning unit notice board had grievance redress mechanisms titled "Grievances referral path for Budaka district" approved by the CAO on 3rd /04/2022 and contained the telephone number of the Focal person</p>	1

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that environment, social and climate change had been integrated into the LGDP, Annual work plans and budgets. For example;

Work plan for on pages 94-99 the LG planned for;

Tree planting and afforestation

Training in forestry management (100 community meeting)

Forestry regulation and inspection

Monitoring and Evaluation of Environmental compliance

From the Approved Budget pages 51-52

Tree planting and afforestation UGX. 30,000,000

Training in forestry management UGX. 9,000,000

Forestry regulation and inspection UGX. 7,202,000

Community training in wetland management UGX. 4,000,000

Monitoring and Evaluation of Environmental compliance UGX. 9,000,000

From LGDP III page 85

Improve coordination, regulation and monitoring of environment management.

Development and implementation of wetland management plans.

Community sensitization.

Restore and replant trees in degraded forests.

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed by the District Planner on dissemination of enhanced DDEG guidelines to LLGs at the time of assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had a project financed by DDEG other than health, education, water and irrigation such as;</p> <p>1. The construction of the District Council chambers phase-3 under procurement Ref. No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00008 by a contractor: M/S Katc Engineering Co.Ltd. This was incorporated into the BoQ and costed UGX. 1,000,000 under item E: Occupational, health and safety, HIV/AIDS and gender.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no project with costing of the additional impact from climate change at the LG</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all 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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a land agreement between Nicholas Nabungangna of Kakwanga village in Iki-Iki sub-county and Budaka DLG dated 30th /11/2021 where he accepted to offer land measuring approximately 6mX6m for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Kakwanga village in order to extend clean water nearer to the community of Kakwanga village in Iki-Iki sub-county the district was represented by Nafuna Irene - the senior Lands Management officer and was witnessed by the area LC-1 chairperson Mugole Yobu on 30th /11/2021.</p> <p>Land title for Budaka District headquarters where there was construction site for the council chambers on freehold volume HQT 130 Folio 21 measuring 7.6470 hectares on block 2 plot 771,772,770 and 769 at Budaka issued on 5th /05/2014</p> <p>Land title for Budaka primary school where there was construction site for the twin staff house block on freehold volume HQT 820 Folio 22 measuring 3.4160 hectares on block 2 plot 956 at Budaka Township issued on 17th /06/2016</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment officer and DCDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of all the projects under health, education water and micro-scale irrigation</p> <p>Monitoring reports for the construction site for the twin staff house block at Budaka primary school in Budaka Town Council and recommendations made such sensitization on the use child labour, replanting trees to replace the dried proper hygiene and sanitation for the workers and landscaping the report was prepared and signed by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 10th /12/2021 and 4th /01/2022</p> <p>Monitoring report for the construction of the Council Chambers phase-3 at the district headquarters in Budaka Town Council and recommendations made such as sensitization on the use child labour, replanting trees to replace the dried ones and landscaping prepared by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 6th /12/2021 and 4th /01/2022.</p>	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 were signed E&S compliance certificates and payment records, examples included; An interim payment certificate was issued for the construction of a twin staff house at Budaka primary school in Budaka Town Council, endorsed by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 19th April, 2022 and payment was made on 20th May 2022. Contractor: M/S Shaban Brothers Ltd under procurement Ref.No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00005 Interim payment certificate for the construction of the council chambers phase-3 endorsed by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 1st March, 2022, under procurement Ref. No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00008, contractor: M/S Katc Engineering .Co.Ltd	1
----	--	---	--	---

Financial management

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0	The District which was on IFMS made its bank reconciliations up to year ended 30/6/2022. As at that date, three sampled bank accounts were reconciled as follows: 1. General Fund A/c reconciled at shs.989,652. 2. UWEB Recovery A/c at shs.8,579,225. 3. YLP Recovery A/c at shs.704,050. As a result of challenges of the system, the position as at 30/9/2022 could not be established. The controls in the system could not enable transactions to be enrolled on the system at the time of this assessment.	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	The LG produced all the four quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2021/2022 as follows: 1st Qrt report produced on 8/11/2021, 2nd Qrt report on 22/02/2022, 3rd Qrt report on 19/5/2022 and 4th Qrt on 25/7/2022. The report were addressed to the District Speaker and copied to CAO, LG PAC , Internal Auditor General, among others.	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not provide information to the Council Chairman and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2021/2022.</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG submitted internal audit reports for FY 2021/2022 to CAO, LG PAC among other stakeholders;</p> <p>In their meeting of 17/11/2021 under Min. 05/11/PAC/2021, PAC discussed the 1st Qrt. report and recommended that that management should prevail over LLGs in ensuring that CAIIP facilities are given attention so as to benefit communities. In another PAC meeting of 9/3/2022 under Min. 05/03/PAC/2022, PAC reviewed 2nd Qrt report and recommended CFO should closely supervise regularly the staff of LLGs to ensure efficient and effective financial management. In their meeting of 15/6/2022 under Min. 05/06/PAC/2022 reviewed 3rd Qrt report in another meeting of 22/9/2022 under Min. 05/09/PAC/2022 reviewed the 4th Qrt report.</p>	1

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>For FY 2021/2022, the District budgeted to collect local revenue shs.254, 770,000 as noted on page 6 of the approved budget for the period. By the year end shs.172, 631,000 had been collected. This was a collection ratio of 67/7%.</p> <p>This was below the +/- 10% set in the manual. The poor performance was due to creation of five Town Councils resulting into loss of revenue to them. Secondly the effect of COVID-19 pandemic causing closure of markets which are main source of revenue.</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>OSR collected FY 2020/2021 was shs.214, 529,953 as reported in Audited Accounts for the period on page 7.</p> <p>For FY 2021/2022 OSR collection was shs.172, 631,000 which was a reduction of shs.41, 898,953 between both years.</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>The sharable local revenue between the District and the LLGs for FY 22021/2022 was shs.116, 122,500 as noted on page 22 of the Draft Financial Statements for the period. There were two transfers of local revenue to the LLGs. One made on 25/01/2022 shs.8, 269,900 and another on 27/4/2022 shs.15, 876,500 totaling to shs.24, 146,400. This was 20.7% remittance of the mandatory LLG share for the period far below the 65% set in the law.</p>	0
----	--	--	---	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The copies of amended procurement plan, awarded contracts and amounts which were up but had been removed by the assessment date were reviewed by the assessment team. Sampled awarded contracts were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a staff house at Namusita H/C III awarded to Eagle Site Ltd. at shs.127, 165,508. 2. Construction of a piped water system in Lyama T/C awarded to Karf Aqua Engineering Solution at shs.273, 228,934. 3. Construction of a staff house at Budaka P/S awarded to Shaban and Brothers (U) Ltd at shs.78, 206,490. 	2
----	--	---	---	---

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG assessment results for 2021 were pinned on a notice board accessible by the public with a summary scores e.g. Overall rank 59th, Crosscutting Measures 42%, Education Measures 57%, Health Measures 58%, Water Measures 33%, Micro Irrigation N/A.</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>During FY 2021/2022, the District conducted two radio talk shows on a local Bugwere FM on 1/3/2022 and 220/6/2022. The main objective was to sensitize masses about a Government program the Parish Development Model. The purposes were to: i. enhances effective mobilization and sensitization of households and communities on PDMIS data collection, ii. Disseminate key messages on PDMIS guidelines, iii. Ensure 100% data collection in the communities among others.</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not publically avail information on tax rates, collection procedures and procedures of appeal as expected.</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>Although there were cases of alleged corruption in the District as per a letter to CAO by IGG-FPP but the official report addressed to IGG was not prepared.</p>	0

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

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>School Year 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total No. of Candidates registered was 4667 • Total absentees was 45 • Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = (163+1596+1151) = 2910 • Pass rate = 2910 X 100 (4667- 45) = 63% <p>School Year 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total No. of Candidates registered =5185 • Total absentees = 45 • Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = (219+1757+1351) = 3327 • Pass rate = 3327 X 100 (5185-45) = 64.7% <p>The PLE pass rate increased by 1.7% (from 63% to 64.7%)</p>	2

1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>School Year 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UCE results for 2019 were not presented for assessment. <p>School Year 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total No. of Candidates = 2267 • Total absentees = 0 • Total Grades (1, 2 & 3) = (143+376+593) = 1112 • Pass rate = 1112×100 $(2267-0) = 49.1\%$ <p>In absence the UCE results for 2019, there was no results pass rate to compare.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 	<p>Education LLG performance was not conducted during the previous FY but one.</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>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The LG during the FY under review set out to undertake the following investments using the Education Development Grant as per the Grant and sector guidelines which included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The construction of 2-classroom blocks at Primary Schools; Kaperi, Nabiteko each at UGX 70,000,000 2. Construction of VIP lined pit latrines at Primary Schools; Kamonkoli at UGX 25,000,000, Kadaturi at UGX 50,000,000, Katira and Namirembe each at UGX 25,000,000/=. 	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>The reviewed project payments records indicated that the Environment Officer and Community Development Officer never certified works before the LG effecting the payments.</p> <p>The assessment reviewed the payment certificate No. 1 for M/s Shaban Brothers (U) Limited of UGX 34,805,280 that was paid on 3rd February, 2022 .</p> <p>The payments for works at Budaka Primary School on 20th May, 2022 via PV 43406 of UGX 40326715 was not certified by the CDO and similarly, the payment of civil works at Kaperi of 3rd February, 2022 via EFT Voucher 41534292 of UGX 208796667 was not certified by the Environment Officer and the CDO.</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>Evidence from the education project investments indicates the following variations;</p> <p>a) Construction of 2 classroom block at Kageri Primary School: Contract price; Ugx 67,946,664 Engineers estimate Ugx70,000,000; variation= Ugx-2,053,336; % variation=-2.9%</p> <p>b) Construction of 5 stance line pit latrine at Katira primary school: Contract price; Ugx24,871,898, Engineers estimates Ugx25,000,000, variation=Ugx = -128,102 %variation =- 0.5%</p> <p>c) Construction of5 stance line pit latrine at Kamomkoli primary school: Contract price; Ugx23,204,744, Engineers estimates Ugx 25,000,000 variation=Ugx = -1,795,256 %Variation =-7.2%</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>The DLG did not have a seed school project during the FY 2021/2022</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>Budaka LG Teacher's staff ceiling was 1458 and the Primary teachers in service at the time of assessment were 917 in 59UPE schools.</p> <p><u>917 X 100=</u> 1458 = 62 %</p> <p>This implied that the LG was 62% compliant with the MoES staffing guidelines of one teacher per class.</p>	0

Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,

- If above 70% and above score: 3
- If between 60 - 69%, score: 2
- If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
- Below 50 score: 0

The LG Consolidated Assets register for Budaka LG 2021/2022 that captured assets (1132 classrooms, 2044 latrines stances, 22829 desks, zero libraries and 353 staff accommodation units) of 59 registered Primary Schools. The Consolidated assets register to have the assets of the 10 Secondary Schools (165 latrines, 16 laboratories, 173 classrooms, 3868 desks and 62 staff houses) was in place.

This implies that 100% met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format. The assessment further verified this from the 3 sampled Primary Schools of; Budaka FHP, Sapiriand, Gadumire were assets registers with stocks tallying those of the DEO's consolidated register were found.

Percentage of Schools that met DES guidelines was;

Total schools that complied X 100

Total (UPE & USE)

69 X 100

69 = 100%

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The LG accurately reported on teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving.

From the three (3) visited Schools of Budaka FHP (urban), Sapiri (semi urban) and Gadumire (rural), it was verified from the teacher's duty roster, the displayed teachers' list and the teacher's daily attendance books the actual presence of the teachers as per the deployment list at the DEO's office.

1. At Budaka P/S, the staff list that was posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU teachers were 30 which were in tandem with the DEO's deployment list which too had 20 teachers.

2. While at Sapiri P/S, the staff list posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU teachers were 19 which number tallied with that on the DEO's deployment list.

3. At Gadumire P/S, the staff list posted on the wall of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU teachers were 15 which number perfectly matched with that on the DEO's deployment list.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

The Consolidated School Asset register at the DEO's office indicated accurate reporting on the primary school assets in some schools. The assessment sampled three (3) schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register and the findings were presented below;

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Budaka FHPP/S had; 22 classrooms, 30 stances of latrines, 325 desks and zero units of staff houses. The Performance Assessment field verification noted the same assets stocks as was reported by the Consolidated Assets register at the DEO's office.
- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Sapiri P/S had; 18 classrooms, 17 stances of pit latrines, 234 desks and 1 staff house. A comparison with the field findings observed the same stocks of assets.
- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that GadumireP/S had; 9 classrooms, 9 stances of pit latrines, 143 three-seater desks and 1 staff house. When the assessment team visited the school, similar assets logs were presented by the Headteacher.

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 evidence to show that the Headteachers of the 59 UPE Schools had compiled the Annual Budget Performance Reports and submitted a copy to the District Education Officer. There reports presented were however for Calendar year 2022 and on assessing the records, the reports never adhered to the set standards because they missed sections like reconciled Cash Flow statements and an annual budget and expenditure report.</p> <p>The assessment reviewed records at the sampled Schools (Budaka FHP, Sapiri and Gadumire and the Headteachers were not having the 2021 annual reports in the format spell out in the Budgeting and Planning guidelines of the MoES.</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>The reviewed inspection reports at the sampled primary schools; Budaka FHP, Sapiri and Gadumire indicated that the inspectors of schools met and discussed the inspection findings during which the School Administration was mentored on how to improve on the noted grey areas that needed improvement which would culminate into coming up with the School Improvement Plans.</p> <p>There school visit however never found copies of SIPs at Sapiri and Gadumire Primary Schools.</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>There was evidence to prove that the LG had collected and compiled OTIMS return forms for all the 59 UPE and 10 USE registered schools from the previous FY. The LG submitted the OTIMS return forms on 17th November, 2021.</p> <p>The LG had included in writing the list of schools, their enrollment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) that contained 59 UPE Schools and 10 USE schools captured on pages 34 to 37 of the 2nd July, 2021 generated LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2021/2022</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2022/2023 it was indicated that UGX 6,697,234,000 was allocated towards primary school teachers and headteachers of 59 registered Primary Schools with a total number of 921 teachers.</p>	4
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>From the three visited Schools of Budaka FHP (herein as urban), Sapiri (semi Urban) and Gadumire as rural Primary Schools, the names and number of teachers as displayed in the Headteachers' office matched with what was on the teacher's deployment list at the DEO's office.</p> <p>For example, as per the Deployment list; Budaka FHP 30 teachers, Sapiri 19 and Gadumire had 15 teachers including the Headteachers.</p> <p>A school verification mission observed from the displayed lists in the offices of the Headteachers a similar staff numbers and names as on the deployment list at the DEO's desk.</p>	3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The LG staff list for 2022 was found posted on the LG Education notice board as per sampled Schools of Budaka FHP(herein as urban),Sapiri(semi Urban) and Gadumire as rural Primary. The headteachers had posted the respective staff lists on the walls of their offices with details like NIN, Telephone contacts and teacher's registration numbers.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence of appraising Primary Schools Headteachers by Senior Assistant Secretaries as per the sampled schools;

1. Mr. Asaba Albert the Headteacher Namengo Boys in Budaka Town was appraised by the Town Clerk Ms. Mugala Kanifah on 2nd December, 2021

2. Ms. Muduwa Scovia Wetaka the Head teacher Nyanza II Primary School in Kamonkoli Sub county was appraised by SAS Kataike Esther on 2nd December, 2021,

3. Mr. Mamaye Robert the Head teacher Sapiri Primary School in Budaka Sub county was appraised by SAS Nagodyo Asimaila on 2nd December, 2021

4. Mr. Mebalethe Head teacher Kadenge Primary School in Ikiri Sub county was appraised by SAS on 6nd December, 2021

5. Mr. Muduko Fred the Head teacher Kamonkoli Mixed Primary School in Kamonkoli Sub county was appraised by SAS Kataike Esther on 22nd November, 2021

6. Mr. Poli Eria the Head teacher Budaka FHP Primary School in Budaka Town Council was appraised by Town Clerk Mudenya Grace on 2nd December, 2021

7. Mr. Dula Robert, the Head teacher Namusita Primary School in Kakule Sub County was appraised by SAS on 6th January, 2022.

8. Mr. Wakoli Samuel the Head teacher Namirembe Boarding Primary School in Kamonkoli Sub county was appraised by SAS Kataike Esther on 2nd December, 2021

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p>	<p>There was no evidence for appraising Secondary School Headteachers.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p>	<p>There was evidence of appraising the Education department staff for their performance for FY 2021/2022 as showed below;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The DEO Mr. Higenyi Paul was appraised by the CAO on 20th July, 2022. 2. Ms. Kataike Paula Esther the Inspector of Schools was appraised by the DEO on 27th June,2022 by Wako Richard the Principal Education Officer. 3. Wako Richard the Principal Education Officer was appraised by DEO on 20th July 2022. 4. Ms. Najjemba Aisha the Education Officer Special Needs was appraised by the Inspector of Schools on 1st July, 2022. 	

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Education department training plan for FY 2021/2022 duly signed by the DIS, DEO and DCAO on 4th July, 2022 was in place with clear activities like training P1 to P4 teachers on effective scheming and lesson planning in use of Local Languages from 10th to 13th September, 2021 and equipping teachers of P1 to P3 with modern methods of teaching mathematics.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessment team noted from DEO, that the LG was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrollment data. Therefore , there was no need of communicating corrections/revisions of school lists and enrollment data submitted via PBS.</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>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>Budaka DLG Education Department made allocations of UGX 22,512,000 to inspection and monitoring UGX 11,200,000 on page 41 the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2021/2022. This was in line with sector guidelines (page 18 and 21 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of UGX 4,000,000 per LG.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence of timely submission of UPE Capitation warrants.

The MoFPED cash limits were on 13th August, 2021 for Quarter 1, warrants No. 578AW-2022-S were prepared on 17th August, 2021, the CAO approved the warrants UGX 317,948,713 on the same date and communication was done on 20th August, 2021.

The MoFPED cash limits were on 9th October, 2021 for Quarter 2, warrants No. 578AW-2022-8 were prepared on 12th October, 2021 the same data, the CAO approved the warrants UGX 317,948,713 on 16th October, 2021 and communication was done on 13th October, 2021.

The MoFPED cash limits were on 4th January, 2022 for Quarter 3, warrants No. 578AW-2022-13 were prepared on 6th January, 2022, the CAO approved the warrants UGX 317,948,713 on 7th January, 2022 and communication was done on the same day

2

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

The CAO through the CFO invoiced the DEO on the Quarterly releases following dates;

- 1stQtr on 15th August, 2021, UGX 353,081,333 and communication was on 17th August, 2021.

- 2nd Qtr on 16th October, 2021 UGX 317,948,713. was received and communicated to the DEO on 13th October, 2021 and

- 3rdQtr on 7th January, 2022 UPE amounting to UGX 317,948,713 and communication was on the same day

2

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>For the FY 2021/2022, the Education department prepared an inspection Plan which was approved by the CAO, DEO and DIS on 15th July, 2021. The plan targeted to inspect all the 59UPE and the 10 USE Schools plus private and community education institutions. Some of the key activities of the plan included, checking compliance of the SOPs before the official opening of Schools in January, 2022.</p> <p>The pre- inspection meetings were held for example;</p> <p>On 13th September, 2021. In such meetings, discussions were on issues like school allocations amongst inspectors discussed under minute No. 03/insp/2021.</p> <p>Other inspection planning meetings were held on 13th November, 2021, 29th April, 2022. The meetings were attended by inspectors like; Waako Richard, Higenyi Paul, Kataike Esther Paula, Kiire Gerald Kigondere, Mugala Kanifah and Najjemba Aisha.</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>The reviewed inspection reports for the FY under review indicated that all the 59 UPE and 10 USE Schools were regularly inspected and monitored for example a the Term III, 2021 indicated that the inspection carried out from 13th to 18thSeptember, 2021 covered all the Government registered and Government aided Schools which translated into 100%.</p> <p>Therefore, it was correct to conclude that 100% UPE Schools were inspected during the FY under review.</p>	2

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence of the LG discussing the inspection reports at Schools and at the department and Council levels as indicated below;

At the visited schools for example Budaka FHP P/S, inspector Panula Esther on 12th May, 2022 discussed the inspection findings with Head teacher Poli Eria as evidenced by the signed inspection feedback report dated 12thMay, 2022.

The assessment further observed that the department of Education discussed the inspection findings in a series of meetings for example on 11th October, 2021 vide minute No. 04/2021 where it was resolved that strict adherence to COVID -19 SOPs be tracked in all schools.

Other meetings that discussed inspection findings were held on; 17th December, 2021, 24th March, 2022 and 29th July, 2022.

The council to discussed inspection findings on 17th March, 2022.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The inspection feedback reports duly signed by the Inspectors of Schools and the School Headteachers were found at the three sampled and visited Schools had evidence of discussion and agreement on the inspection findings between the School administration and the inspectorate. Inspector Panula Esther on 12th May, 2022 while at Budaka FHP P/S discussed the inspection findings and agreed with the Headteacher to take regular roll calls to ensure daily attendance of learners.

The DIS prepared and submitted all the inspection reports together with the Activity work plans and budgets to DES on the dates listed below;

1. Term III, 2021 report was submitted on 8th October, 2021 to DES Mbale office.
2. Term I, 2022 report was submitted on 1st June, 2022 and,
3. Term II, 2022 report was submitted on 3rd October, 2022.

The submissions of Budaka LG inspection reports were further confirmed on the Matrix for submission of Inspection Work plans, Reports and Accountabilities to DES

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Social Services committee discussed matters of education service delivery as per the example below;</p> <p>On 29th April, 2022 under minute No. 06/SC/04/2020 discussed the Qtr III report were school enrollment came out prominently following the re-opening of Schools after the COVID-19 lockdown lifting</p> <p>Another Committee meeting was held on 17th March, 2022 which through minute No. 05/SS/03/2022 discussed the Qtr II FY 2021/2022 report.</p> <p>The LG Full Council on 24th March, 2022 through minute No. 13/03/BDLG/COU/2022 discussed the Education report and it was resolved that procuring of school desks be prioritized.</p> <p>The full council under minute No. 07/03/BDLG/COU/2022 of meeting held on 3rd March, 2022 recommended for improved access of CWDs to latrines.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of mobilizing learners into Schools through the community engagements held by the LG and various stakeholders for example;</p> <p>During the meeting held on 24th February, 2022 at Kodiri Primary School under minute No. 4/2022, the Chairperson LC III called upon parents to provide what was required of them to ensure that children keep in School.</p>	2

Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

The Consolidated School Asset register at the DEO's office indicated accurate reporting on the primary school assets in some schools. The assessment sampled three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register and the findings are presented below;

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Budaka FHP P/S had; 22 classrooms, 30 stances of latrines, 325 desks and zero units of staff houses. The Performance Assessment field verification noted the same assets stocks as was reported by the Consolidated Assets register at the DEO's office.

- In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that SapiriP/S had; 18 classrooms, 17 stances of pit latrines, 234 desks and 1 staff house. A comparison with the field findings observed the same stocks of assets.

In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Gadumire P/S had; 9 classrooms, 9 stances of pit latrines, 143 three-seater desks and 1 staff house. When the assessment team visited the school, similar assets logs were presented by the Headteacher.

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>There was evidence of Desk appraisal for the Education sector implemented projects FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>The appraisal form for the construction of a 5-stance lined Pit latrine at Namirembe Boarding Primary School was desk appraised by team that comprised of the District Planner, District Engineer, District Community Development Officer, the Senior Environment Officer and CAO on 10th September, 2021</p> <p>The sector projects were well incorporated into the DDP III on page 108 and were qualifying according to the sector guidelines for instance;</p> <p>On page 143 of the DDP III under Human Capital development, the LG under adopted output 3 planned to construct supportive facilities like laboratories, classrooms and latrines.</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>Desk appraisal for all projects in the budget was conducted by Planner, Engineer, Environmental Officer, CDO, PAS on 16/9/2021. The team filled the desk appraisal forms which they all endorsed. The three sampled ESG projects were: The construction of a 5-stance Pit latrine at Kadatuni, Katira, Namirembe, Nansanga, Mugiti Seed Schools was desk appraised on 16th August, 2021 Aall were reflected in the DDPIII page 89 and AWP page 24. The team that undertook the exercise finally recommended for funding and implementation.</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>The LG did not plan to construct a seed school for the FY 2022/2023. Therefore, the Procurement Plan did not incorporate it.</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 of education projects in the previous financial year being approved by contracts committee before commencement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kaperi primary school was approved on 29th September 2021 minute 12/29/09/2021 • Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Katira primary school was approved on 24th January 2022 minute 6/24/01//2022 • Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kamonkoli primary school was approved on 24th January 2022 minute 07/24/01/2022. <p>A sector procurement plan for previous financial year indicating the approved projects listed above was submitted to PDU on 23rd June 2021 by Mr.Higenyi Paul (DEO).</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>The project implementation team was for all health ,water and education department projects with the following members;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eng. Mugweri Charles (District Engineer) as Project Manager • Mpindi Pheryster (District Development Officer) • Nankoma Faiza (District Environment Officer) • Dida Sam (Ass Eng. Officer) as Clerk of works • Kaire Paul as Labour Officer. • Higenyi Paul (District Education Officer). 	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There was a phased seed secondary at Kamonkoli for financial year 2018/2019 and the designs of the structures on ground were the same as on paper, the plastering works indicated a relatively fair mix ratio, the number of doors and windows for all structures were appropriately installed however were not yet painted as required.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	<p>There was evidence of a report prepared from a site meeting that was held on 3rd February 2022 at Kamonkoli seed secondary school with the Environment officer (Nankoma Faiza), District Engineer (Mugweri Charles), CDO (Kirya Christine), CAO (Elly Piwang) and DEO (Higenyi Paul). This report indicated 100% completion of works on the site exception of the sports field, rainwater harvesting, external works (not listed in details) which were not yet commenced.</p> <p>Evidence of another site meeting held on 21st March 2022 for a 2 classroom block at Kageri primary school. The meeting was attended by the relevant technical officers including DCDO, DEO, Environment officer and District engineer.</p> <p>Min. 02/03/21/2022 was a site inspection and issues that arose from it where hairy cracks on plaster works, burglar proof was in less as per what was required</p> <p>Min .04/03/21/2022 the project manager addressed his areas of interest,</p> <p>Min 06/03/21/2022 was the head teacher placing in their concerned issues about the site</p> <p>Min. 06/03/21/2022, the contractor addressed his areas of weaknesses and strength.</p> <p>Min 07/03/2021/2022 were the reactions.</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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 *score: 1, else score: 0*

There was evidence of a report prepared from a site meeting that was held on 3rd February 2022 at Kamonkoli seed secondary school with the Environment officer (Nankoma Faiza), District Engineer (Mugweri Charles), CDO (Kirya Christine), CAO (Elly Piwang) and DEO (Higenyi Paul). This report indicated 100% completion of works on the site exception of the sports field, rainwater harvesting, external works (not listed in details) which were not yet commenced.

Evidence of another site meeting held on 21st March 2022 for a 2 classroom block at Kageri primary school. The meeting was attended by the relevant technical officers including DCDO, DEO, Environment officer and District engineer.

Min.02/03/21/2022 was a site inspection and issues that arose from it where hairy cracks on plaster works, burglar proof was in less as per what was required

Min .04/03/21/2022 the project manager addressed his areas of interest,

Min 06/03/21/2022 was the head teacher placing in their concerned issues about the site

Min.06/03/21/2022, the contractor addressed his areas of weaknesses and strengths

Min 07/03/2021/2022 was the reactions.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The payments for the sector infrastructure projects were verified and made to contractors within the following time frames;

a) Construction of a 2-classroom block and office at Kaperi primary school : A requisition for payment from Jerusalem General Consult Ltd for works done was on 9th May 2022, An interim certificate issued on 12th June 2022 of Ugx 16,043,016 certified by Asst Eng Officer, District engineer, District Education Officer and Environment, a payment voucher on 20th June 2022 under voucher number 44216772.

b) Construction of a 2-classroom block and office at Kaperi primary school : A requisition for payment from Jerusalem General Consult Ltd for works done was on 3rd January 2022, An interim certificate issued on 3rd January 2022 of Ugx 20,879,669 certified by Asst Eng Officer, District engineer, District Education Officer and CAO, a payment voucher on 3rd February 2022 under voucher number 41534292.

c) Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine t Katira primary school : A requisition for payment from the contractor for works done on 3rd May 2022, , An interim certificate issued on 13th May 2022 of Ugx 17,156,130, A payment voucher on 8th June 2022 under voucher number 43820717

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, *score: 1, else, score: 0*

The LG Education department submitted a procurement plan on 23rd June 2021 by DEO (Mr. Higenyi Paul) this was a late submission. The plan included projects such as:

1. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kaperi primary school approved under minute 12/29/09/2021 on 29/September 2021 at Ugx 67,946,644
2. Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kamonkoli primary school approved under minute no 07/24/01/2022 on 24th January 2022 Ugx 23,204,744
3. Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Katira primary school approved under minute no 6/24/01/2022 on 24th January 2022 Ugx 24,871,898

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0

The LG had a seed secondary school project in the current financial year with the procurement file s indicated below;

1.Construction of the 2 seed secondary schools (Mugiti and Nasanga) were approved and awarded in the current financial year

2.Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kaperi primary school, Procurement ref no. BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00006 with a works contract signed on 24th November 2021, contracts committee minute 12/20/09/2021 on 29th September 2021,an evaluation report approved by the committee on 17th September 2021.

3.Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kamonkoli primary school ,Procurement ref no.BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00017with a works contract signed on 15th April 2022, contract committee minute 07/24/01/2022 on 24th January 2022, an evaluation report on 14th January 2022.

4.Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Katira primary school ,Procurement ref no.BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00016with a works contract signed on 14th February 2022, contract committee minute 6/24/01/2022 on 24th January 2022, an evaluation report on 14th January 2022.

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had a log for recording grievance which was in place and during the assessment the log was reviewed, it was noted that for the FY under review 2021/2022, grievances were recorded as shown below;</p> <p>Site workers (17) from Kamokoli Seed S.S construction works on 17th /01/2022 reported to the District Engineer during the site meeting about non-payment of their wages ranging from UGX. 300,000 - 600,000. PIT sought for the contractor view and he was instructed to pay workers before any requisitions are made to the district and on 21st /06/2022 the labour officer confirmed payment was made by the contractor.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of Education guidelines incorporating Environmental aspects into schools at the LG and there was no dissemination of education guidelines to provide access to proper siting of schools, green schools and energy and water conservation.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of incorporating costed ESMPs in the BoQs and contractual documents as per the examples below;</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX 100,000 was incorporated into the BoQs under item: Allowance for the Environmental mitigation and social safeguards for the construction of 2 classrooms block at Nabiketo primary school, under procurement Ref. No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00007, contractor: M/S Mugole Investments Ltd</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX 100,000 was incorporated into the BoQs under preliminaries item E: tree planting and grassing for the construction of 1 block of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Kadatumi primary school, under procurement Ref. No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00008, contractor: M/s. Muweman Enterprises Ltd.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was a proof of land ownership documents availed for the education projects as shown below;</p> <p>Land title for Budaka primary school where there was a construction site for the twin staff house block on freehold volume HQT 820 Folio 22 measuring 3.4160 hectares on block 2 plot 956 at Budaka Township issued on 17th /o6/2016</p> <p>Land title for Nabiketo primary school where there was construction site for the 1 block of 2 classrooms on freehold volume TOR 26 Folio 21 measuring 1.8670 hectares on block 2 plot 1551 at Nabiketo Chali issued on 27th /o5/2021</p> <p>Land title for Kaperi primary school where there was construction site for the 1 block of 2 classrooms on freehold volume HQT 1624 Folio 1 measuring 0.7450 hectares on block 2 plot 1896 at Kaperi issued on 23rd /07/2018.</p>	1

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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, *score: 2, else score:0*

There were monthly monitoring reports of support supervision of all the Education projects. The examples included;

Monitoring reports for the construction of 1 block 2 classrooms with an office and store block at St. Joseph Kamolokini primary school in Kagumu sub-county and recommendations made such re-grassing of the compound, replanting of dried trees proper hygiene and sanitation for the workers and landscaping prepared by the Senior Environment Officer and Ag. DCDO on 14th January 2022 and 29th April, 2022

Monitoring reports for the construction site for the twin staff house block at Budaka primary school in Budaka Town Council and recommendations made such sensitization on the use of child labour, replanting trees to replace the dried proper hygiene and sanitation for the workers and landscaping prepared by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 10th /12/2021 and 4th /01/2022

Monitoring reports for the construction of 1 block 2 classrooms at Nabiketo primary school in Budaka sub-county and recommendations made such sensitization on the use of child labour, replanting trees to replace the dried proper hygiene and sanitation for the workers and landscaping prepared by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 15th /12/2021 and 10th /01/2022

Monitoring reports for the construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Katira primary school in Katira sub-county which was carried out as per the reports dated 15th /12/2021 and 10th /01/2022. The recommendation made such as; site levelling, covering of the dug pit proper sanitation on and around the site prepared by the environment officer and the DCDO.

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments

Score: 1, else score:0

There were Contractor certification forms for all the projects in education sector.

Interim payment certificate issued for the construction of 2 classrooms block at Nabiketo primary school in Budaka sub-county was endorsed by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 3rd/01/2022.

Contractor: M/S Mugole Investments Ltd under procurement Ref. No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00007

Interim payment certificate issued for the construction of a twin staff house at Budaka primary school in Budaka Town Council, endorsed by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 19th April, 2022 and payment was made on 20th May 2022.

Contractor: M/S. Shaban Brothers Ltd under procurement Ref.No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00005

Interim payment certificate issued for the construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Katira primary school in Katira sub-county, endorsed by the Environment Officer and DCDO on 16th May, 2022 and payment was made on 8th June 2022 under procurement Ref. No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00016

Health Performance
Measures

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>Total deliveries in the LG with focus on HCIIIs and IVs</p> <p>2020/21 total deliveries 14470</p> <p>2021/22 total deliveries 14262</p> <p>%ntage increase = $14470 - 14262 - 208/14470 * 100 = \text{neg.}1.43\%$</p> <p>Selected 3 out of 10HC IVs &IIIs, randomly. The selected three were:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2020/21</th> <th>2021/22</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>increase</td> <td>%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Budaka HCIV</td> <td>2585</td> <td>2410</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>175</td> <td>-6.7%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Naboa HCIII</td> <td>697</td> <td>859</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1622</td> <td>3.2%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sapiri HCIII.</td> <td>629</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>555</td> <td>74</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The team analyzed the data found that the increase of <u>1.43%</u> was less than 20%</p>		2020/21	2021/22		increase	%			Budaka HCIV	2585	2410	-	175	-6.7%			Naboa HCIII	697	859		1622	3.2%			Sapiri HCIII.	629			555	74	11.8%		0
	2020/21	2021/22																																		
increase	%																																			
Budaka HCIV	2585	2410	-																																	
175	-6.7%																																			
Naboa HCIII	697	859																																		
1622	3.2%																																			
Sapiri HCIII.	629																																			
555	74	11.8%																																		

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

The LG received shs. 485,700,000/= HSDG for the FY 2021/2022 and were spent on eligible projects as follows.

Fencing Nasanga HCIII 15,000,000/=

Fencing Kerekeren HCIII 15,000,000/=

Fencing Mugiti HCIII 10,000,000/=

Renovation of staff house Kameruka HC III 2,000,0000/=

Completion of Pediatric ward Budaka HCIV 166,034,000/=

Construction of placenta pit Naboa 10,000,000/=

Construction of VIP pit Latrine Lyama 20,000,000/=

Procurement furniture DHO 5,000,000/=

Procurement 2 filling cabinets DHO 6,000,000/=

Procurement of Lap Top Accountant 3,000,000/=

Retantion 40,000,000/=

Surveying land Bukwobehciiii 70,990,000/=

Completion ART clinic at Ikiiki 10,000,000/=

Construction of staff at Namusita HCIII 135,000,000/=

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>The LG availed invoices of payment vouchers for that were certified by the CFO, CDO and Environment Officer before actual payment as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of staff house at Namusita HCIII which cost 17,810,114/= and was signed District Engineer , Nankoma Faiso Environment officer and Mrs. Mpindi Pheriyeter and both signed on 18/01/2022. 2. Construction Pediatric ward (phase III) at Budaka HCIII which cost 44,290,467/= and was also signed by CDO Mpindi and Environment officer on 14/01/2022. 	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variations in the contract price of the sampled health projects for instance;</p> <p>The construction of a staff house at Namusita HCIII Procurement ref no'Buda571/wrks/2021-2022/000002 Contract sum Ugx 127,165,508, Engineers estimates Ugx 135,000,000, Variations =Ugx-7,834,492, % Variation= - 5.8%</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>There was no project for a health Centre II upgrade to III in the previous FY2021/2022.</p>	2

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIII's and HCIV's 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>There was evidence to confirm that Budaka DLG recruited staff for all HC III's and HC IV as per the staffing structure dated 20th June 2022.</p> <p>The staff structure obtained from DHO indicated that the district had both HC III's and HC IV's whereby HC III's were required to have 19 health workers and 48 for HC IV's.</p> <p>The LG health sector staff establishment list had 257 approved health workers of which 181 were in the post which represented 70.4% recruitment.</p> <p>This implied that 70.4% of positions of health workers for the available HC III's and HC IV were filled.</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 was no project on health Centre upgrade from II to III in 2021/2022.</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 Staff list for current FY was obtained from the LG in PBS and three health units sampled Budaka HCIV, Naboa HCIII and Sapiri HCIII</p> <p>Staffing $216/324 * 100 = 67\%$</p> <p>From the sampled three centers Budaka HCIII which had 48hws out of 49 and the percentage was 92% with a wage bill 431,054,568 Naboa HCIII had 16 health workers out 19 percentage 84.2 and a wage bill of 122,022,948/ =.Sapiri HCIII had 12 health workers out 19 percentage 63% wage bill 102,997,836/=</p> <p>The LG provided a list of names per facility as seen in the PBS and staff list at the DHO. The assessment team moved to sampled health units(Kadama, Naboa and Sapiri, HCIV and HCIII's respectively) and compared the names at the staff notice boards at that at units with the one in the PBS and they were exactly the same. The other tools looked at were the duty rosters and attendance register and discrepancies were seen.</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>The LG did not construct or Upgrade any health facility during the year of assessment</p>	2												
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The team sampled 3 out of 11(Budaka HCIV, Naboa HCIII and Sapiri HCIII.). The team requested the LG to avail the 3 PIPS for examination. All the three were submitted after 31stMarch in fact Budaka was 7/7/2021,Sapiri HCIII was 30/6/2021 while Naboa had no reports availed</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="788 1693 1410 2051"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health Unit Budget</th> <th>Date</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Budaka HCIV 304,264,000/=</td> <td>7/7/2021</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Naboa HCIII availed</td> <td>Not availed</td> <td>not</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sapiri HCIII 325,471,309</td> <td>30/6/2021</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Health Unit Budget	Date		Budaka HCIV 304,264,000/=	7/7/2021		Naboa HCIII availed	Not availed	not	Sapiri HCIII 325,471,309	30/6/2021		0
Health Unit Budget	Date															
Budaka HCIV 304,264,000/=	7/7/2021															
Naboa HCIII availed	Not availed	not														
Sapiri HCIII 325,471,309	30/6/2021															

6

0

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.

b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :

- Score 2 or else 0

The LG did not avail evidence that the health facilities prepared and submitted to DHO Annual budget performance reports for the previous year by July 15th of current FY2022/2023.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

0

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.

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

- Score 2 or else 0

The LG did not avail evidence that the health facilities developed to prove that health facilities developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that did incorporate performance issues identified by in monitoring and assessment reports.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,

• score 2 or else score 0

The LG availed evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7daysfollowing the end of each month and quarter) . This was by review HMIS 105& 104 reports for the sampled health facilities as below:

Budaka HC IV

4/8/2021, 2/9/2021 6/10/2021, 4/11/2021 ,3/12/2021,1/2022,2/2/2022, 4/3/2022, 4/4/2022, 4/5/2022, 5/6/2022, 5/7/2022

Naboa HCIII

6/8/2021, 6/9/2021, 7/10/2021, 7/11/2021, 7/12/2021, 7/1/2022, 7/2/2022, 4/3/2022, 7/4/2022, 2/5/2022, 7/6/2022, 7/7/2022

Sapiri HCIII

4/8/2021, 2/9/2021, 4/10/2021, 5/11/2021,5/12 2021 7/1/2022 7/2/2022 ,7/3/2022, 5/4/2022, 5 /5/2022, 7/6/2022 6/7/2022,

The quarterly reports were submitted as below:

Budaka HCIVQ15/7/2021, Q2 7/1/2022 Q3 5/4/2022 Q4 5/7/2022

NaboaHCIII

Q1 6/10/2021, Q2 7/1/2022 Q3 7/4/2022 Q4 7/7/2022

Sapiri HCIII

Q1 7/10/2021 Q2 6/1/2022 Q3 1/4/2022 Q 4 7/4/2022

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>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was change of guidance from MOH stating although did not provide evidence of the letter from the PS MOH</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>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail all the evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports (timely 7 days following the end of each month and quarter) The evidence availed was quarter 1 report dated 15/12/2021 & Q2 report of 22/2/2022 which were both indicating late submission</p> <p>Q1 15/12/2021</p> <p>Q2 22/2/2022</p> <p>Q3 -No evidence</p> <p>Q4 - No evidence</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

6

0

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.

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

The LG did not avail evidence that they timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance at the time of assessment.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

6

0

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.

h) Evidence that the LG has:

i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0

The LG did not avail evidence that the LG had;

i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities. There was no evidence that the LG developed and approved PIP for weak performing Health units of and hence did not avail it to the team

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0

The LG they did not avail evidence for the implementation of Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing facilities at the time of assessment.

Human Resource Management and Development

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:
i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

The LG had a total of 216 health workers out of an establishment 324 representing 67% . The LG in the approved budget estimates for the FY 2022/2023 indicated a wage bill of shs. 2,547,812,000/=.

2

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:
ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

The LG deployed health workers as per the guidelines for example in three sampled health units of Kadama HCIV, Naboa HCIII and Sapiri HCIII the situation was proved beyond doubt

Budaka HCIV had a total 48 (92%) health workers, Naboa HCIII had 16 (82.2%) and Sapiri HCIII had 12 (63%) Out of an establishment of 49 for HCIV, and 19 for HCIII respectively.

That means; $(92+82.2+63)/300 * 100 = 79\%$.

2

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The team of assessors visited the three health centers of Budaka HCIV, Naboa HCIII, Sapiri HCIII and it was noted that the health workers were working at the stations where they were deployed.

At Budaka HC IV, there was a total of 48 staff on the deployment list obtained from the DHO's officer and the same number was verified from the attendance registers for instance; Dr. Mutaki Winfred in charge, Dr. Wagabaka John, Nagamya Agatha Senior Nursing Officer Akurut Sarah Nursing Officer Midwife, Kateu Yokoyasi Health inspector, Kibugwe Isaac clinical officer Mwaninka Ronald Lab assistant, Laaki Keneth Tabu the theater assistant, Bunyolo Ali Enrolled nurse among others.

At Naboa HCIII the staff deployment list indicated 16 health workers and the same number was verified from the reviewed duty roster among the verified staff included: Lyada Samuel Senior Clinical Officer, Ziwa Julius was a Lab assistant, Mutonyi Lovina Enrolled Nurse and Namaganda Olivier Nursing Officer, Mugolo Robert Lab technician.

Sapiri HCIII had 12 health workers and all were deployed and working at the station. Some of the verified staff on the list included Masaba Nasur senior Clinical officer, Dagu Aggrey health assistant, Kataike Iva was an Enrolled nurse and Naimbonde Oliveir Nursing officer midwife

The names of the above were found on the public notice boards at the health units, the duty rosters in all the facilities visited and attendance registers.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0

The team of assessors visited sampled health centers and Public notice boards at Budaka, Naboa and Sapiri and found staff lists for current FY and duty rosters displayed on public notice boards.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

Evidence from the 10 files of Health facility in-charges sampled for assessment revealed that only 2 were appraised they included;

1. Tabitya Sarah, Senior Medical Clinical Officer at Namusita HC III was appraised by Nachomo Teruza on 30/6/2022.
2. Mundangha Paul, Medical Clinical Officer at Kameruka HC III was appraised by DHO Dr. Mulwani Erisa on 16/7/2022.

Those not appraised were;

3. Dr. Mutaki Winfred, in-charge of Budaka HC IV ref file no.CR/BD/10006.
4. Lyada Samuel, in-charge of Naboa HC III ref file no.CR/BD/10015.
5. Masaba Nasuru, in-charge of Sapiri HC III ref file no.CR/BD/10150.
6. Tumuhimbise Joy, in-charge of Kamonkoli HC III ref file no.CR/BD/10056.
7. Wajega Samuel, in-charge of Mugiti HC III ref file no.CR/BD/10096.
8. Naula Dorreen, in-charge of Kerekerene HC III ref file no.CR/BD/10263.
9. Wambede Budallah, in-charge of Kaderuna HC III ref file no.CR/BD/10322.
10. Kityaku Ezekiel, in-charge of Kebula HC III ref file no.CR/BD/1010430.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

Evidence revealed that 7 out the 10 health facility workers sampled were appraised by as per the details here under;

1. Watuba Hendrick, Health Assistant at Namusita HC III was appraised by Tabitya Sarah Juliet, Senior Medical Clinical Officer on 30/6/2022.

2. Gimbo Proscovia, enrolled midwife at Namusita HC III was appraised by Tabitya Sarah Juliet, Senior Medical Clinical Officer on 7/6/2022;.

3. Nafuma Fatuma, Enrolled nurse at Namusita HC III was appraised by Tabitya Sarah Juliet, Senior Medical Clinical Officer on 30/6/2022.

4. Kasingabalya John, Enrolled nurse at Namusita HC III was appraised by Tabitya Sarah Juliet, Senior Medical Clinical Officer on 30/6/2022

5. Mugala Erusa, Enrolled nurse at Namusita HC III was appraised by Tabitya Sarah Juliet, Senior Medical Clinical Officer on 12/7/2022

6. Namugambe Miria, porter at Namusita HC III was appraised by Tabitya Sarah Juliet, Senior Medical Clinical Officer on 30/9/2022.

7. Masika Scovia, Health Information Assistant at Namusita HC III was appraised by Tabitya Sarah Juliet, Senior Medical Clinical Officer on 30/9/2022.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0

No evidence was availed for assessment in regard to the LG taking corrective actions based on appraisal findings.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not provide evidence that they conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plan sat District training was said to have been done but no evidence was availed during assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No training data base was availed during assessment.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG availed to the team a letter by CAO dated 5/9/2022 and received at MOH registry 7/9/2020 and contained They include; Budaka HCIV, Naboia, Sapiri, Ikiiki, Katira, Mugiti, Kamonkoli, Naboia, Lyama, Nasanga, Kaderuna, Kerekereni, Namusita and Kameruka health centers respectively. The health two's on the list were, Butuve, Kebula, and Namengo.</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>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG availed evidence of allocation of 15% of the budget monitoring service delivery. The amount 16,162,000 /=</p>	2	
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>For FY 2021/2022, the District did timely (within 5 working days) warranting of HSDG transfers to Health Facilities s in fulfillment of the budget requirements. 1st Qrt funds released by MoFPED on 21/7/2021 and LG warranted on 23/7/2021 (2 days). 2nd Qrt released on 20/10/2021 and LG warranted on 24/10/2021 (2 days) 3rd Qrt released on 6/01/2021 and LG warranted on 10/01/2022 (2 days)</p>	2	
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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>For FY 2021/2022, the District did not do timely (within 5 working days) communication of HSDG transfers to Health Facilities in fulfillment of the budget requirements. 1st Qrt funds released by MoFPED on 21/7/2021 and LG communicated on 27/7/2021 (4 days). 2nd Qrt released on 20/10/2021 and LG communicated on 26/10/2021 (4 days) 3rd Qrt released on 6/01/2021 and LG communicated on 17/01/2022 (7 days). There was a delay in communicating the 3rd release of funds to the Health Facilities</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>					

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG publicized all quarterly financial releases to all health facilities but no evidence availed that its done within 5 days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MOPPED through posting on public notice boards</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail evidences at the time assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>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>LG availed evidence of four sets minutes of Q1. 15/7/2021, Q2. 15/12/2021, Q3. 22/4/2022 and Q4. 30/8/2022. There was evidence of involvement of in charges and other implementing partners like Baylor, RHITES, DHMT's, key LG departments like WASH,Community Development and Education department.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG had one HCIV Budaka, which was supervised according the reports dated below:</p> <p>Q1 29/9/2021 addressed issues such no blood storage facilities, Stock out medicines and partographs</p> <p>Q2 4/1/2021 Managemnt of funds and proper accountability</p> <p>Q3 1/4/2022</p> <p>Triaging of Tuberculosis patients</p> <p>Use of unqualified workers in ART clinics</p> <p>Q4 25/6/2022</p> <p>Focus was on medicines ordering on time from NMS and supporting facility focal person on electronic ordering.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>No evidence availed to show that that the DHT ensured HSD carried support supervision to lower facilities</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>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail evidence that at the time of assessment.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	The LG availed evidence that they provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: The reports analyzed were dated 15/10/2021, 15/1/2022, 7/4/2022 and 7/7/2022.	1
	Maximum 7 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	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	The LG availed evidence in the PBS that the LG allocated 30% (32,000,000/=) of District Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities during the FY 2021/2022.	2
	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	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	The LG availed evidence of DHT health promotion,disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per the ToRs for DHTs,during the previous FY for example conducted; 1. Indoor residential spraying sensitization activities at community level on 20/3/2022 2. Conducted radio talk shows on 12/6/2022 to 17/6/2022 3. Sensitization communities in Bulukwa and several other villages, Social change communication 20/4/2022	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail evidence of follow-up actions taken by the District Health Team on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The District Health Department was using the new assets data template developed by MoFPED to update their assets register after which it would be uploaded on IFMS, It included, Transport equipment, Office equipment, Medical equipment like beds, generators, theater equipments, ICT equipment's , Furniture among others</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>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));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The desk appraisal for all projects in the budget was conducted by Planner, Engineer, Environmental Officer, CDO, DHO, PAS on 16/9/2021. The team filled the desk appraisal forms which they all endorsed.</p> <p>Among the Health Sector projects appraised were: Construction of pediatric ward at Budaka HC IV in Budaka Town Council as indicated on page 85 of the DDP and page 8 of the guidelines and the construction of the a twin staff house block at Namusita HC III in Kakule sub-county on page 87 of the DDPIII and page 9 of the guideliens.</p>	1
----	--	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The field appraisal was conducted by Planner, Engineer, ADHO, Environmental Officer, and Information Officer on 23/8/2021. All criteria for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customer design were positively responded to in the forms used and final all recommended for funding.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening to ascertain environment and social acceptability and on site visits as shown by the examples below;</p> <p>The Screening for the construction of the a twin staff house block at Namusita HC III in Kakule sub-county it was carried out as per the report dated 17th/08/2021. The impacts identified were; soil erosion because of the step nature of the site, debris generation at the site, vegetation loss and waste generation, and mitigation measures designed such as backfilling, proper waste management, limit vegetation clearance to the site and landscaping on site made in the costed ESMP of UGX. 1,500,000 was prepared by the Environment Officer and the DCDO on 4th October 2021.</p> <p>The Screening for the Construction of pediatric ward at Budaka HC IV in Budaka Town Council,Council was carried out as per the report dated 25th August 2021. The impacts were identified like vegetation loss, soil erosion and surface runoff, construction debris, loose overburden on site and mitigation measures such as limit vegetation clearance, site re-grassing and trees planting and backfilling made in the costed ESMP of UGX. 200,000 was prepared by the Environment Officer and the DCDO on 4thon 4th October 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>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health sector procurement plan was submitted to PDU on 1st July 2022 by approved head of department (Dr.Mulwani Erisa) with the following projects to be incorporated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a staff house at Namusita HCIII Ugx 135,000,000 • Construction of a placenta pit at Naboa HCIII atUgx 7,000,000 • Completion of Peadiatric ward at Budaka HCIV at Ugx 160,634,000 • Construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at Lyama HCIII Ugx 20,000,000 <p>The LG justified that failure to submit on time the user department sector procurement plans was due to delay of IPF's from ministry which in turn delays preparation of the plans from the user department to PDU.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Evidence of a PPI form submitted procurement by first quarter of current FY as a confirmation of need from DHO: Dr.Mulwani Erisa on 1st July 2022. Completion of a pediatric ward at Budaka HCIV at Ugx 140,000,000.</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 one infrastructure project under health and approved by contract committee as indicated below;</p> <p>Construction of a staff house at Namusita HCIII was approved by contracts committee on 29th September 2021 ,minute number 11/29/09/2021</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>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The project implementation team was for all health ,water and education department projects with the following members;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eng. Mugweri Charles (District Engineer) as Project Manager • Mpindi Pheryster (District Development Officer) • Nankoma Faiza (District Environment Officer) • Dida Sam (Ass Eng. Officer) as Clerk of works • Kaire Paul as Labour Officer. • Higenyi Paul (District Education Officer). 	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>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The staff house at Namusita HCIII was properly executed following the designs of the engineer with 150mm thick block wall,28 gauge pre-painted corrugated iron sheets,painting works were well applied and the openings at the correct measurements.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>A supervision report prepared on12th January 2022 with all substructure,for excavation of trenches, concrete casting of strip foundation to receive plinth walling,a murrum back fill and hard core filling received by a blinding works complete,superstructure works at the time of site supervision were in progress,with identified challenges of adverse weather conditions which affected the curing process plus delayed submission of tests from the lab for verification by the contractor.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no health Centre upgrade project from HC II to HCIII in the previous FY 2021/2022</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence of site instructions for the health projects as indicated below;</p> <p>A site instruction on 31st April 2022 for a staff house at Namusita HCIII;To adjust the adjust the master bedroom and kitchen to match the health infrastructure drawings for MOH issued to the contractor,To introduce columns at the four corners and avoid separating walls</p> <p>A site instruction on 10th February 2022 by Daka Aramathan the Asst Eng. Officer ;allowing the contractor to proceed with casting column footings using the 1:11/2:3 mix ratio,make concrete cubes during casting of the column footings to enable concrete testing samples.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for payments as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a staff house in Namusita HCIII, A requisition for payment by Eagles sites limited for works done made on 29th March 2022, therein an interim certificate issued on 19th April 2022 of Ugx 22,250,439 certified by CAO, Asst Eng Officer, District Engineer, DCDO, District Health Officer and a voucher payment of Ugx 22,250,439 on 5th May 2022 for voucher number 43206075 2. Construction of a staff house at Namusita HCIII, a requisition for payment by the Eagles sites limited on 26th May 2022 for an amounting to works worth Ugx 42,643,745 an interim certificate issued on 1st June 2022 of Ugx 49,664,718 certified by the Asst Eng Officer, District Engineer, District Health Officer, Environment officer, District Internal Auditor and CAO, there by an voucher payment on 10th June 2022 under voucher number 43840012 of Ugx 37,444,149 and on 20th June 2022 voucher number 442167766 of Ugx 2,979,883 . 	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>Evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for the one health project under sector development grant as indicated below.</p> <p>Construction of a staff house at Namusita HCIII; Procurement reference number Buda 571/wrks/2021-2022/000102</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation report approved by contracts committee dated 16th September 2021 • Works Contract signed on 18th Oct 2021 with Eagles Sites Ltd • Contracts committee minutes 11/29/09/2021 on 11th September 2021 	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 a centralized grievances log opened on 20th /07/2021 at the LG for the FY 2021/22 where grievances could be recorded, investigated and responded under the health sector and by the time of assessment and when reviewing the Log of grievances, it was noted that there was no grievance recorded under the health sector from the project implementation.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had guidelines on health care / medical waste management titled “National Guidelines for WASH in healthcare facilities 2022 ” and there was evidence of guidelines and medical waste segregation charts in sampled health Centres such as; Budaka HC IV, Naboa HC III and Sapir HC III</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health facilities had functional health care waste bins and placenta pits, waste pits and ash pits where ash is disposed after burning from the waste pits.</p> <p>M/s Green Label Services Ltd was contracted by MoH with funding from USAID to manage health care waste at Health Centres IV and III that generate higher volumes of waste and there was evidence of waste collection forms dated 15th/03/2022, 14th/06/2022, 17th/05/2022 and 12th /04/2022</p> <p>Other health units take the waste generated to Health Centre IV and III for collection.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed on training records on medical waste management by the time of the assessment for health centres although the Ag.ADHO - EH said they carried out training during monitoring and mentoring sessions but without evidence of reports.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were ESMPs for health projects for the FY 2021/2022 and were incorporated in contract documents and BoQs seen for the health investments;</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX. 1,500,000 for the Construction of a twin staff house Namusita HC III was incorporated into the contract documents and BoQ under preliminaries item F and E: Cross-cutting issues for example; gender and HIV/AIDS sensitization, grass and tree planting under procurement Ref No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00002 Contractor: M/S Eagle sites Ltd.</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX. 350,000 for the Construction of a pediatric ward at Budaka HC IV was incorporated into the contract documents and BoQ under preliminaries item F and E: Cross-cutting issues for example; gender and HIV/AIDS sensitization, grass and tree planting under procurement Ref No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00001</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of land acquisition for sites where Health projects for the FY 2021/22 were implemented which included;</p> <p>Land title for the construction of a pediatric ward at Budaka HC IV in Budaka Town Council.</p> <p>Freehold volume 1138 FOLIO 7 measuring 4.372 hectares on plot 1-33 Mbale - Iganga Road issued on 28th/03/2012.</p> <p>Land title for the construction of a staff house at Namusita HC III in Kakule Sub-county.</p> <p>Freehold volume 1210 FOLIO 19 measuring 0.266hectares on block 2 plot 630 issued on 2nd/07/2012</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A monitoring report for the construction of the a staff house at Namusita HC III in Kakule Sub-county, with recommendations made in the report such as erection of signage on site, payment of casual workers, stakeholder engagement, plant grass and tress, was prepared by the DCDO and the Environment officer on 3rd /01/2022</p> <p>Monitoring report for the construction of a pediatric ward at Budaka HC IV in Budaka Town Council, with recommendations made in the report such as replanting of trees to replace dried ones, signage on-site, site hoarding and proper hygiene and sanitation prepared by the DCDO and the Environment officer on 4th/01/2022</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Payment certificate for the construction of a pediatric ward at Budaka HC IV under procurement Ref. No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00001 the works were endorsed by the DCDO and the Environment Officer on 15th /06/2022 and payment was made on 20th /06/2022</p> <p>Payment certificate for the construction of a staff house at Namusita HC III under procurement Ref. No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00002</p> <p>Contractor: Eagles Site Ltd. the DCDO and the Environment Officer endorsed works on 28th /02/2022 and payment was made on 16th /03/2022</p>	2

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the ministry MIS FY 2021/2022, the percentage of functional rural water sources was 95%</p>	2
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the ministry MIS FY 2021/2022, Percentage of rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees was 86%.</p>	1

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <p>a. Above 80% score 2</p> <p>b. 60 -80%: 1</p> <p>c. Below 60: 0</p> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>Awaiting LLGs Assessment Results.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>The percentage of the budgeted water projects implemented in S/C with safe water coverage below Budaka DLG average was 71.1% they included:</p> <p>Kachomo at 70.6% received 1BHs, Naboia at 59.7% received 2BH, Kamonkoli S/C at 66.3% received 1BH and 1 Spring to be protected, Kakule S/C at 62% received 1 Spring protection, Lyama S/C at 63% received a Solar Mini Power Water system. Therefore out of the 14 water Point Projects implemented in the FY 2021/2022 ; 7 were Implemented in S/C below the District average</p> <p>Average</p> <p>= $7/14 * 100 = 50\%$.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>Engineers estimate was UGX 157,762,703 for the Bore hole projects Vizavi the awarded contract price according to the procurement files was UGX 134,035,020 Thus $[(157,762,703 - 134,035,020) / 157,762,703] \times 100 = 15\%$ which was within the required range of 20%.</p>	2

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>Projects planned to be constructed in the previous FY 2021/2022 according to the AWP Pg. 2 of 3 included ;</p> <p>1).Drilling and installation of 7BHs in the various S/C, 6 Protected Springs, Solar Mini Power System</p> <p>All were implemented</p> <p>According to the Appendix B of water Contracts attached within Q-4. However the Mini Power system had not yet been finished by the time of assessment thus the percentage of projects completed =$\frac{3}{4} \times 100 = 75\%$</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>There was no percentage increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2020/2021 was 95%</p> <p>Percentage of functional water facilities in the FY 2021/2022 = 95%</p> <p>Percentage change = 0%.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <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>There was no percentage increase in the percentage of functional water facilities between the FY 2020/2021 and 2021/2022.</p> <p>Rural water facilities with functional water & sanitation committee in the FY 2020/2021 was 86%</p> <p>Rural water facilities with functional water and sanitation committee in the FY 2021/2022 was 86%</p> <p>Percentage change =0%</p>	0

4

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

3

The projects/facilities sampled included; Burweta BH DWD 78619 in Burweta parish of Kachomo S/C funded by the DWSCG completed on 01/12/2022
Kakoli II BH DWD 78621 in Bunyekero Parish of Naboia S/C funded by DWSCG completed on 03/12/2021
Zibangabo BH DWD 78623 in Chali Parish of Budaka S/C funded by DWSCG completed on 07/08/2022
Suni Solar mini power piped water system located in Suni B LC1 Suni parish of Lyama S/C

All the Borehole facilities were in place and of good water yield, as reported.

However, the Suni Mini Power project had not been completed and works were still under way. The engineer reported that they got some issues with the contractor that caused delay in project finishing.

Thus the three projects were in place as reported

5

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2

2

The DWO presented Q-1 report that was submitted on 21/08/2021, Information on Functionality was found within the report and here data on Households with functional Latrines, Hand washing facility, District Population and households was found collected., some of the committees were no longer active and needed re training

Similarly Q-2 report was submitted on 06/01/2022 and information on functionality was found, some of the challenges were Lack of transport for extension workers to do extensive monitoring, and community involvement.

Q-3 & Q-4 reports were submitted On 8/04/2022 & 4/07/2022 respectively contained information in regards to training WSCs,

Sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs and safe water coverage.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO updates quarterly the MIS data base.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Awaiting LLGs assessment verification Results.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO had budgeted for UGX 52,494,000 for Civil Engineer (Water) and Borehole maintenance Technician as indicated in the performance contract for FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The other staff Water like Assistant Water Officer for mobilization was seconded by Community Based Services and Assistant Water Officer for sanitation and hygiene was seconded by the Health Department.</p>	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>There was evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer had budgeted for UGX 96,000,000 for Environment Officer and Forestry Officer as indicated in the performance contract for FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The Natural Resource Officer was not budgeted for because the position was not reflected in the customized approved structure dated 20th July, 2017.</p>	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>Evidence showed that the DWO staff were appraised during the FY 2021/2022 for instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gewuma G. William the Borehole maintenance Technician was appraised by Lutaya Robert Civil Engineer (Water) on 29/3/2022. 2. Lutaya Robert, Civil Engineer (Water) was appraised by Eng. Mugweri Charles the District Engineer on 31/8/2022. <p>The rest of the staff like the Assistant Water for mobilization and the Assistant Water Officer for sanitation and hygiene were appraised from their mother departments.</p>	3

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database :
Score 3

There was evidence presented on some of the capacity needs identified during appraisals including; communication skills, financial management, planning, organizing, and coordination.

Based on these, the District Water Office for instance, on 5th August 2021, the water office held a training on hand pump mechanics (communication skills Borehole Maintenance skills, and record-keeping).

Under Min. 4/5/2021, the Borehole Maintenance Technician taught hand pumps mechanics on how to use hand pumps of four types

U1 Pump- wooden

U2 Pump –GI metallic

U3 Stainless Steel

U3 Modified (PVT)

Under the same minute, the Water Officer also taught hand pump mechanics about preventive maintenance, periodic maintenance, and rehabilitation activities carried out to restore facilities to their intended operational status and capacity without significantly expanding them beyond their originally planned or designed function or extent.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO allocated 85.6% of the budget to sub counties below the district average which was 71% in the year 2022/2023

Allocation to S/C below LG included;

Mugiti S/C at 69.7% received 1BH worth 22.54M, Kamonkoli S/C at 63.8% received 1BH worth 22.54M, Kadeluna S/C at 66% received 1BH worth 22.54M. Kadimonkoli S/C at 67.8% received 1BH worth 22.54M, Kakule S/C at 62.2% received 1BH and 2 spring protection worth 8M, Nasanga S/C at 70% received received 1 Spring protection, Tademeli S/C at 63% received piped water system worth 170.83M

Therefore out of the total budget of 348.59M for the new water sources, percentage allocation to sub counties below the district average was $(298.52M/348.59M) * 100 = 85.6\%$

2

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGS their respective allocations for the current FY 2022/2023, and the DWO reported that the advocacy meeting for the various stake holders had not yet been conducted to present and discuss the allocations.

0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

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

There was evidence that the DWO monitored WSS facilities.

The DWO presented monitoring reports for the various water sources on the dates summarized below;

On 26/10/2021 a monitoring report alongside monitoring which was done between July to October was conducted in proposed S/Cs and here issues to do with population in particular villages & the distance between each entire village to the nearest source and mainly the safe water source took precedence.

In Q-2, 28/02/2022 another report was compiled following the monitoring of the construction of a piped water supply system in Lyama S/C.

On 24/05/2022 another report was compiled following the monitoring of a piped water scheme in Lyama S/C and a 4 stance latrine in Irabi RGC

On 28/07/2022 a monitoring section had been on going to check on the general hygiene and sanitation of the targeted water facilities, it was found out that health assistants are poorly facilitated to perform follow up support activities, it was also noted that the non-functionality was attributed to technical breakdown of sources of which 10% of those are due to vandalism, 17 percent are of low water yield and the rest worn out parts.

A list of all water sources in the district was presented to PAT and it was concluded that more that 95% of the sources were being monitored as per the planned schedule.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was no proof that 4 DWSCC meetings were conducted.

Meetings were conducted in the second and third quarter respectively on 17/12/2021 and 18/03/2022, with key issues discussed being to sensitize communities on the use of Chlorine and that there were many dry BHs realized in addition to sanitation facilities being very few in RGCs among many other aspects discussed.

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO publicized the current year allocations on the district notice board.</p>	0
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 DWO allocated UGX 28,686,914 equivalent to 45% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget to mobilization activities out of the total budget of UGX 62,366,414 towards community mobilization activities according to pg. 2 of 3 of the approved AWP</p>	3
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained WSC's on their roles as seen in the following WSC's training reports.</p> <p>A general report on training of the seven (7) water and Sanitation committees held on 26/12/2021 where there was formation of WSC's in Kadama S/C, Kadimonkoli S/C, Budaka S/C, Ikiki S/C, the community was also trained on Promotion of Sanitation, selection and removal of WSC's, transporting water in closed containers, organizing regular meetings, and land agreement acquisition to avoid land conflicts after project establishments among others.</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>The DWO presented an updated Asset register as per 30/06/2022 where all water sources were stipulated by their Location, Nature of the water source point, functionality and other relevant Information.</p> <p>It was noted that the LG had 501 functional BHs, 156 protected springs, 13 tap stands among others sources</p> <p>The latest BH updates as per June 2022 by the ministry were, a BH DWD 78618 located in Kakwangha village of Kadenghe Parish in Iki-Iki S/C funded by DDEG, another Bulweta BH DWD 78619 located in kachomo Parish of Kachomo S/C funded by DWSCG, Kakoli II BH DWD 78621 in Nangeye Parish of Naboia S/C.</p>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the WSS underwent desk review as evidenced by the Project desk appraisal forms compiled, On 8/09/2022, a number of BH projects were desk appraised that's to say, a BH in Bukomolo 1 Village of Kachomo Ward in Kachomo S/C, A BH in Kakule S.S in Kasuleta ward of kakule S/C, a BH in Namwamba village of Bunamwara ward in Mugiti S/C.</p> <p>These were derived from the DDP III into the AWP for the FY 2022/23. On page 85 of the DDP III, the LG planned to construct 100 BHs, 4 water supply scheme, and to maintain about 562 BHs in a span of 5 years.</p> <p>The AWP FY 2022/2023 page 3 of 3 indicated construction of 1 piped water Supply system in Tademeri S/C and the Sitting, drilling and installation of 7 BHs in various S/Cs among which included Migiti, Kadimonkoli, Budaka Sub counties among others, thus all the projects were derived from the LGDP III.</p>	4

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented community application files for the current FY with current application forms for projects under implementation</p> <p>Some of the application files found in the file included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request of a BH source on 28/06/2020 in Sekulo B village, Sekulo Parish in Kadimukoli S/C signed by Talyampindi Herman the LC1 Chairman. • Request of a BH on 18/08/2020 in Naboa LC1, Naboa Parish in Naboa S/C by Kamba Richard the LC1 chairman. • Request of a BH source on 13/02/2021 in Gadumire P/S in Gadumire parish of Budaka S/C signed by Katula William the School Head Teacher. 	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that field based appraisals were conducted to check on the technical, Environmental aspects and designs as evidenced by field appraisal reports on water. On 18/08/2022, field based surveys were done and a number of BHs appraised as evidenced by the field appraisal forms compiled on the aboved named date where BHs like Nyanzi 1 BH in Kamonkoli South Parish of Kamonkoli T/C, Kakule S.S BH in Kafuleta Parish of Kakule S/C, Bukatikoko BH in Nachwa Parish of Kadimonkoli S/C and all these were appraised by a joint team that included Lutaaya Robert the DWO, Nankoma Faiza, the EO and Charles Donfi the Planner evidenced by their signatures on the report forms.</p>	2

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2

There were filled environment, social and climate change screening forms for all the water projects.

There were costed ESMPs for all the water projects in the previous FY 2021/2022, examples included;

The Screening for the drilling and installation of 7 deep well boreholes in the sub-counties of Naboa, Kamokoli, Kachomo and Iki-Iki and Kamokoli under procurement Ref No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00003 Contractor: M/S KLR Uganda Ltd prepared by the Environment officer and the DCDO and costed ESMP of 1,750,000 was incorporated into the BoQ under item 4: Environmental mitigation, safety and social safeguards

The Screening for the construction and protection of 7 spring wells in the sub-counties of Mabwali spring in Budaka S/C, Kopia spring in Kakule S/C, Sudi spring in Kabuna S/C, Nasenye spring in Kameruka S/C, Bukoli spring in Kamokoli S/C and Kiruruma spring in Iki-Iki S/C under procurement Ref No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00008.

Contractor: M/S Al-Des Discount construction and instant planner Ltd prepared by the Environment officer and the DCDO prepared a costed ESMP of 60,000 for each spring well incorporated into the BoQ under item 9: Environmental mitigation, safety and social safeguards

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan approved by CAO ; Ely Piwang dated 15th June 2022

- Construction of 4 stances of flood resilient pit latrine at Irabi RGC at Ugx 28,000,000 on page 4.

- Drilling, casting and installation of 7 boreholes in Ugx 143,766,000 on page 4

- Construction of piped water supply at Lyama Sub county Ugx 274,000,000 page 4

- Protection of 7 springs and 2 springs at Budaka sub county Ugx 36,000,000 on page 4

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitations infrastructure for the previous FY 2021/2022 were approved by the contacts committee before commencement as indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 4 stances of flood resilient pit latrine at Irabi RGC; minute number 11/24/01/2022 on 24th January 2022 • Construction of piped water supply minute number 10/29/09/2021 on 29th September 2021 • Drilling of 7 boreholes <p>Under minute number 15/20/09/2021 dated 29th September 2021.</p> <p>Protection of 7 springs at the district was approved by the contract committee on 24th January 2022 minute 10/29/09/2021.</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>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The project implementation team was for all health ,water and education department projects with the following members;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eng. Mugweri Charles (District Engineer) as Project Manager • Mpindi Pheryster (District Development Officer) • Nankoma Faiza (District Environment Officer) • Dida Sam (Ass Eng. Officer) as Clerk of works • Kaire Paul as Labour Officer. <p>Higenyi Paul the District Education Officer was appointed as contract manager</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2

Three projects and contracts were visited and were as follows;

Burweta BH DWD 78619 in Burweta parish of Kachomo S/C funded by the DWSCG

Kakoli II BH DWD 78621 in Bunyekero Parish of Naboia S/C funded by DWSCG

Zibangabo BH DWD 78623 in Chali Parish of Budaka S/C funded by DWSCG

The boreholes had good water yield, borehole recharge catchment area was well fenced, well operating hand pump and properly constructed apron 150mm by 150mm as prescribed by the design with a neat cement screed at the base.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- A supervision report on the 4stances constructed at Irabi RGC dated 24th May 2022, the was attached with photography indicating different activities of a walling that was built out of burnt clay bricks bedded in a cement mortar mix of 1:4 and a 24x3mm hoop iron after very 3 -4 courses of brick work, roofing with 28 gauged pre-painted iron sheets(50x100)purlins,(50x100)mm wall plate with (50x150)mm rafters to reicieve the iron sheets .

- A supervision report for protection of the 7 springs at the district dated 14th June 2022, 6 springs were completely constructed according to the report on file that is Kopia, Nabwali, Bunyolo,Nasenye, Kiruluma,Buleffe except Bubulanga,challenges stated on this report were the water officer not sitting on the evaluation committee for water projects as prepared by Lutaya Robert the project manager for water projects.

- A supervision report for the 7 boreholes on 13th December 2021,6 boreholes were completed and functional that is ;Kakwangha,Burweta,Kilalaka,Kakoli,Nabiketo and Nakatende,The last borehole in Kadimukoli sub county was not installed with reason of no potential water source finding ,later it was relocated to Sekulo B.

However, there was no site meeting minutes provided as proof of evidence for joint supervision by the relevant technical officer for the projects.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2

o If not score 0

Evidence of payments for verified work by the DWO for the sampled projects ;

- Construction of a piped water supply at Lyama sub county; A requisition for payment from Karf Aqua Engineering Solutions Limited for works done on 15th June 2022, ,a payment certificate issued on 16th June 2022 of Ugx 73,771,812 certified by the District water officer, District Engineer, Environment officer, DCDO, CAO , District Internal Auditor and CAO effecting a voucher on 29th June 2022 of Ugx 69,345,305 with voucher number 4458029.

- Drilling, casting and installation of 6 boreholes; A requisition for payment was made from KLR (UG) LTD on 9th December 2021, and an interim certificate issued on 13th December 2021 of Ugx 103,398,44 certified by the water officer, District engineer, DCDO, Environment officer, District Internal Auditor and CAO effecting a voucher on 10th February 2022 for voucher number 41576220..

- Drilling, casting and installation of 1 borehole; A requisition for payment was made from KLR (UG) LTD on 29th March 2022, and an interim certificate issued on 24th April 2022 of Ugx 17,053,074 certified by the water officer, District engineer, DCDO, Environment officer, District Internal Auditor and CAO effecting a voucher on 8th June 202 for voucher number 43820722..

- Protection of 7 springs at the district; requisition for payment of works done form Al.Dos discount construction instant planner on 16th May 2022, and an interim certificate issued on 14th June 2022 of Ugx 12,690,000 certified by water officer, District engineer, Environment officer, DCDO, District Internal Auditor, CAO and effecting payment for voucher number 44580319 on 29th June 2022.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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:

Score 2, If not score 0

The LG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;

- Protection of 7 springs at the district ,Procurement ref no.BUDA571/WRKS/2021/2022/00008 was approved under contract committee minute number 10/24/01/2022 on 24th January 2022; Evaluation report approved by the contracts committee on 14th January 2022, Works contract signed on 18th February 2022

- Drilling, casting and installation of 7 boreholes, Procurement ref no.BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00003 approved under contract committee minute number 15/29/09/2021 on 29th September 2021, Evaluation report approved by the contracts committee on 15th September 2021, and a works contract signed on 27th October 2021..

- Construction of a piped water supply system at Lyama Sub County, Procurement ref no.BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00004 approved under contract committee minute number 10/29/09/2021 on 29th September 2021, Evaluation report approved by the contracts committee on 15th September 2021, and a works contract signed on 27th October 2021.

- Construction of 4 stances of flood resilient pit latrine at Irabi RGC, Procurement ref no.BUDA571/WRKS/2021-2022/00013 approved under contract committee minute number 11/24/01/2021 on 24th January 2021, Evaluation report approved by the contracts committee on 14th January 2021, and a works contract signed on 18th February 2022.

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>The LG had a grievance redress committee and grievance log where grievances were recorded for further investigation and response. The LG had recorded grievances from the water sector project for the FY2021/22 under review for example;</p> <p>M.r Daudi Gawona from Suni village in Lyama Town Council on 20th/01/2022 reported to the DWO about non compensation for his land where the solar powered mini piped water system project was set up, in response to the complaint, there was a meeting held on 13th/06/2022 the GRC members were in attendance, DWO, DE Lyama Town Clerk and other political leadership of Lyama town council and Mr. Daudi Gawona (aggrieved) was also in attendance and the complaint resolved where they agreed to construct for Mr. Daudi a yard tap and also employ him as a security guard for the pumping site.</p>	3
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed for the dissemination of guidelines by the DWO and the environment officer to the CDOs by the time of assessment although the LG had a guideline Titled "Rural water supply and sanitation - community management handbook for extension workers - volume-1"</p>	0

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

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 were evidences of filled E&S screening forms for all the water projects implemented in the previous FY as per the example below;

The Screening for the drilling and installation of 7 deep well boreholes in the sub-counties of Naboa, Kamokoli, Kachomo and Iki-Iki and Kamokoli under procurement Ref No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00003 Contractor: M/S KLR Uganda Ltd prepared by the Environment officer and the DCDO and costed ESMP of 1,750,000 was incorporated into the BoQ under item 4: Environmental mitigation, safety and social safeguards

The Screening for the construction and protection of 7 spring wells in the sub-counties of Mabwali spring in Budaka S/C, Kopia spring in Kakule S/C, Sudi spring in Kabuna S/C, Nasenye spring in Kameruka S/C, Bukoli spring in Kamokoli S/C and Kiruruma spring in Iki-Iki S/C under procurement Ref No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00008.

Contractor: M/S Al-Des Discount construction and instant planner Ltd prepared by the Environment officer and the DCDO prepared a costed ESMP of 60,000 for each spring well incorporated into the BoQ under item 9: Environmental mitigation, safety and social safeguards.

Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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 LG had evidence of all the MoUs where the water sources were implemented as per the examples below;

a Land agreement between Mr. Daudi Gawona and Budaka DLG dated 20/01/2022 where Mr. Daudi Gawona from Suni village Lyama Town council agreed to offer land measuring 20mX30m for the drilling of the solar-powered mini piped water system pumping point witnessed by Daliya Samali (Wife to Daudi), Lyama town clerk Mr. Muwandika Jamada and the LC-1 chairperson of suni village Mr. Gwalkiri Andrew on 20/01/2022

There was a land agreement between Nicholas Nabungangna of Kakwanga village in Iki-Iki sub-county and Budaka DLG dated 30th /11/2021 where he accepted to offer land measuring approximately 6mX6m for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Kakwanga village in order to extend clean water nearer to the community of Kakwanga village in Iki-Iki sub-county the district was represented by Nafuna Irene - the senior Lands Management officer and was witnessed by the area LC-1 chairperson Mugole Yobu on 30th /11/2021.

There was a land agreement between Natudde Yolonimu of Nakatende village in Naboa sub-county and Budaka DLG dated 5th /12/2021 where he accepted to offer land measuring approximately 4mX6m for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Nakatende village in order to extend clean water nearer to the community of Nakatende village in Naboa sub-county the district was represented by Nafuna Irene - the senior Lands Management officer and was witnessed by the area LC-1 chairperson Kirunde Yoakimu on 5th /12/2021

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	<p>There were pieces of evidence of signed E&S compliance certification forms. Examples include;</p> <p>The interim payment certification for the drilling and installation of 7 deep well boreholes, under procurement Ref No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00003, Contractor: M/S KLR Uganda Ltd payment was endorsed by the Environment officer and the DCDO on 30th/05/2022 and payment was made on 8th /06/2022.</p> <p>The interim payment certification for the construction of 7 protected spring wells, under procurement Ref No. BUDA571/WRKS/21-22/00000, Contractor: M/SM/S AI-Des Discount construction and instant planner Ltd works endorsed by the Environment officer and the DCDO on 17/06/2022 and payment was made on 22nd /06/2022.</p>	2
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	<p>There was evidence of the monitoring reports availed for all the water projects;</p> <p>Monitoring reports for the drilling and installation of 7 deep well boreholes in the sub-counties of Naboa, Kamokoli, Kachomo, Iki-Iki with recommendations made such as fencing of the water source, formation of the WUC and planting of shade trees was prepared by the DCDO and the Environment Officer on 20th /12/2021 and 10/01/2022.</p> <p>Monitoring reports for the construction and protection of 7 spring wells in the sub-counties of Mabwali spring in Budaka S/C, Kopia spring in Kakule S/C, Sudi spring in Kabuna S/C, Nasenye spring in Kameruka S/C, Bukoli spring in Kamokoli S/C and Kiruruma spring in Iki-Iki S/C with recommendations made such the formation of the water user committee and create larger soak pits to drain away wastewater, was prepared by the DCDO and the Environment Officer on 13th /01/2022 and 6th /02/2022.</p>	2

**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>Bukada DLG had just begun implementing the MSI programme this FY and there was no evidence of data on irrigated land for the last two FYs.</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>There was no evidence of data on increase acreage of irrigated land for the last two FYs 2021/2022 & 2020/2021.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of the development component of the MSI grant used on eligible activities since the district did not receive funding last FY.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of approved farmer signed acceptance form last FY because the district was not yet rolled for MSI equipments.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p>	<p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of supplier contract/price and SAE quotation to compare suppliers quote. Supply of MSI equipment wasn't taken place in the LG to assess and determine the ±20 variation between supplier price and SAE estimate.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p>	<p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p>	<p>There was no evidence of MSI supplier contracts and completion certificate on MSI installation for last FY. The district had just started the MSI programme this FY 2022/23.</p>	0
Maximum score 6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p>	<p>The assessment team obtained from the LG and reviewed staff structures and staff lists.</p>	0
Maximum score 6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	<p>According to the report dated 30/6/2022 pages 1-3. The district had recruited 21 representing 39.6% of LLGs extension workers out of 53 LLGS needed in the district and the detail were shown below.</p>	
			<p>From the LG staff structure and staff list it was found out that</p>	
			<p>i. 13 Assistant Agricultural</p>	

officers were approved for recruitment but only 3 extension workers were recruited leaving 10 positions vacant.

ii. Also, the district needs 13 Agric Animal Husbandry Officers-(AAHO) where 9 positions were filled and 4 vacant.

iii. likewise, for Veterinary Officers (VO) 13 extension workers were approved for recruitment but only one had been recruited and 12 positions were still vacant.

iv. Besides, 13 Agricultural Officers (AO) were approved for recruitment unfortunately eight (8) were recruited and 5 positions were still vacant at the time of assessment.

v. while a Senior Agricultural Engineer and Asst Entomologist was planned and all the positions were established to be vacant at the time of assessment.

The percentage of extension workers was calculated as $(21/53) \times 100 = 39.6\%$.

4

Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF

- If 100% score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence of inventory of installed MSI equipment for the last FY 2021/22

0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence of inventory of installed MSI equipment for the last FY 2021/2022.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The assessment team sampled three LLGS of Budaka, Nansanga Sub-counties, Budaka and Lyama TCs and visited on 5/12/2022. It was established that the information on positions extension workers filled was accurate. For instance:	2
	Maximum score 4			

The current FY 2022/2023 staff list indicated that Kwetega Irene had filled the position of (AO) in Budaka Sub-county and was in place as per the staff attendance register verified and was also assigned similar duties in Nansanga Sub County..

Babula Clement had filled the position of (AAHO) in Lyama TC and was in place as per verified attendance register

While Higenyi Siraji filled the position of AAHO in Budaka TC and was confirmed through verification of staff attendance register

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	No evidence was availed at the time of assessment on installed MSI equipment to sample 3 and observe the functionality and accuracy of the information.	0
	Maximum score 4			

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence of quarterly information collected on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment during supervision and monitoring of MSI equipment</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of LLG information entered into the MIS in the district.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of quarterly reports availed to the assessment team for verification.</p>	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	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	The LG had evidence of approved performance plan on land conservation in irrigated land, database management and MIS application as per the report dated 23/4/2022 p1-2. The PIP target the LLGs of Nansanga, Budaka and Lyama.	1
	Maximum score 6			

There was evidence that PIP was implemented by MAAIF on 30/5/2022 (online training) attended by Kwetega Irene (AO), Higenyi Siraji (AAHO), Babula Clement (AAHO), Waigambi Mesusera (AO). And Botiri Abner (DAO) as per the PIP report dated 4/6/2022 p1-16 and certificate of attendance for extensions worker dated 2/6/2022.

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that PIP was implemented by MAAIF on 30/5/2022 (online training) attended by Kwetega Irene (AO), Higenyi Siraji (AAHO), Babula Clement (AAHO), Waigambi Mesusera (AO) and Botiri Abner (DAO) as per the PIP report dated 4/6/2022 p1-16 and certificate of attendance for extensions worker dated 2/6/2022.	1
	Maximum score 6			

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	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The LG had evidence of UGX 662,400,000 allocated for 21 extension workers in 2022/2023 FY as per the approved performance plan dated 15/8/2022 page 24, under district vote 811.	1
	Maximum score 6			

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

Three LLGs of Budaka and Nansanga Sub-counties, Budaka and Lyama TCs were sampled and visited on 5/12/2022. The attendance books were reviewed and it was established that the extension workers were deployed and working as follows:

Kwetega Irene (AO), a staff of Budaka Sub county as well as working in Nansanga Sub-county,

Babula Clement (AAHO) a staff of Lyama TC and also working in Nansanga sub-county.

And Higenyi Siraji (AAHO), a staff of Budaka TC but also assigned to work in Budaka Sub-County

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

Three LLGS of Budaka and Nansanga Sub-counties, Budaka and Lyama TCs were sampled and visited on 5/12/2022. The attendance books were reviewed and it was established that the extension workers were deployed and working at their respective deployed stations. For instance;

Kwetega Irene (AO), a staff of Budaka Sub-county as well as working in Nansanga Sub-county, Babula Clement (AAHO) a staff of Lyama TC and also working in Nansanga sub-county and Higenyi Siraji (AAHO), a staff of Budaka TC but also assigned to work in Budaka Sub-County.

2

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

According to a field visit on 5/12/2022 to three sampled LLGS of Budaka and Nansanga Sub-counties, Budaka and Lyama TCs. It was established the SAS publicized list of extension workers on LLGs noticeboards in accordance to CAO's circular on deployment dated 30/6/2022. For examples:

The name of Kwetega Irene (AO) was published on the noticeboard of Budaka Sub county and Nansanga Sub-counties.

The name of Babula Clement (AAHO) was published on the noticeboard of Lyama TC and Nansanga sub-counties based on field visit.

The name of Higenyi Siraji (AAHO), was published on the noticeboard of Budaka TC as well as working in Budaka Sub-County.

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

There was evidence that DPO appraised extension workers based on ten (10) sampled personal files and appraisal reports reviewed on 6/12/2022. The sampled files and appraised reports reviewed indicated that:

i. Waiswa Herbert (AO) of Kachomo TC and Kachomo Sub-county was appraised by SACAO (Namulondo Rose) on 1/7/2022.

ii. Mugale Joy (AAO) of Kadimukodi and Kakoli sub-county was appraised by SACAO (Nassuna Joy Edith) on 30/6/2022.

iii. Lwiisi Kafere (AO) of Budaka sub-county and Tademeru sub-county was appraised by SAS Sharifa on 29/6/2022.

iv. Muyinda Difasi (AAHO) of Iki-Iki sub-county was appraised by Katoko Constance on 30/6/2022.

v. Kedi Emmanuel (AAHO) of Kakoli sub-county was appraised by Nassuna Joy Edith on 30/6/2022.

vi. Pioto Stephen (AAHO) of Kabuna sub-county was appraised by MugoyaAnnah on 30/6/2022.

vii. Kwetega Irene (AO) of Nansanga sub-county was appraised by DakaThompson on 30/6/2022.

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	There was no evidence of corrective taken to LLGs extension workers based on agreed performance plan.	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	Not applicable because the MSI programme had just started this FY 2022/23.	0
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	Not applicable because the MSI programme had just started this FY 2022/23	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	There was no evidence of performance contracts in the LG on MSI grant allocation between capital development and complementary services in 2021/2022 FY. The programme of MSI had just been rolled out in the district recently.	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>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>The LG had allocated UGX 275,170,131 for MSI programme this FY towards establishment of demonstration of farmers field schools</p> <p>The performance contracts, showed the LG allocated 30% (UGX 82,551,031.3) for MSI equipment development and installation,</p> <p>40% (UGX 110,068,852.4) catered for awareness of farmers,</p> <p>15% (UGX 41,275,519.6) for the awareness of district staff and political leaders, and farm visits allocation of 15% (UGX 41,275,519.6) according to MAAIF guidelines dated 28/4/2022 page 6 on establishment of demonstration.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had just started the MSI programme and there was no evidence of co-funding reflected in the budget performance contract.</p> <p>There was no co-funding needed for the MSI demonstration, as per MAAIF guidelines dated 28/4/2022 p6.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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>The LG had just rolled out the MSI programme in the district and there was no evidence of budget performance report for the last FY 2021/22.</p>	0
<p>Maximum score 10</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.</p>	0
<p>Maximum score 10</p>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p>	<p>Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.</p>	0
<p>Maximum score 8</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 		
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.</p>	0
<p>Maximum score 8</p>				

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme to establish 4 MSI equipment for demonstration as per approved procurement plan dated 28/8/2022, page 2.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.	0

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	Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.	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	Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.	0
	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	Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district	0
	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	Not applicable because the LG had just rolled out the programme in the district.	0
	Maximum score 8			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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.	The LG had approved procurement plan dated 28/8/2022 page 2 towards establishment of 4 MSI equipment development and installation this Current FY. The LG had allocated 30% (UGX 82,551,031.3 for the establishment of the 4 demonstrations of MSI equipment this FY2022/2023.	1
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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 of pre-qualified suppliers that the LG requested for quotation.	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	The LG had just rolled out the programme in the district and there was no evidence of minutes of the contracts committee at the time of assessment	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	The LG had just rolled out the programme in the district and there was no evidence of minutes of the contracts committee for the approval of MSI supply at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum score 18			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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 of selected bidders to sample three and compare prices with other bidders prices in the LG regarding the supply of MSI equipment.	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was no evidence of installed MSI equipment to sample and ascertain if they were in line with the design output sheet generated by irritrack App.	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was no evidence of supervision reports and installed MSI equipment installed in the district to sample three sites to verify if the district conducted technical supervision during the FY.	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was no evidence of supervision reports and MSI installed to sample three sites to verify if the LG had signed sites books and overseen the testing the functionality of installed MSI equipment.	0
	Maximum score 18			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	The LG had no evidence of supervision reports pertaining hand over of equipment to approved farmers.	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence of payment requests for supply contract of MSI equipment during the last FY.	0
	Maximum score 18			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence of procurement for MSI projects last FY to check whether it had complete procurement files for each contract and with all records required by PPDA. The district had just started to implement MSI project.	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	The LG had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms at the production department notice board had grievance redress mechanisms titled "Grievances referral path for Budaka district" approved by the CAO on 3rd /04/2022 and contained the telephone number of the Focal person	2
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	The LG had grievance log for recording grievances at the time of assessment but the LG did not implement projects under MSI	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence available for any grievance investigated at the LG by the time of assessment since the LG did not have any projects executed in the FY 2021/22 under review due to no funding	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of response to the aggrieved parties at the LG available at the time of assessment because there was no project executed in the FY 2021/22 under review due to no funding	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There were no grievances reported in line with LG grievance redress framework because there were no projects implemented in the FY under review due to no funding.	0

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	There was no dissemination of guidelines to farmers No MoUs signed between farmers and the LG No farm visits because there were no projects executed in the FY 2021/22 under review	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	There were no ESMPs to be incorporated into the BoQs for the irrigation projects because there were no MSI projects in FY 2021/22 under review	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	There were no projects to be monitored in the FY 2021/22 under review since the LG had not been rolled out for MSI projects.	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	The LG had no evidence of E&S Certification issued since the LG had not been rolled out for MSI projects.	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	The LG had no evidence of E&S Certification issued since the LG had not been rolled out for MSI projects.	0

**Micro-scale Irrigation
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The position of Senior Agriculture Engineer was vacant at the time of assessment.</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not have projects under micro-scale irrigation in the previous FY 2021/22 by the time of assessment and therefore there was no E&S screening carried out because the LG did not receive funding for the micro-scale irrigation projects</p> <p>The LG did not have any project to be screened under the micro-scale irrigation for the previous FY 2021/2022 under review</p>	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. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The post of Civil Engineer (Water) was substantively filled by Mr.Lutaaya Robert who was appointed on 12th December 2019 as was directed by DSC Min. No.34/DSC/BDK/2019 of 5th February 2019.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant Water officer for mobilization was filled on secondment. Kalere Moses was assigned duties of Assistant Water officer for mobilization on 10th July 2018 by the CAO Mr. Batambuze Abdu. Kalere Moses was substantively appointed Community Development Officer on 18th December 2018 under DSC Min.No. 17/DSC/BDK/2018.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Borehole Maintenance Technician was substantively filled by Mr. Gewuma. G. William who was appointed on 20th March 2008 as was directed by Min.No. 64/2008 of 7th March 2008.	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.	The position of Natural Resources Officer was not provided for on the District approved staff establishment structure dated 20th July, 2017.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Environment Officer was substantively filled by Nankoma Faiza who was appointed on 27th February 2018 as was directed by Min.No. 162/02/2018 of 23rd February 2018.	10

1

10

New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.

The position of Forestry Officer was substantively filled by Okki Patrick Wilber who was appointed on 17th July 2009 as was directed by DSC Min. No.105/2009 of 8th July 2009.

Maximum score is 70

Environment and Social Requirements

2

10

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.

The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for water projects for the previous FY 2021/2022, Examples include;

Screening for the construction of a solar-powered mini piped water system at Suni village in Lyama Town Council was executed as per the report dated 20th/09/2021. The impacts addressed for example vegetation clearance, soil contamination, soil erosion from loose overburden and habitat disruption and mitigation measures were; limit vegetation clearance, planting trees and paspalum grass and site levelling. The screening form was prepared by the DCDO and the Environment Officer and attached a costed ESMP of 4,550,000 which was prepared on 8th/10/2021.

The Screening for the drilling and installation of a deep well borehole at Burweta village in Kachomo sub-county was executed as per the report dated 27th /09/2021. The impacts and mitigation measures were addressed for example generation of waste water, vegetation clearance, land dispute, digging a larger soak pit to trap waste water. The screening form was prepared by Environment officer and the DCDO.

The screening for the drilling and installation of deep borehole at Nabiketo village in Budaka sub county was carried out on 22nd /09/2021. The impacts and mitigation measures were identified and addressed for example vegetation loss, soil erosion from loose overburden soils, wastewater, land wrangle, digging a larger soak pit to trap waste water, community

sensitization. The screening form prepared and signed by Environment officer and the DCDO.

The Screening for the construction of a spring well at Kiruluma village in Iki-Iki sub county was carried out on 8th /10/2021. The impacts and mitigation measures were identified and addressed for example flora and fauna disruption due vegetation clearance, waste water, change in the water course, construction debris. The screening form prepared and signed by Environment officer and the DCDO.

The Screening for the drilling and installation of a deep borehole at Kiralaka village in Kamokoli sub county was carried out on 6th /10/2021. The impacts and mitigation measures were identified and addressed for example flora and fauna disruption due vegetation clearance and drilling digging a larger soak pit to trap waste water. The screening form prepared and signed by the Environment officer and the DCDO.

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.

The water projects in the LG did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) in reference to the National environment Act 2019 schedule 4, part 2 section (3a) which were categorized as small projects that required screening and had minimal impacts. The Implementation of mitigation measures was proposed in the ESMPs.

10

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.

There were evidence of a drilling permits since the projects required the contractor to have them as per the example below;

A drilling permit of number KAM 04/DP-00662/2021/RR was issued to M/S KLR Uganda Ltd on 17th May, 2021 by the Director of Water development Eng. Joseph Oriono Eyatu valid for one year

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of District Health Officer was substantively filled by Mulwani Erisa Meywa appointed on 27th February, 2018 as was directed by DSC Min.No.163/02/2018 (i)&(ii)of 23rd February,2018.	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	The position of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal Child Health and Nursing was substantively filled by Wanyenze Hellen appointed on 17th April, 2019 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 84/DSC/BDK/2019 of 5th April, 2019.	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	Nantongo Alice Jemimah was the Ag. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health substantively appointed Senior Environmental Officer on 23rd March, 2020 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 138/DSC/BDK/2020 of 27th February,2020, 2020. She was assigned duties of Ag. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health as per CAO's letter dated 5/5/2021.	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>The position of Senior Environmental Health Officer was substantively filled by Nantongo Alice Jemimah appointed on 23rd March, 2020 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 138/DSC/BDK/2020 of 27th February,2020.</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>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Senior Health Educator was substantively filled by Namugwere Victoria appointed on 22nd December, 2016 as was directed by DSC Min.No.108.22/12/2016 of 6th December, 2016.</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>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The position of Biostatistician was substantively filled by Agwaro Kizito appointed on 18th January, 2016 as was directed by Min. No. 303.2/12/2015 of 16th December, 2015.</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>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of District Cold Chain Technician was substantively filled by Manyonyi Allan appointed on 16th December, 2016 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 12.4/08/2017 of 31st August, 2017.</p>	10

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

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

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

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

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

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

Environment and Social Requirements

2

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

There was evidence that showed LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all health projects implemented during the previous FY and they were only 2 as shown below;

The Screening for the construction of the a twin staff house block at Namusita HC III in Kakule sub-county it was carried out as per the report dated 17th/08/2021. The impacts identified were; soil erosion because of the step nature of the site, debris generation at the site, vegetation loss and waste generation, and mitigation measures designed such as backfilling, proper waste management, limit vegetation clearance to the site and landscaping on site made in the costed ESMP of UGX. 1,500,000 was prepared by the Environment Officer and the DCDO on 4th October 2021.

The Screening for the Construction of pediatric ward at Budaka HC IV in Budaka Town Council was carried out as per the report dated 25th August 2021. The impacts were identified like vegetation loss, soil erosion and surface runoff, construction debris, loose overburden on site and mitigation measures such as limit vegetation clearance, site re-grassing and trees planting and backfilling made in the costed ESMP of UGX. 200,000 was prepared by the Environment Officer and the DCDO on 4th October 2021.

2

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

Maximum score is 30

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

There was no requirement for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA's) for the health projects, this was in reference to the National environment Act 2019 schedule 4, part 2 section (4) subsection (e) which categorized them as small projects that required screening and had minimal impacts.

15

Education Minimum
Conditions

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	Mr. Higenyi Paul was substantively appointed as DEO on 23rd March, 2020 as was directed by DSC minute No.141/DSC/BDK/2020 of 27th February, 2020.	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.	The DLG provided for 3 positions of inspectors of schools. However, at the time of assessment, The Education inspectorate of Budaka was substantively staffed with only one inspector by names of KataikePanula Esther the Inspector of Schools who was appointed on 1st July, 2020 as was directed by the DSC Minute No. 171/DSC/BDK/2020 of 22nd June, 2020.	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.	The LG had carried out Environmental, Social and climate change Screening forms for all Education projects for the previous FY as per the examples below; The screening for the construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Nabiketo Primary school in Budaka sub-county was carried out as per the report dated 27th /08/ 2021. The impacts identified such as vegetation clearance leading to habitat disruption, loose overburden soils leading to erosion and mitigation measures identified such as proper waste management at the site, backfilling, planting of grass and trees and site levelling and attached a costed ESMP of UGX 100,000 which was prepared by DCDO and the Environment officer on 6th /10/ 2021 The screening form for the construction of a twin staff house block at Budaka Primary school in Budaka Town Council was carried out as per the report dated 24th /08/ 2021. The impacts identified such as vegetation	15
	The Maximum score is 30			

clearance leading to habitat disruption, loose overburden soils leading to erosion and mitigation measures identified such as proper waste management at the site, backfilling, planting of grass and trees and site levelling and attached a costed ESMP of UGX 200,000 which was prepared by DCDO and the Environment officer on 6th /10/ 2021

The Screening for the construction of 1 block of 5-stance of drainable latrine at Bugolya primary school in Iki-Iki Sub-county was carried out as per the report dated 1st /09/ 2021. The impacts identified were; vegetation loss, loose overburden soils leading to soil erosion and surface runoff and mitigation measures suggested included limited clearance vegetation and backfilling and site levelling made in a costed ESMP of UGX.150,000 was prepared and was signed by the Environment officer and the DCDO on 6th /10/ 2021

The Screening for the construction of 1 block of 5-stance of drainable latrine at Katira Bugolya primary school in Katira Sub-county was carried out as per the report dated 3rd /09/ 2021. The impacts identified were; vegetation loss, loose overburden soils leading to soil erosion and surface runoff and mitigation measures suggested included limited clearance vegetation and backfilling and site levelling made in a costed ESMP of UGX.200,000 and was prepared and was signed by the Environment officer and the DCDO on 6th /10/ 2021.

2

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

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

All the Education projects in the LG did not require ESIAs, this was in reference to the National Environment Act 2019 schedule 4, part 2 section (4) sub-section (d) in which, small projects that required screening and had minimal impacts.

The anticipated impacts and Mitigation measures for the education projects were identified in the screening process and proposed in the ESMPs.

15

The Maximum score is 30

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Chief Finance Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Magoola Balamu who was appointed on 23rd January 2018 as was directed by DSC under Min. No. 86.2/01/2018 of 22nd January 2018.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Planner was substantively filled by Mr. Kabise Shaban who was appointed on 23rd January 2018 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 86.1/01/2018 of 22nd January 2018.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Engineer was substantively filled by Mugweri Charles who was appointed on 27th February 2018 as was directed by Min.No.163/02/2018 of 23rd February 2018.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Kijali Kamwada Cyprian was the Ag.District Natural Resources Officer substantively who was appointed Senior Environmental Officer on 20th February 2018 as was directed by District Service Commission Min.No. 118/02/2018 of 19th February 2018. He was assigned duties of District Natural Resources Officer as per CAO's letter dated 25th April 2018.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Production Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Dambya Ambrose who was appointed on 12th February 2019 as was directed by DSC Min.No.35/DSC/BDK/2019 of 5th February 2019.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Mpindi Pheryster who was appointed on 14th May 2018 as was directed by District Service Commission Min.No.184.2/ 05/2018 of 8th May 2018.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Mulekwa Andrew Martin who was appointed on 12th February 2019 as was directed by Min.No. 34/DSC/BDK/2019 of 5th February 2019.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The post of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Kutta Noah who was appointed on 28th November 2007 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 70/2007 of 16th November 2007.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The position of Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Kuchana Sam who was appointed on 27th February 2018 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 161/02/2018 of 23rd February 2018.	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The position of Principal Human Resource Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Mwirugazu Paul who was appointed on 23rd January 2018 as was directed by Min 86.0/01/2018 of 22nd January 2018.	2
	District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.			
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Kijali Kamwanda Cyprian who was appointed on 20th February 2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No.118/02/2018 of 19th February 2018.	2
	District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.			
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The post of Senior Land Management Officer was substantively filled by Ms. Nafuna Irene who was appointed on 23rd January 2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 86.3/01/2018 of 22nd January 2018.	2
	District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.			
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The position of Senior Accountant was substantively filled by Namwase Praxedes who was appointed on 13thFebruary, 2018 under Min.No. 93.2/02/2018 of 8th February, 2018.	2
	District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.			
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The Position of Principal Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Mr.Mbago Charles who was appointed on 13th February 2018 under Min.No. 93.1/02/2018 of 8th February 2018.	2
	District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.			

1

0

New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.

n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0

The position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was not substantively filled.

Mr. Kwajja M. Moses was the Ag. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) substantively appointed Senior Human Resource Officer on 10th May 2022 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 59.6/5/2022 of 6th May 2022.

He was assigned duties of Ag. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) as per CAO's letter dated 14/6/2022.

2

5

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

Maximum score is 15

a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).

The total LLGS were 20 in number including 14 S/Cs and 6 TC.

Evidence showed that all the 20 LLGs had positions of Senior Assistant Secretaries and Town Clerks substantively filled as per the following details;

1. Tegule Gustine, the SAS of Nansanga Sub County was appointed on 14/4/2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 43/03/2022(ii) of 18th March 2022.

2. Daka Thampson, the SAS of Katira Sub County was appointed on 15/6/2022 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 154/DSC/BDK/2020 of 15th May 2022.

3. Nassuna Joy Edith the SAS of Kakoli Sub County was appointed on 14/5/2019 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 100/DSC/BDK/2019 of 10th May 2019.

4. Kalebo Jonathan, the SAS of Kaderuna Sub County was appointed on 14/5/2019 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 100/DSC/BDK/2019 of 10th May 2019.

5. Naula Minati, the SAS of Mugiti Sub County was appointed on 17/4/2019 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 79/DSC/BDK/2019 of 5th April 2019.

6. Tabitya David, the Town Clerk of Iki-Iki Town Council was appointed on 12/2/2019 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 33/DSC/BDK/2019 of 5th February, 2019.

7. Mugombe Yusufu, the Town Clerk of Kamonkoli Town Council was appointed on 10/5/2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 95.4/5/2022 of 6th May, 2022.

8. Namugungu Philstus, the the Town Clerk of Naboia Town Council was appointed on 10/5/2022 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 59.2/5/2022 of 6th May 2022.

9. Nagodyo Asailah, the SAS of Budaka Sub County was appointed on 22/10/2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 06.9/10/2018 of 19th June 2018.

10. Abbo Marion Amonya, the SAS of Tademeru Sub County was appointed on 22/10/2019 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 06.4/10/2018 of 18th June 2018.

11. Nachala Sharifa, the SAS of Kakule Sub County was appointed on 22/10/2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 06.5/10/2018 of 19th June 2018.

12. Namulondo Rosemary, the SAS of Kameruka Sub County was appointed on 22/10/2018 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 06.11/10/2018 of 19th June 2018.

13. Mugoya Annah, the SAS of Kabuna Sub County was appointed on 14/4/2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 43/03/2022(i) of 18th March 2022.

14. Kerebba Samuel, the Town Clerk of Kachomo Town Council was appointed on 10/5/2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 59.1/5/2022 of 6th May 2022.

15. Maiso Safatia, the SAS of Kamonkoli Sub County was appointed on 1/7/2020 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 185/DSC/BDK/2020 of 22nd June 2020.

16. Katooko Constance, the Town Clerk of Lyama Town Council was appointed on 1/6/2020 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 156/DSC/BDK/2020.

17. Mwanika David, the SAS of Iki-Iki Sub County was appointed on 26/5/2008 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 102/2008.

18. Mudanya Grace, the Town Clerk of Budaka Town Council was appointed on 10/5/2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 59.3/5/2022 of 6th May 2022.

19. Kirya Shaban, the SAS of Kadimukoli County was appointed on 2/5/2017 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 108.13/12/2016 of 6th December, 2016.

20. Nachomo Teruza, the SAS of Kachomo Sub County was appointed on 22/10/2018

2

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

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

The total LLGS were 20 in number including 14 S/Cs and 6 TC.

Evidence showed that Budaka DLG had recruited only CDOs both in Town Councils and Sub-Counties of which 9 of them were on assigned capacities as mentioned below:

1. Naigino Specioza, a substantive parish Chief appointed on 24/1/2018 under DSC Min.No. 68.2/01/2018 of 12th January 2018 was assigned duties of Ag.CDO for Kamonkoli Town Council as per the CAO's letter dated 8/2/2018.

2. Wenene Grace, a substantive parish Chief appointed on 24/1/2018 under DSC Min.No. 68.8/01/2018 of 12th January 2018 was assigned duties of Ag. CDO for Naboa T.C as per the CAO's letter dated 8/2/2018.

3. Mbayo Geoffrey, a substantive parish Chief appointed on 24/1/2018 under DSC Min.No. 68.3/01/2018 of 12th January 2018 was assigned duties of Ag. CDO for Kameruka S/C as per the CAO's letter dated 8/2/2018.

4. Namutamba Justine, a substantive parish Chief appointed on 24/1/2018 under DSC Min.No. 68.5/01/2018 of 12th January 2018 was assigned duties of Ag. CDO for Kakule S/C as per the CAO's letter dated 18/8/2020.

5. Gimbo Hajira, a substantive parish Chief appointed on 17/4/2019 under DSC Min.No. 81.4/DSC/BDK/2019 of 5th April, 2019 was assigned duties of Ag. CDO for Kakoli S/C as per the CAO's letter dated 18/8/2020.

6. Nabucha Samuel, a substantive parish Chief appointed on 24/1/2018 under DSC Min.No. 68.7/01/2018 of 12th January 2018 was assigned duties of Ag. CDO for Kabuna S/C as per the CAO's letter dated 8/2/2018.

7. Baluka Shamira, a substantive parish Chief appointed on 1/7/2020 under DSC Min.No. 177/DSC/BDK/2020 of 22nd June, 2020 was assigned duties of Ag. CDO for Kadimukoli S/C as per the CAO's letter dated 18/8/2020.

8. Katooko Fatuma, a substantive CDO appointed on 13/2/2018 under DSC Min.No. 93.3/02/2018 of 8th February 2018 was assigned duties of Ag. CDO for Kachomo T/C as per the CAO's letter dated 24/10/2022.

Among the substantively recruited were;

1. Gatolya Innocent, the CDO of Tandemeri sub county was appointed on 14/4/2022 as was directed by DSC Min No. 44/03/2022(i) of 8th March 2022.

2. Mukebezi Hellen, the CDO of Iki-Iki Town Council was appointed on 14/4/2022 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 44/03/2022 (ii) of 8th March 2022.

3. Koloyi Tom, the CDO of Kamonkoli sub county was appointed on 14/4/2022 as was directed by DSC Min. No. 44/03/2022 (iii) of 8th March 2022.

4. Musenero Christine, the CDO of Mugiti sub county was appointed on 12/2/2019 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 25/DSC/BDK/2019 of 4th February 2019.

5. Konso Perusi, the CDO of Budaka Town Council was appointed on 24/1/2018 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 68.1/01/2018 of 12th January 2018.

6. Tahaya Julius Tabisa, the CDO of Budaka sub county was appointed on 12/2/2019 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 25/DSC/BDK/2019 of 4th February 2019.

7. Muwereza Richard Nsuna, the CDO of Iki-Iki sub county was appointed on 12/2/2019 as was directed by DSC Min.No. 25/DSC/BDK/2019 of 4th February 2019.

8. Kalere Moses, the CDO of Kachomo Sub county was appointed on 7/1/2019 under Min.No.17/DSC/BDK/2018.

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 total LLGS were 20 in number including 14 S/Cs and 6 TC.

Evidence showed that only 4 Senior Accounts Assistants were substantively recruited and the rest were in acting positions as indicated below;

The staff that were not substantive included;

1. Wasansay Ali, a substantive SAA appointed on 11/1/2011 under DSC Min.No. 198/2010 of 19th July 2010 was assigned duties of Ag. Town Treasure for Lyama Town Council as per the CAO's letter dated 15/7/2021.

2. Tegule Tom, a substantive SAA appointed on 7/2/2012 under DSC Min.No. 61.2/2012 of 2nd May 2012 was assigned duties of Ag. Town Treasure for Kamonkoli Town Council as per the CAO's letter dated 28/2/2022.

3. Tazanya Jackson, a substantive SAA appointed on 7/5/2012 under DSC Min.No.61.5/2012 of 2nd May 2012 was assigned duties of Ag. Town Treasure for Budaka Town Council as per the CAO's letter dated 28/3/2022.

Among the Substantive were

1. Nkewe Zadock, the SAA of Kakure sub county was appointed on 12/3/2019 as directed by DSC under Min. 53.3/DSC/BDK/2019 of 11th March 2019.

2. Nakamya Sarah, the SAA of Kakoli sub county was appointed on 16/1/2018 as directed by DSC Min. 31.5/10/2017 of 19th October 2017.

3. Galandi Robert, the SAA of Kamonkoli Town Council was appointed on 22/5/2015 under DSC Min. No.115.1/05/2015 of 18th May 2015.

4. Mugisu Peter, the SAA of Kachomo Town Council was appointed on 2/6/2021 as directed by DSC under Min. No. 243/DSC/BDK/2021 of 25th May 2021.

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY. Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to: a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG released 100% of the funds allocated to the Natural Resources Department in the previous FY 2021/2022, the amount warranted was UGX. 251,000,000 and the department received 100%. The department spent all the received amount UGX.251,000,000 as indicated on page 14 of the financial statement ended 30th June 2022 FY 2021/22 approved by the CAO on 23rd August, 2022.	2
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY. Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to: b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	There was evidence that the LG released 100% of the funds allocated to the Community Based Services department in the previous FY 2021/2022, the amount warranted was UGX. 319,000,000 and the department received 100%.The department spent all the received amount UGX.319,000,000 as indicated on page 14 of the financial statement end 30th June 2022 FY 2021/22 approved by the CAO on 23rd August, 2022.	2

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or else 0

There was evidence that LG carried out Environmental, social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works for all the projects implemented using the DDEG.

The screening form for the construction of a twin staff house at Budaka primary school in Budaka Town Council, the impacts identified such as; vegetation clearance, debris on site, accidents and construction waste generation and mitigation measures addressed made in the ESMP such as; proper waste management at the site, levelling of the site and removal of debris on site, prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and Environment officer on 24th /08/2021.

Screening for the construction of the Council Chambers block Phase-3 at the district headquarters in Budaka Town Council, impacts identified include; dust emission, accidents, waste generation, child labour and debris on site and suggested mitigation measures such as; site levelling, site hoarding, avoid child access to the site and provide workers with proper PPE prepared by Environment officer and the DCDO on 10th /9/2021.

Screening for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Kakwanga village in Iki-Iki sub-county where impacts such as surface wastewater, vegetation clearance, water contamination and soil erosion and mitigation measures suggested included; waste management limit vegetation cover clearance, digging of a larger soak pit made in the screening form and the ESMPs. This was prepared by the DCDO and Environment officer on 19th /08/ 2021 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX 1,750,000 for 7 boreholes each costed at UGX.250,000 which had been approved by EO and DCDO on 8th /10/ 2021

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or 0

All the DDEG financed projects did not require ESIAs, this was in reference to the National Environment Act 20219 under schedule 4 part 2 which consists of projects with simple environmental and social measures and a minimal level of impacts and require screening.

Impacts could be mitigated or avoided through appropriate and timely implementation of recommended mitigation measures and by strictly following the requirements and guidance in the ESMPs.

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

Maximum score is 12

c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0

There was evidence of costed ESMPs for all the projects implemented using the DDEG in the previous FY 2021/22 for instance.

A costed ESMP of UGX 200,000 for the construction of a twin staff house at Budaka primary school in Budaka Town Council where impacts such as vegetation clearance, debris on site, accidents and construction waste generation and mitigation measures addressed made in the ESMP such as; proper waste management at the site, levelling of the site and removal of debris on site, prepared and endorsed by the DCDO and Environment officer on 6th /10/2021.

A costed ESMP of UGX 250,000 for the drilling and installation of a borehole at Kakwanga village in Iki-Iki sub-county where impacts such as surface wastewater, vegetation clearance, water contamination and soil erosion and mitigation measures suggested included; waste management limit vegetation cover clearance, digging of a larger soak pit made in the ESMPs. This was prepared by the DCDO and Environment officer on 8th /10/ 2021.

A costed ESMP of UGX 400,000 for the construction of the Council Chambers block Phase-3 at the district headquarters in Budaka Town Council, impacts identified include; dust emission, accidents, waste generation, child labour and debris on site and suggested mitigation measures such as; site levelling, site hoarding, avoid child access to the site and provide workers with proper PPE prepared by Environment officer and the DCDO on 4th /10/ 2021.

Financial management and reporting

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	<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>	There was evidence that Budaka DLG obtained Un-qualified audit opinion from the statutory audit conducted by the Office of the Auditor General for the previous FY 2021/2022.	10
	Maximum score is 10			
6	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>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>	The District provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General's findings on 6/4/2022. The same information on Auditor General's findings was submitted to the same office on 5/4/2022. Both submissions were made after February contrary to PFMA s.11 2g. For this matter the LG was not complaint.	0
	maximum score is 10			
7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	<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>	The District submitted an annual performance contract for FY 2022/2023 to the MoFPED via PBS on 21/7/2022. This submission was before the dead line of August 31st.	4
	Maximum Score 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 District submitted the Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022 to the MoFPED via PBS on 29/8/2022. Since this submission was made before August 31, the LG was compliant.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District submitted quarterly budget performance reports to the MoFPED via PBS as follows: 1st report was submitted on 2/11/2021, 2nd Qrt. on 21/01/2022, 3rd Qrt on 5/05/2022 and 4th Qrt report on 29/08/2022. All the four quarterly reports were in by August 31, the LG was compliant with the requirement.</p>	4