



## **LGMSD 2021/22**

Mitooma District

(Vote Code: 601)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	58%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	80%
Educational Performance Measures	62%
Health Performance Measures	53%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	47%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	10%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG provided evidence that infrastructure project implemented using DDEG funding was functional and utilized as per purpose of the project.</p> <p>The projects was.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of the District Main Administration Block Phase 1V, UGX. 199,230,000 (ABPR, page 37, AWP, page, 79).</li> </ul>	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>LLGs were not assessed in 2021/2022.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG provided evidence that the DDEG funded investment project implemented was 100% completed as per performance contract by end of the FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>The project was.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of the District Main Administration Block Phase 1V, at UGX. 199,230,000 (ABPR, page, 37) was 100% as per completion report by District Engineer dated 22nd June 2022.</li> </ul>	3

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:  Score 2 or else score 0.	The LG budgeted for DDEG, UGX. 219,230,000. The amount spent was UGX. 219,230,000 (ABPR, page, 8; AWP, page, 10).  The project and activities were.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of the District Main Administration Block Phase 1V, UGX.199, 230,000 (ABPR, page, 37, Annual Budget Estimates, page, 96).</li> <li>• Monitoring and supervision, (10%), UGX.10, 000,000 (ABPR, page,37; AWP, page, page, 96).</li> <li>• Capacity building (10%), UGX. 10,000,000 (AWP, page 4).</li> </ul>	2
---	--	--	--	---

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	From the LG amended District Procurement and Disposal Plan for FY 2021/2022 Ref. CR/05/2 page 1, the implemented DDEG project was construction of administration block phase IV. The project had a budget of UGX 562,000,000/= of which UGX 200,000,000/= was DDEG grant. From the costed Bills of Quantities, the Engineer\'s Estimates was UGX 459,230,713/= and the contract price was UGX 456,547,949/= according to signed contract agreement between Mitooma District LG and Geses Uganda Ltd dated 25th/11/2021. The price variation for the project was 0.6%. This was within acceptable range of +/-20%	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	There was evidence that the information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate.  Three LLGs were visited, and the staff were in place as follows:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kashenshero SC had a staff list of 12 staff according to HRM division's list, and the staff list at the Sub county indicated 12 staff, as well</li> <li>2. Katenfa SC had a total of 9 staff according to HRM division's list and the staff list at the Sub county indicated 9 staff as well</li> <li>3. Mitooma Town Council had a staff list of 18 staff according to HRM division's list and the staff list at the Sub County, indicated 18 staff as well.</li> </ol>	2
---	--	--	---	---

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>Evidence availed showed that the infrastructure constructed using the DDEG FY 2021/2022, were completed and in place as per completion report by the District Engineer dated 12th May 2022.</p> <p>The project was.</p> <p>Construction of the District Main Administration Block Phase 1V, UGX.199, 230,000 (ABPR, page, 37, Annual Budget Estimates, page, 96).</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to MoPS, in a letter dated 23/9/2022, received on 28/9/2022</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as guided by MoPS CSI. The HRM submits staff attendance reports to the CAO on a quarterly basis. In the first quarter of July -September 2021, average staff attendance was recorded at 92%, while in the 2nd quarter of October to December 2021, average staff attendance dropped to 90%</p>	2

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Heads of Departments were appraised for the previous FY against their performance agreements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Chief Finance Officer- Tumuhame Juliet Olive was appraised on 5/7/2022</li> <li>2. The acting District Engineer – Tumwebaze John Baptist was appraised on 15/7/2022</li> <li>3. The District Natural Resource Officer – Baguma Naboth Vincent was appraised on 30/6/2022</li> <li>4. The District Community Development Beyendeza Saverinus was appraised on 30/6/2022</li> <li>5. The acting District Commercial Officer Ahimbisibwe Gervas was appraised on 9/7/2022</li> <li>6. The District Education Officer Birungi Peace Gloria was appraised on 4/8/2022</li> <li>7. The District Health Officer Byamugisha Sadic was appraised on 30/6/2022</li> <li>8. The DPO Monday Swaibuh Lwanga was appraised on 5/8/2022</li> <li>9. The acting Principal Auditor Akankwasa Isreal was appraised on 4/8/2022</li> </ol>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented.</p> <p>The Rewards and Sanctions committee met on 27/1/2022 and handled several cases, including a case of Mugabe Robert an Education Assistant II, who had absconded from duty. The committee recommended suspension of salary and eventually delete the officer from the payroll through the Ministry of Education. This later was done in the month of April 2022.</p>	1

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that the LG established a Consultative Committee for staff grievances which was functional.

The committee is composed of;

1. Baguma Naboth as chairperson
2. Nahurira Anna as Secretary
3. Niwagaba Sylvia,
4. Musimenta Pamera
5. Byarugaba Johnson
6. Twinamaisko Evans

The committee met on 3/8/2022 to discuss a complaint by one Kusasira Jovelt a CDO of Bitereko Sub County who was acting SAS but was later replaced (as SAS) while still at station without notice. The Committee recommended that the HRM officially writes a transfer letter for the officer to another station.

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 no evidence to show that 100% of staff recruited in Previous FY accessed the salary payroll within 2 months. A total of 52 staff were recruited in the previous FY; a sample of 10 staff was taken and evidence did not show that they accessed the salary payroll within 2 months as follows;

1. Abenaitwe Eunice appointed on 26/11/2021 did not access the salary payroll until April 2022
2. Mutayebwa Yoab appointed on 26/11/2021 did not access the salary payroll until April 2022
3. Twiziire Fara appointed on 26/11/2021 did not access the salary payroll until April 2022
4. Mwesigwa Edwn appointed on 18/3/2022 did not access the salary payroll in the two months after appointment
5. Mushabe Vicent appointed on 22/3/2022 did not access the salary payroll in the two months after appointment
6. Rukundo Alex appointed on 22/3/2022 did not access the salary payroll in the two months after appointment
7. Natukunda Richard appointed on 18/2/2022 did not access the salary payroll in the two months after appointment
8. Agaba Stanely appointed on 24/6/2022 did not access the salary payroll in the two months after appointment
9. Arikiriza David appointed on 24/6/2022 did not access the salary payroll in the two months after appointment
10. Nahurira Anna appointed on 24/6/2022 did not access the salary payroll in the two months after appointment

It was noted that these were teachers and DLG was required to make a back check with the ministry and therefore the delay happened in the ministry not at the DLG

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.

There was evidence to show that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement. A total of 22 staff retired and a sample of 10 staff indicated as follows;

1. Bony Amy Kiiza (IPPS 177734) retired on 22/2/2022 and accessed the pension payroll in April 2022
2. Bamwine Jovia (IPPS 177962) retired on 16/9/2021 and accessed pension payroll in November 2021
3. Richard Muhumuza (IPPS 177939) retired on 12/9/2021 and accessed pension payroll in November 2021
4. Lawrence B Twezirikire (IPPS 177874) retired on 11/3/2022 and accessed pension payroll in May 2022
5. Asiiimwe Molly (IPPS 755944) retired on 2/9/2021 and accessed pension payroll in October 2021
6. Samuel Bakuneeta (IPPS 561469) retired on 4/4/2022 and accessed pension payroll in May 2022
7. Twine Godwin (IPPS 78150) retired on 25/3/2022 and accessed pension payroll in May 2022
8. Margaret Katungweni (IPPS 178341) retired on 1/7/2021 and accessed pension payroll in August 2021
9. Francis Karefu (IPPS 755976) retired on 6/7/2021 and accessed pension payroll in August 2021
10. Charles Byaruhanga (IPPS 179599) retired on 14/4/2022 and accessed pension payroll in May 2022

## Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.



10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	<p>LG Annual budget for DDEG for FY 2021-2022 was UGX.568,640,000 (ABPR, page,4) for HLG and LLGs.</p> <p>1. HLG, UGX. 219,230,000</p> <p>2. LLGs, UGX. 349,410,000</p> <p><b>The DDEG budgeted and transferred to LLGs was UGX. 349,410,000 as follows;</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>a. Sub-county</td> <td>UGX.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1. Mayanga</td> <td>25,104,879</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Kabira</td> <td>24,827,886</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Kashenshero</td> <td>26,351,352</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Rurehe</td> <td>36,351,522</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Katenga</td> <td>34,522,671</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Bitereko</td> <td>49,895,829</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Mutara</td> <td>42,555,492</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8. Kiyanga</td> <td>38,262,087</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9. Mitooma</td> <td>35,907,639</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10. Kanyabwanga</td> <td>35,630,643</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Subtotal</b></td> <td><b>349,410,000</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>3. Town Councils, budgeted UGX.22,930,530 and transferred UGX. 22,930,530.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>a. Kashenshro</td> <td>11,538,225</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Mitooma</td> <td>11,392,305</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>22,930,530</b></td> </tr> </table>	a. Sub-county	UGX.	1. Mayanga	25,104,879	2. Kabira	24,827,886	3. Kashenshero	26,351,352	4. Rurehe	36,351,522	5. Katenga	34,522,671	6. Bitereko	49,895,829	7. Mutara	42,555,492	8. Kiyanga	38,262,087	9. Mitooma	35,907,639	10. Kanyabwanga	35,630,643	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>349,410,000</b>	a. Kashenshro	11,538,225	b. Mitooma	11,392,305	<b>Total</b>	<b>22,930,530</b>
a. Sub-county	UGX.																																
1. Mayanga	25,104,879																																
2. Kabira	24,827,886																																
3. Kashenshero	26,351,352																																
4. Rurehe	36,351,522																																
5. Katenga	34,522,671																																
6. Bitereko	49,895,829																																
7. Mutara	42,555,492																																
8. Kiyanga	38,262,087																																
9. Mitooma	35,907,639																																
10. Kanyabwanga	35,630,643																																
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>349,410,000</b>																																
a. Kashenshro	11,538,225																																
b. Mitooma	11,392,305																																
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,930,530</b>																																

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):  Score: 2 or else score 0	<p>The LG did not timely warrant DDEG transfers to LLGs FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>Time taken;</p> <p>Q 1-9 days;</p> <p>Q 2-12 days</p> <p>Q 3-21 days.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Notification of Expenditure Limits</td> <td>Warranted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 1- 06/07/2021</td> <td>15/07/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 2- 30/09/2021</td> <td>13/10/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 3- 22/12/2021</td> <td>12/01/2021</td> </tr> </table>	Notification of Expenditure Limits	Warranted	Q 1- 06/07/2021	15/07/2021	Q 2- 30/09/2021	13/10/2021	Q 3- 22/12/2021	12/01/2021
Notification of Expenditure Limits	Warranted										
Q 1- 06/07/2021	15/07/2021										
Q 2- 30/09/2021	13/10/2021										
Q 3- 22/12/2021	12/01/2021										

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:	The evidence shows that the LG did not invoice and communicate all DDEG transfers to the LLGs within 5 working days within from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Time taken;</p> <p>Q 1- 13 days</p> <p>Q 2- 17 days</p> <p>Q 3- 23 days</p> <p>The communication and invoicing were on the following dates below;</p> <p>Notification of Cash release from MOFPED Invoiced</p> <p>Q 1- 06/07/2021 19/07/2021</p> <p>Q 2 -30/09/2021V 17/10/2021</p> <p>Q 3 -22/12/2021 14/01/2021</p>	
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	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>The LG provided evidence on supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District on quarterly basis as per reports below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring &amp; Mentoring Reports</li> </ul> <p>Q-1, dated 5th October 2021</p> <p>Q-2, dated 1st December 2022</p> <p>Q-3, dated 15th March 2022</p> <p>Q-4, dated 11th July 2022</p>	2
	Maximum 4 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>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>The LG availed reports which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow up.</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <p>The monitoring/Mentoring reports were discussed in the following TPC Meetings</p> <p>Q-1, discussed in TPC meeting dated 26/10/2021, under MIN 86/TPC/2021)</p> <p>Q-2, discussed in TPC, meeting dated 16/02/2022, under MIN148/TPC/2022)</p> <p>Q-3, discussed in TPC dated meeting 07/05/2022, under MIN 122/TPC/2022)</p> <p>Q-4, discussed in TPC meeting dated 02/08/2022, under MIN 09/TPC/2022)</p>
----	---	---	---

### 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>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>The LG provided the assets register which was maintained by the District up to-date by the time of assessment on 1st December 2022. The assets register was maintained according the Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007 and was printed from IFMIS system. The assets registers included; land and buildings at headquarters and at LLGs; transport equipment and the location of each; furniture and fittings and location; ICT equipment machinery; office equipment and their locations. The LG provided both manual and IFMIS copies.</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>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The District provided the Board of Survey (BOS) dated 29/08/2022 signed by the committee chairperson, Kagumire Godwine with three other members. The BOS report included the following items; Cash balances and bank reconciliations; District land and buildings at headquarters and at LLGs; transport equipment; ICT equipment, office equipment; medical equipment, machinery. BOS as well showed Assets Management decisions on recommending disposal of existing assets (section, 2.4, page, 7 and 91-96).</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The evidence provided indicate the District had functional physical planning committee and all fully appointed of 14 members. The Physical planner Tushabomwe Primus availed the following documents:</p> <p>a. Plans submission register with the last transaction on 23/06/2022, Mugumya Cysistome at Mayanga Sub-county.</p> <p>b. Annual work-plan.</p> <p>c. Appointments letters dated 02/03/2021 members.</p> <p>d. The minutes were stamped and received by MoLHUD as follows.</p> <p>Q. 1. Date of report 18/10/2021. Submitted on 18/10/2011.</p> <p>Q -2-Date of report 02/02/2022; submitted on 11/02/2022.</p> <p>Q -3-Date of report 08/07/2022; submitted on 21/07/2022.</p> <p>Q-4, Date of report 27/07/2022; submitted on 24/07/2022.</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</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence that the District conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget and the prioritized investments were derived from the LG Development Plan eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source. The desk appraisal was carried out on 08/07/2021 by the following; District Planner, Senior Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer and HODs.</p> <p>The projects desk appraised were</p> <p>a. Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga Gravity Flow Scheme Phase1 in Mitooma s/c.</p> <p>b. Rehabilitation of spring and shallow wells in Katenga s/c.</p>	2

<p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Rehabilitation of rural water sources in Mitooma s/c.</li> <li>d. Paying retention for Kibazi GFS phase III and IV</li> <li>e. Construction of feero cement rain water harvesting tanks at Ryakahimbi p.s in Mitooma TC.</li> <li>f. Construction of feero cement rain water harvesting tanks at Kakimba p/s.</li> <li>g. Construction of feero cement rain water harvesting tanks at Bukiriro village.</li> <li>h. Upgrade of Nyakishojwa HCIII in Mitooma sub county.</li> <li>i. Upgrade of Ryengyerero HCIII in Mutara sub county.</li> <li>j. Rehabilitation of Kabira HCIII in Kabira T/C.</li> <li>k. Upgrade of Bukuba HCIII in Kashenshero sub county.</li> <li>l. Construction of staff houses at Bukuba HCIII.</li> <li>m. Renovation of Rwoburunga HCIII in Rwoburunga sub county.</li> <li>n. Supply and installation of medical equipment at Ryengyerero HCII in Mutara SC.</li> <li>o. Supply and installation of medical equipment for Nyakishojwa in Mitooma SC.</li> <li>p. Construction of a latrine at Kibungo primary School in Kanyabwanga sub county.</li> <li>q. Renovation of a classroom block at Kibungo P/S in Kayabwanga SC.</li> <li>r. Renovation of a classroom block at Nyakanoni P/S in Kanyabwanga SC.</li> <li>s. Supply of furniture at Bitooma P/S in Katenga SC.</li> <li>t. Supply of Frurniture at Ruhungye P/S in Kiyanga SC.</li> <li>u. Latrine construction at Katerera p/s.</li> <li>v. Construction of main administration block phase III at Mitooma District headquarters.</li> </ul>
---	--

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

For DDEG financed projects:

e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for

The LG provided evidence that showed it conducted field appraisals as per report dated 24/11/2021 and 25/11/2021 to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects. They were appraised by, the, District Planner, Senior Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer and HODs.

The projects were;

a. Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga Gravity Flow Scheme Phase1 in Mitooma s/c.

2

- investment projects of the previous FY:
- Score 2 or else score 0
- b. Rehabilitation of spring and shallow wells in Katenga s/c.
  - c. Rehabilitation of rural water sources in Mitooma s/c.
  - d. Paying retention for Kibazi GFS phase III and IV
  - e. Construction of feero cement rain water harvesting tanks at Ryakahimbi p.s in Mitooma TC.
  - f. Construction of feero cement rain water harvesting tanks at Kakimba p/s.
  - g. Construction of feero cement rain water harvesting tanks at Bukiro village.
  - h. Upgrade of Nyakishojwa HCIII in Mitooma sub county.
  - i. Upgrade of Ryengyerero HCIII in Mutara sub county.
  - j. Rehabilitation of Kabira HCIII in Kabira T/C.
  - k. Upgrade of Bukuba HCIII in Kashenshero sub county.
  - l. Construction of staff houses at Bukuba HCIII.
  - m. Renovation of Rwoburunga HCIII in Rwoburunga sub county.
  - n. Supply and installation of medical equipment at Ryengyerero HCII in Mutara SC.
  - o. Supply and installation of medical equipment for Nyakishojwa in Mitooma SC.
  - p. Construction of a latrine at Kibungo primary School in Kanyabwanga sub county.
  - q. Renovation of a classroom block at Kibungo P/S in Kayabwanga SC.
  - r. Renovation of a classroom block at Nyakanoni P/S in Kanyabwanga SC.
  - s. Supply of furniture at Bitooma P/S in Katenga SC.
  - t. Supply of Furniture at Ruhungye P/S in Kiyanga SC.
  - u. Latrine construction at Katerera p/s.
  - v. Construction of main administration block phase III at Mitooma District headquarters.

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

Evidence that project profiles with costing were developed by HODs from different departments and discussed on 16/03/2022, under Min 105/TPC/2022 with presentation developed from LG DP III , pages,133- 183, Annual Work plans and Approved Budget Estimates for the FY 2022/23.

The projects were.

1. Construction of two classroom blocks at

1

guidelines:

Score 1 or else  
score 0.

Ruhungye p/s in Kiyanga, Bitooma p/s in Katenga, kyeibaare p/s in Mutara, Katerera p/s in Kanyabwanga, Rugando p/s in Rurehe, Rwenshama p/s in Kanyabwanga, Nyakanoni p/s in Kabira, Kikunyu p/s in Kashenshero, Katunda p/s in Mitooma, Kibungo p/s in Kanyabwanga, Nyakanoni p/s in Kabira

Kikunyu ps in Kashenshero, UGX.100,000,000 (LG DP II, page,133).

2. Construction of a SEED School at Kitojo, UGX. 3,000,000,000 (LG DP III, page, 140).

3. VIP latrines construction at , Katerera Ps in Kanyabwanga, Mitooma Central ps in Mitooma TC, Igambiro ps in Katenga, Rwamuniori ps in Kanyabwanga, Furuma ps in Mutara, Kanyabwanga ps, Kibungo ps in Kanyabwanga, Rukararwe ps in Katenga, Bukongoro ps in Mutara, Kaigukire ps in Kashenshero, Kyamushongora ps in Katenga, Rwanja ps in Rurehe, Nyamutamba ps in Kiyanga, Kitwe ps in Kabira, Mahungye ps in BiterekoUGX.135,000,000 (LG DP III, page,143).

4. GFS construction at Nkinga GFS phases I and II, Rwenkureijo GFS phases I and II, Mushunga GFS phases I and II, UGX.2,740,000,000 (LG DP III, page, 150).

5. GFSs rehabilitation at Katenga and Kibazi, UGX. 280,000,000 (LG DP III, page,155).

6. Springs protected at Kirembe P/S in Katenga SC, Mahwizi P/S in Mutara SC, Kiyanga P/S in Kiyanga SC, Kashongorero P/S in Kanyabwanga SC, Rwoburunga parish in Kiyanga SC and Nyakizinga parish in Nyakizinga SC , UGX. (LG DP III, page,159).

7. Design of GFS at Ryengyerero. UGX. 36,000,000 (LG DP III, page,166).

8. Manual maintenance of feeder roads at Ncwera-Bitereko-Kati, Mitooma-Kabira-Kashenshero, Kabira-Rwitanzi, Mutara-Kabuceera, Katenga-Bwoma, Kabira-Rwemburara, Mitooma-Kiyanga-Bitereko, Mutara-Kagogo-Kashansha, Mutara-Bukongoro-Bwoma, Mutara-Nyakihita-Kataho, Katenga-Kakamba-Nkukuru, Rwanja-Butembe, Omukabira-Nyaruzinga-Nkinga, Rwempungu-Rushaya, Rwempungu-Kashenshero-Bukuba-Bitereko, Kibingo-Ijumo-Rwentookye, UGX. 623,000,000 (LG DP III, page, 169).

9. Upgrading health centres from IIs to IIIs at Mayanga, Iraramira, Kyeibare, kigyende , UGX. 4,000,000,000 (LG DP III, page,178).

10. Upgrading health centres from IIIs to IVs at , UGX.4,000,000,000 (LG DP III, page,183).

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Mitooma DLG screened for environmental and social risks for DDEG projects for the current financial year before being approved for construction using checklists;</p> <p>Construction of the main block (phase III) was screened for environment and social safeguards on 07/07/2022 with mitigation measures prepared on 07/07/2022.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Review of the LG Procurement plan FY 2022/2023 dated 12th/08/2022 Ref.CR.105/2 there was evidence that DDEG project of construction of administration block phase V was incorporated in the plan. The project had a budget of UGX 240,000,000/= with domestic open bidding as proposed procurement method and admeasurement contract.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of approval by contracts committee as minutes were not presented during assessment. This was captured on exit form signed by representative of the LG.</p>	0
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>Presented was a memo from office of the CAO dated 15th/12/2021 Ref. Admin/207/1 the established team lacked inclusion of Clerk of Works as stipulated by Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines for FY 2021/22</p>	0



13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	The construction of Mitooma District LG administration block followed standard technical designs provided by the District Engineer. The phase specifically involved ground floor, concrete pillars, walling and water borne toilet at the office of the CAO. The phase included super structure (columns, beams, lintols, ditto in ribs and 150mm thick solid slab. Steel reinforcement reinforced concrete staircase. Construction by the contract was in line with the technical specifications given by the LG Engineer.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	The LG technical officers (DE, Environment Officer, CDO) supervised the project prior to verification and certification. Reviewed were supervision reports including report dated 14th/02/2022 for the progress of the main administration block. The report noted great progress and adherence to technical designs. From the social and environment component, the officers noted that the contract had not submitted ESHM management strategies and implementation plan. Noise from the construction site had been well minimized. This was captured in Environment and Social mitigation and climate change safeguards for construction of administration block dated 27th/05/2022.	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	The LG verified works and initiated payments timely. For example, M/S Geses Uganda Limited submitted payment claim of UGX 130,083,468/= on 16th/05/2022. The LG issued interim payment certificate No.3 of UGX 153,842,593/= signed by the Ag. District Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO dated 18th/05/2022. Payment of UGX 146,020,088/= was effected on 10th/06/2022 as per reviewed payment voucher No.43547517	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:	The LG has a complete file in place with all records as required by PPDA law. Procurement requisition was signed by all relevant officers on 4th/08/2021. Submission for approval of procurement method, technical evaluation committee and bidding documents was approved by contracts committee in a meeting held on 25th/08/2021 under minute number MIN:013/CC/2021-22. Submission for amendment of contract price (to include mechanical, electrical and sunshade at 40,847,235/=, 9% of original contract price) the contracts committee approved under minute MIN:100/CC/2021-22. Since the project was above threshold, the LG got clearance from Solicitor General as evidenced by letter dated 15th/11/2021 Ref.DLAS/MBR/138/2021. On file was evaluation report dated 15th/10/2021 signed by members and approved by contracts committee under minute MIN:023/CC/2021-22. Contract agreement was signed on 25th/11/2021 between the LG and M/S Geses Uganda Limited with contract price of UGX 456,547,949 VAT Inclusive.	<b>1</b>
	Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	Score 1 or else 0		

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.	Ms. Sylvia Nuwagaba was appointed the GRM focal person as per appointment letter dated 17/01/2018.  In the same vein, the Grievance Redress Committee was appointed on 20/10/2019 by the CAO. The appointed members included;  Baguma Naboth- Natural Resource Officer.  Nuwagaba Sylvia- Focal person.  Atuzariirwe Allen- Community Development Officer.  Kagumire Godwine- Environment Officer.  Mbamanya Francis- Production Officer.	<b>2</b>
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The local government had a complaints log for registering grievances. The complaints log had the following provisions; date, complainant, content, responsible officer and action taken. The Grievance redress mechanism was also displayed on the public notice board at the district.</p>	<b>2</b>
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>Mitooma DLG had publicised the GRM to the public as per the display on the public notice board the structure of the mechanism and the focal person for receiving the grievances.</p>	<b>1</b>

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

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

The evidence indicates, environment, social and climate change interventions were integrated into, LG development plans, AWP and Budget estimates for FY 2021/2022. The interventions were; environment interventions, section, 2.6, page, 49 and pages, 44 and 49); Social interventions-pages, section section-4.3 page 199; climate change interventions-section-2.4, page 44 and section 2.6, page, 44 and pages,49 and 75. AWP-environment interventions- pages-104-112; social interventions- pages-110-122; climate interventions- pages-101-111. Approved Annual Budget Estimates; environment interventions-pages- 55-58; social interventions-pages-54-58; climate interventions-pages-55-57.

Sample projects were.

1. GFS construction at Nkinga GFS phases I and II, Rwenkureijo GFS phases I and II, Mushunga GFS phases I and II, UGX.2,740,000,000 (LG DP III, page, 150).

2. Springs protected at Kirembe P/S in Katenga SC, Mahwizi P/S in Mutara SC, Kiyanga P/S in Kiyanga SC, Kashongorero P/S in Kanyabwanga SC, Rwoburunga parish in Kiyanga SC and Nyakizinga parish in Nyakizinga SC , UGX. (LG DP III, page,159).

3. Manual maintenance of feeder roads at Ncwera-Bitereko-Kati, Mitooma-Kabira-Kashenshero, Kabira-Rwitanzi, Mutara-Kabuceera, Katenga-Bwoma, Kabira-Rwemburara, Mitooma-Kiyanga-Bitereko, Mutara-Kagogo-Kashansha, Mutara-Bukongoro-Bwoma, Mutara-Nyakihita-Kataho, Katenga-Kakamba-Nkukuru, Rwanja-Butembe, Omukabira-Nyaruzinga-Nkinga, Rwempungu-Rushaya, Rwempungu-Kashenshero-Bukuba-Bitereko, Kibingo-Ijumo-Rwentookye, UGX. 623,000,000 (LG DP III, page, 169).

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>The LG disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines that strengthened and included, environment, climate change mitigation and adaptation and social risk management. This is in reference to the mentoring report dated 15/02/2022 which was discussed under minute, MIN. 22/FEB/2022.regarding the dissemination of the DDEG guidelines to LLGs. Those involved were, CAO All HODs, Town Clerks of Town Councils and Sub-County Chiefs. The activities included;</p> <p>Objectives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To disseminate new guidelines on DDEG and unconditional Grant Guidelines.</li> <li>• Changes in internal assessment guidelines on DDEG.</li> <li>• Planning for Parish Model at LLGs using DDEG.</li> <li>• To guide LLGs on project DDEG selection for projects for FY 2021/22.</li> <li>• To have all LLGs plans/budgets for 2021/22 to follow DDEG guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>DDEG guidelines were disseminated to LLGs through an extended TPC on 15/10/2020 to 18/10/2020, as per distribution sheet which was seen during the assessment. The guidelines were signed for by the recipients who included S/C chiefs and Town Clerks.</p>	<b>1</b>
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>Construction of the main block upto ground slab level ( phase II) was screened on on 16/07/2019. However the costed ESMPs were not incorporated into the Bills of Quantities.</p>	<b>0</b>

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There were no projects in the previous financial year implemented in Mitooma DLG that required costing of the additional impact from climate change.	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	The administration block is on land with a land title- Certificate of title- freehold register, volume MBR Folio4. signed on 25/06/2014 by the register of titles.	<b>1</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	A review of the reports revealed that Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMP. However , for some projects monitoring was done once and not on a monthly basis as shown below;  Renovation of classroom block at Nyakanoni primary school had one monitoring report dated; 01/04/2022.  Construction of main block (phase II) had a monitoring report dated; 27/04/2022.  Construction/ upgrading of Mayanga HC II to HC III had monitoring reports dated, 13/06/2022, 20/04/2021, 02/09/20221 and 04/03/2022.  Construction of water tank at Kakimba primary school had a monitoring report dated; 07/06/2022.	<b>0</b>

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:	There was Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors;  Renovation of classroom block at Nyakanoni primary school had an Environment and certification form dated 01/04/2022.  Construction of main block (phase II) had an E&S certification form dated 27/05/2022.  Construction/ upgrading of Mayanga HC II to HC III had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 01/06/2022  Construction of water tank at Kakimba primary school had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 01/06/2022	1
		Score 1 or else score 0		

### 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:	The LG monthly bank reconciliations were up to-date at time of the assessment on 1st December 2022. The bank reconciliations were as at 31st October 2022.  The 3 sampled banks were as follows;  1. Mitooma DLG, UWEP Revolving Recovery a/c. Centenary Bank a/c. no. 3100049511, -UGX. 15,013,750.  2. Mitooma DLG General Fund, Stanbic Bank a/c. 9030005706814, UGX. 22,878,259.  3. Rukungiri General Fund, Stanbic a/c. no. 9030005706814, UGX.22,878,259.	2
		Score 2 or else score 0		
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.	The LG Internal Auditor Akankwasa Israel provided to the assessor all four quarterly internal audits (IA) reports. The reports were submitted to the CAO on; observations, recommendations and action.  Submissions dates were as follows:  Q 1- 28/10/2021  Q 2 -28/01/2022  Q 3- 29/04/2022  Q 4 -29/07/2021	2
		Score 2 or else score 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>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>Evidence provided showed the LG has provided information to the Council and LC V and the Chairperson LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the FY 2021/2022. This was on information on follow up on audit queries from all the quarterly internal audit reports.</p>	1
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the internal audit reports for FY2020/21 were submitted to CAO, LGPAC, RDC and LCV Chair through the Registry on the following dates.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report dated 04/04/2022, submitted on 04/04/2022 was discussed on 20/04/2022, under MIN. 88./DEC/2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 report dated 04/04/2022, submitted on 04/04/2022 discussed on 20/04/2022, under MIN. 88./DEC/2022.</p> <p>Quarter 3, report dated 18/11/2022, submitted on 18/11/2022, had not been discussed by the time of assessment.</p> <p>Quarter 4, report dated 18/11/2022, submitted on 18/11/2022, had not been discussed by the time of assessment</p> <p>However no evidence that report of , Q 3 and Q 4 for were discussed by the LG-PAC for FY 2121/2022.</p>	0

**Local Revenues**

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Actual Revenue collected in FY 2021/22 was UGX. 269,679,336 against the planned of UGX. 577,806,000. The difference between actual and planned was UGX. 308,126,664. This was 53.3% not within the range of 10%.</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"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The actual OSR for the FY 2021/22 was UGX. 269,679,336 and actual for 2020/2021 was UGX. 215,315,957 (ABPR, page, 10). There was an increase of UGX. 54,363,379, which was 25.3% more than 10% (Final accounts 2020/21, page 12).</p>	2																												
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Mitooma DLG financial records, for FY 2021/22 the total local revenue collected was UGX. 269,679,336, less Non-shareable of, UGX.80,615,301. This left a balance of UGX.189,064,035 of local service tax shareable.</p> <p>The amount transferred to LLGs was UGX. 122,891,623 (Ugx.189,064,035 x 65%).</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">ENTITY AMOUNT</th> <th style="text-align: right;">-UGX.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1. Mayanga S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">16,028,342</td></tr> <tr><td>2. Kabira S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">8,144,314</td></tr> <tr><td>3. Kashenshero S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">13,285,312</td></tr> <tr><td>4. Rurehe S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">11,018,371</td></tr> <tr><td>5. Katenga S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">8,009,652</td></tr> <tr><td>6. Bitereko S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">13,635,960</td></tr> <tr><td>7. Mutara S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">10,333,709</td></tr> <tr><td>8. Kiyanga S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">9,193,002</td></tr> <tr><td>9. Mitooma S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">16,172,525</td></tr> <tr><td>10. Nyakizinga S/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">8,250,143</td></tr> <tr><td>11. Kashenshero T/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">4,015,000</td></tr> <tr><td>12. Mitooma T/C</td><td style="text-align: right;">4,805,293</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Totals</b></td><td style="text-align: right;"><b>122,891,623</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The UGX.122,091,968 was the mandatory 65% transferred to LLGs.</p>	ENTITY AMOUNT	-UGX.	1. Mayanga S/C	16,028,342	2. Kabira S/C	8,144,314	3. Kashenshero S/C	13,285,312	4. Rurehe S/C	11,018,371	5. Katenga S/C	8,009,652	6. Bitereko S/C	13,635,960	7. Mutara S/C	10,333,709	8. Kiyanga S/C	9,193,002	9. Mitooma S/C	16,172,525	10. Nyakizinga S/C	8,250,143	11. Kashenshero T/C	4,015,000	12. Mitooma T/C	4,805,293	<b>Totals</b>	<b>122,891,623</b>	2
ENTITY AMOUNT	-UGX.																															
1. Mayanga S/C	16,028,342																															
2. Kabira S/C	8,144,314																															
3. Kashenshero S/C	13,285,312																															
4. Rurehe S/C	11,018,371																															
5. Katenga S/C	8,009,652																															
6. Bitereko S/C	13,635,960																															
7. Mutara S/C	10,333,709																															
8. Kiyanga S/C	9,193,002																															
9. Mitooma S/C	16,172,525																															
10. Nyakizinga S/C	8,250,143																															
11. Kashenshero T/C	4,015,000																															
12. Mitooma T/C	4,805,293																															
<b>Totals</b>	<b>122,891,623</b>																															

**Transparency and Accountability**

21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	Procurement Plan, contract awards and shortlisted firms were displayed on LG Council Hall notice board for the public.	<b>2</b>										
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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>The LG was number 86 with a score of 42% FY 2020/2021.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Score-%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Cross-cutting</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education</td> <td>58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water</td> <td>28</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The results were also displayed on the notice-board as seen on the date of assessment 1st December 2022.</p>		Score-%	Cross-cutting	38	Education	58	Health	44	Water	28	<b>2</b>
	Score-%													
Cross-cutting	38													
Education	58													
Health	44													
Water	28													
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	There was no evidence that the LG during the FY 2021/2022 conducted discussions with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation.	<b>0</b>										
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	The LG publicly avail information on, tax rates, collection procedures, and procedures for appeal as per evidence of circulars signed by the CAO, Akileng Simon Peter 18/08/2021. These were on livestock market charges, animal movement permit loading fees, trading licenses, ground rent, English beer licenses, liquor licenses, building plan inspection fees, charcoal loading, slaughter fees, loitering fees, milling machine fees, operational license, industry license, rental tax for commercial buildings and local service tax. It was also seen on the noticeboard by the assessor on 1st December 2022.	<b>1</b>										

Reporting to IGG  
Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure

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

The LG had no case on corruption as confirmed by Clerk to Council, Yusuf Lule and District Internal auditor in the FY 2021/2022.

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The assessor obtained and reviewed the PLE results for 2019 and 2020 from UNEB and calculated the percentage change in performance. it was noted that the PLE performance increased by (2.8%) as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3,716 out of 4,085 (90.9%) pupils who sat PLE in 2019 passed between grades 1 and 3, inclusive - Div1 (788), Div2 (2411) &amp; Div3 (517) adding up to 3,917. This excludes absentees (82).</li> <li>- 3722 out of 3971 (93.7%) pupils who sat PLE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3 Div1(982), Div2(2318) &amp; Div3 (422) adding up to 3722.This excludes absentees (57).</li> </ul> <p>Thus, a percentage increase of (2.8%) and a score is 2</p>	2
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The assessor obtained and reviewed the UCE results for 2019 and 2020 and calculated the percentage improvement in performance for USE schools as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 685 out of 1283 (53.3%) students who sat UCE in 12 USE schools) in 2019 passed between grade 1 and 3. Inclusive Div1 (71), Div2 (254) &amp; Div3 (360), adding up to 685. This excludes absentees1,291-08 adding up to 1283.</li> <li>- 828 out 1351 (61.3%) students who sat UCE (in 13 USE schools) in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3: Div1 (120), Div2 (309) &amp; Div3 (399) =828). There were no absentees.</li> </ul> <p>Thus, performance improvement of 8.0%. The score is 3</p>	3
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>To be scored Zero for all LGs in Y1 &amp; Y2</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

There was evidence that the education development grant was used on eligible activities as per Planning, Budgeting and Implementation guidelines for LGs (May 2019, page 11). The review of the LG quarterly performance report (Q4) FY 2021/22 indicated that, Ush.1,627,973, 000 was released in FY 2021/22, representing 150% of the approved budget of Ush. 1,087,013,000/=. The additional release was due to the supplementary budget. The expenditure on capital investment was as follows:

- Under output 078180: Four (4) classrooms rehabilitated at Kibungo PS and Nyakanoni PS in Kanyabwanga and Bitereko sub-counties respectively at the cost of Ush. 122,045,000/=
- Under output 078181: five-stance latrine constructed at Katerera PS in Kanyawanga at the cost of Ush. 23,000,000/=
- Under output 078183: provision of furniture at Bitooma PS and Ruhungye PS at the cost of Ush. 11,253,000/=
- Under output 078280: construction of Kitojo Seed Secondary schools in Kashenshero sub-county at the cost of Ush. 798,295,000/=.
- Computer supplies to Kitojo Seed School at the cost of Ush. 148,873,000/=
- The returned funds for Kitojo Seed balances as unspent balances Ush. 324,505,000/=

Thus, the score of 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 DEO, District Engineer, DCDO and Senior Environment Officer certified works on Education construction projects in FY 2021/2022 before the LG made payments to the contractors.</p> <p>The projects were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Katerera P/S by Bitereko Hardware &amp; Building construction. MITO601/WKS/21-22/00009. Requisitioned on 11/12/2021. Certified works on 13/12/2021. Paid on 14/01/2022 by EFT. 41490528, UGX.18,843,337.</li> <li>2. Construction of 2 classroom block &amp; 5 stances lined latrine at Kibungo P/S by Twin Technical &amp; Building construction Co. Limited. MITO601/WKS/21-22/00020. Requisitioned on 06/06/2022. Certified works on 13/06/2022. Paid on 29/06/2022 by EFT. 444582721, UGX.85, 380,840.</li> <li>3. Construction of classroom block at Nyakanoni P/S by Twinka enterprises (U) Ltd. MITO601/WKS/21-22/00008. Requisitioned on 03/03/2022. Certified works on 09/03/2022. Paid on 07/04/2022 by EFT. 42657032,UGX.53,004,184.</li> </ol>	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>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The indicator was tagged to seed secondary school which the LG did not implement in the period under review.</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"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG did not implement seed secondary school in the period under review</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"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the Education staffing structure, LG has an approved 1177 staff with a staffing filling of 1037 making 88% of staff filled in the department.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Mitooma LG education department had a consolidated school asset register for two FY2021/2022 dated 18th October 2021 and FY2020/2021 dated 18th June 2022.</p> <p>(i) The school asset register - FY2020/2021 contained the (105) UPE schools and (12) USE schools. There were 7 UPE (6.6%) and 9 USE (75%) schools with accommodation for 4 or more teachers, and none of the UPE schools met the basic requirements and standards set out by DES. In secondary schools, only 9 out of the 12 USE schools met the standard. In FY2020/21, the overall percentage of schools (UPE and USE) meeting basic requirements and minimum standards in LG 12 out of 117, representing 10.2%.</p> <p>(ii) The school asset register - FY2021/2022 contained the (105) UPE schools and (12) USE schools. There were 7 UPE (6.6%) and 9 USE (75%) schools with accommodation for 4 or more teachers and none (0%) of the UPE schools meet the basic requirements and standards set out by DES. For example, in 2 out of 3 sample schools: (1) Bitooma PS (with enrollment- 628): classroom-pupil ratio (1:62.8), Latrine-pupil ratio (1:31), Desk-pupil ratio (1:3.5); (2) Kirambi PS (with enrolment-415): classroom-pupil ratio (1:41.5), Latrine-pupil ratio (1:24.4), Desk-pupil ratio (1:4.5) and had only 2 teacher house. In secondary schools, only 9 out of the 12 USE schools meet the standards.</p> <p>In FY2021/22, the overall percentage of schools (UPE and USE) meeting basic requirements and minimum standards in LG 12 out of 118, representing 10.1%. Therefore, the average percentage of schools with basic requirements and minimum standards is <math>(10.1 + 10.2)/2 = 10\%</math>, which is less than 50%, hence a score of 0.</p>	0

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 list of primary school teacher deployment obtained from the DEO's office for 2021 indicated that (1037) teachers were deployed in (105) UPE schools in Mitooma DLG.

Verification was done in 03 sampled UPE schools and the following was established as per the deployment list from the DEO's office.

The number of teachers (14) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (14) in Bitooma PS, Katenga S/C. The number of teachers (16) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (16) in Ryakahimbi PS, and Mitooma TC. The number of teachers (09) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (09) in Kirambi PS, Mitooma S/C. Therefore, there was evidence that LG had accurately reported on teachers' deployment, score 2.



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 information on the LG education department consolidated asset register for FY 2021/22 and school asset registers of the sampled 3 UPE schools was verified in the sampled 03 UPE schools.

Specific details are documented below:

□ Bitooma PS: The education department merged school asset register for FY 2021/22 showed that the school had (10) classrooms, (16) latrines, (118) desks and (02) teacher accommodation while the school asset register had (10) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (178) desks and (01) teacher accommodation. This information was not consistent.

□ Ryakahimbi PS: The education department merged school asset register for FY 2021/22 showed that the school had (12) classrooms, (14) latrines, (140) desks and (03) teacher accommodation meanwhile there was no evidence of school asset at school for verification.

□ Kirambi PS: The education department merged school asset register for FY 2021/22 showed that the school had (12) classrooms, (14) latrines, (140) desks and (03) teacher accommodation while the school asset register had (10) classrooms, (17) latrine stances, (92) desks and (2) teacher accommodation. This was not consistent.

School FY 2020/21 No.of classrooms No.of toilets No.of desks Teacher houses

Bitooma PS Consolidated Asset Register 08  
16 118 02

School Asset Register 10 20 178 01

Ryakahimbi PS Consolidated Asset Register  
09 14 140 03

School Asset Register

Kirambi Consolidated Asset Register 08  
3bocks 42 02

School Asset Register 10 17 92 2

Therefore; the information was not 100% consistent , score 0

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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:

- If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4

- Between 80 - 99% score: 2

- Below 80% score 0

There was non-compliance to MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines. There was no evidence that any school submitted complete annual school reports and budgets in line with MoES guidelines, using formats on page(21-26) in Budgeting and Implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools (May 2019). i.e., (i) highlight school performance and school asset register,(ii) cash flow statements , (iii) annual budget and expenditure and (iii) school improvement plan by 30th January deadline. In some schools, headteachers submitted only highlight and school improvement plans using other templates. Therefore, school head teachers were not using the reporting formats in the sector guidelines and 0% school submission to LG, score: 0

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30- 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The assessor obtained and reviewed inspection reports/departmental minutes and copies of SIPs and found no evidence that the education department supported the UPE schools to prepare and implement school improvement plans (SIPs) in line with inspection recommendations as required in budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools (May 2019). Although the education department had distributed copies of these guidelines (May 2019) as well as an improved version (April 2022) to schools, headteachers were not implementing these guidelines.</p> <p>Verification at the school level revealed that none of the 03 UPE schools sampled (Bitooma PS, Ryakayimbi PS and Kirambi PS had SIPs in place in the required format (page 21) of the budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools (May 2019).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In Bitooma PS has prepared a school improvement plan using an old version of the template despite the fact that he was advised to prepare a SIP plan during the school inspection on 2nd September 2022.</li> <li>- In Rwakahimbi PS, the school improvement plan was in the older format.</li> <li>- In Kirambi PS, no school improvement plan in the new format.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the score of 0</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG submission on 9th November 2021 captured a list of government aided UPE schools (105), USE schools(13) and 2 tertiary institutions consistent with the information in excel data sheet (OTIMS) for FY 2021/22.</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>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>The assessor obtained and reviewed a list of schools and their staff and established that the LG has budgeted for school teachers as per staffing norms/guidelines.</p>	4
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Mitooma DLG budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of (7) teachers per school or a teacher per class in all the (105) Government aided primary schools. IPFs for Mitooma district has a total wage bill provision - UGX 7,865,896,923/= FY 2022/23 budgeted for (1037) primary teachers. There is evidence that the LG has a budget catering for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers, score 4</p>	
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>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p>	<p>The education department primary school deployment list for FY 2022/23 obtained from the DEO indicated that a total of (1037) teachers were deployed in (105) UPE schools in FY 2022/23 as per sector guidelines. e.g., all the (105) UPE schools had a minimum of (7) teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>Verification was done in 03 sampled UPE schools and the following was established as per the deployment/ school staff lists.</p>	
			<p>The number of teachers (14) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (14) in Bitooma PS, Katenga S/C.</p>	
			<p>The number of teachers (16) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (16) in Ryakahimbi PS, Mitooma TC.</p>	
			<p>The number of teachers (09) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (09) in Kirambi PS, Mitooma S/C. Hence, there was evidence that LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, a score of 3.</p>	

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The teacher deployment data had been displayed on school notice boards in all the 03 sampled UPE schools as indicated below:</p> <p>Display Bitooma PS (Katenga S/C) deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (14) teachers including the head teacher i.e., Male (5) and Female (09)</p> <p>Ryakahimbi PS (Mitooma TC) deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (16) teachers including the head teacher i.e., Males (10) and Females (06)</p> <p>Kirambi PS ( Mitooma S/C) deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (09) teachers including the head teacher i.e., Male (02) and Female (07)</p> <p>Thus, score 1</p>	1	
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence produced to show that all Primary School Head teachers were appraised, and reports submitted by SAS for the previous academic year. A sample of 10 files for primary schools' head teachers was taken as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kembabazi Joy Kwesigabo of Kanyabwanga PS was had an appraisal dated 29/12/2021</li> <li>2. Niwamanya Richard of Rweshama OS had an appraisal dated 30/12/2021</li> <li>3. Ashaba Verious of Rwempungu PS had an appraisal dated 30/12/2021</li> <li>4. Abarishaba jacintaa of Kirambi PS had an appraisal dated 3/12/2021</li> <li>5. Turyasingura Henry Rwaama of Rwenkureiju P S had an appraisal dated 29/12/2021</li> <li>6. kihembo Sandrah of Kyabahehi PS was appraised on 1/3/2022</li> <li>7. Birungi Grace of Kitaka PS was appraised on 30/12/2021</li> <li>8. Muramuzi Duncan of Ryanyamunyonyi PS was appraised on 30/12/2021</li> <li>9. Turyamureeba James of Nkinga PS was appraised on 12/12/2021</li> <li>10. Nahabwe Kam Asman of Rwemiyaga PS was appraised on 30/12/2021</li> </ol>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>					

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that all Secondary School head teachers were appraised by D/CAO for the previous FY.</p> <p>Files for secondary school head teachers were not available for assessment</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the staff in the education department were appraised against their performance plans in the previous FY .</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kyomugisa Sharon (Inspector of Schools) was appraised on 13/8/2022</li> <li>2. Tushabe Jane a Senior inspector of school was appraised on 15/8/2022</li> <li>3. Nyabahika Jacos Dickens an Education officer was appraised on 15/8/2022</li> <li>4. Namudu Aisha an Inspector of Schools was appraised on 15/8/2022</li> </ol>	2
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a training plan developed during FY 2021/22 to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level. The key activities are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sensitizing school committee members(SMCs &amp; PTA)</li> <li>- Training of senior women/men teachers.</li> <li>- Training of headteachers and their deputies on how to keep books of accounts</li> <li>- Training Bursars on Financial Management and Accountability</li> <li>- Sensitizing school communities on GBV and VAC</li> <li>- Etc.</li> </ul> <p>Hence , score 2.</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>There was evidence that LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th 2022.</p> <p>The submission letter for school enrolment for IPFs FY2022/2023 dated 17th November 2022 was received MoES on 18th November 2022. It included excel sheet confirming 105 UPE schools and 13 USE schools and 2 tertiary institutions. Therefore, there was 100% compliance, score:2</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>There was evidence that the Mitooma DLG allocated Ush. 41,663,000/= for school inspection and Ush. 87,886,000/= for monitoring and supervision as per performance contract Q4 report FY 2021/22 (page 55). The LG spent Ush. 104,546,000/=of the approved budget FY 2021/22.</p> <p>- The allocated funds were more than a minimum of 41,732,000/= for output (078401) and (Output 078401) as per the Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for LGs for the Education Sector (FY 2021/2022, page 11).</p> <p>- i.e., <math>[4,000,000 + (100,000*124) + 4,500,000 + (168,000*124)] = 41,732,000/=</math></p> <p>where 105 is the total number of schools(105 UPE and 13 USE, 95 private primary and 18 private secondary schools , 2 Tertiary institutions) in the district.</p> <p>Therefore, there was evidence that the LG was 100% compliance, score:2</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

The evidence shows the LG did not submit warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters.

Time taken:

Q 1- 9 days

Q 3 -21 days

Q 4-21 days.

The warranting dates were.

Notification if Expenditure Limits Warranted

Q 1 -06/07/2021  
15/07/2021

Q 3- 22/12/2021  
12/01/2022

Q 4- 04/04/2022  
25/04/2022

0

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

Evidence shows the LG did not invoice and communicate capitation releases to schools within three working days of release of MoFPED.

Time taken;

Q 1-18 days

Q3- 29 days

Q 4- 26 days

Notification of Cash release by MoFPED  
Invoiced                      Communicated

Q 1 -06/07/2021  
22/07/2021                      24/07/2021

Q 3- 22/12/2021  
17/01/2022                      20/01/2022

Q 4- 04/04/2022  
28/04/2022                      30/04/2022

0



Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

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

There was evidence that the education department held meetings to plan for inspection activities as shown below:

- On 6th May 2022, school inspectors held a preparatory meeting. The DIS gave a brief review of the previous term school inspection, and thereafter under-allocated school inspectors to different regions for Term II – 2022 school inspection schedule, e.g., Namuddu Aisha was assigned – Ruhinda central and Atwiine Angellah – Ruhinda North

- On 05th September 2022, school inspectors held a preparatory meeting. Under Min. 38/Educ./2022 the DIS reported the numbers of schools that were inspected in term II 2022. Thereafter, the school inspectors draw up a schedule for Term III 2022 school inspections.

- There was also evidence that the Term 1 2022 school inspection schedule was prepared on 10/01/2022.

Hence score of 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"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Mitooma district education department had three (3) school inspection reports as detailed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School inspection report for Term III 2021 stamped with 12th February 2022 of DLG. The report contained list of 101 UPE schools(96%) and 44 private schools. The main purpose of this inspection was to check the compliance of Covid19 SOPs in education institutions. with their enrolment before second closure due to</li> <li>- School inspection report for Term 1 2022, dated 17th May 2022 with 96 UPE schools(91%) and 52 private schools inspected. The key issues observed in the report were: high rate of teacher and learner absenteeism, teachers and learners needed psychosocial support after COVID-19 home lockdown and application SOPs was still a challenge in many schools. The report was complied and sent to the DES on 1st June 2022.</li> <li>- School inspection report for Term II 2022, dated 1st September 2022 was complied and sent to DES on 26th September 2022. The number of schools inspected were 98 UPE schools(93%) and 42 private schools inspected. Key issues</li> <li>- This report contained details of school enrollment, staff attendance details, areas of strengthen, areas of improvement and recommendation. The has evidence of DIS talking to teachers and learners during inspection.</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>The assessor noted that 95 % of the UPE schools were inspected, thus, the score of 1.</p>
----	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of presentation and discussion of school inspection reports during departmental meetings in FY 2021/22 as detailed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The education department held a meeting on 10th May 2022 and discussed the inspection report. On the side of strength: school inspectors reported that 94% of the schools visited had hand washing facilities with soap, schools had displays of COVID-19 messages and most schools had displays of instructional materials in their classrooms. As areas of improvement, members discussed the concern of poor infrastructure in schools, no display of capitation grants, and inadequate latrine coverage in schools such as Kyamuyanga PS, Rutookye PS and Kashenshero PS.</li> <li>- School Inspection evaluation meeting on</li> </ul>
----	---	---	--

17th October 2022, DIS presented the findings under Min.43/Educ/2022. Some of the issues discussed were: the improvement of infrastructure such as school libraries and furniture in Karoza PS, Rwemigango PS etc.

- Department meeting held on 19th September 2022, under Min. 35. Discussion, on the issue of high-rate teachers requesting retirement, DIS suggested the submissions be made early enough for replacement to be made in time. On the issues of Rutooma parents' PS, the department resolved to visit the school as a team for support supervision.

During the visit for verification, it was noted that school inspectors had visited the school, notably;

- Bitooma PS: school inspector (Joshua) visited on 2nd September 2022 and recommended that the headteacher prepares SIP; Dicken visited on 15th February 2022 and recommended improvement on hygiene in school. In the SMC/PTA joint meeting of 25th October 2022 under Min. 10/2022(b) the headteacher reported the inspection feedback and the parents recommended that the boy's latrine be repaired.

- In Ryakahimbi PS: the school inspector visited the school on 18th July 2022 and gave feedback on the indiscipline of pupils. In another visit by the inspector of schools (Dickens) recommended the improvement of school hygiene. There was no access to establish what was discussed because the headteacher was new in the school.

- In Kirambi PS, the school inspector (Aisha) visited the school on 12th July 2022 and recommended that the school should have an updated PTA/SMC. In the meeting of joint PTA/SMC on 22nd November 2022, the headteacher reported the school inspection feedback, and members resolved that a new PTA/SMC be in place in term I 2023.

- Hence, a score of 2.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of DES acknowledgement letters for submission of school inspection report dated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Term III- 2021, was forwarded by the DEO on 13th February 2022</li> <li>- Term 1 -2022, submitted by Sports Officer and received by Winnie Kirenda for DES on 6th May 2022.</li> <li>- Term 1I -2022, submitted by Sports Officer and received by Winnie Kirenda for DES on 26th September 2022.</li> </ul> <p>Hence, score 2</p>	2
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>There was evidence that the standing committee in charge of social services met and discussed education issues related to education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the meeting 20th May 2022, under Min 10/SSC/2022 the committee discussed abscondment of teachers and recommended that such teachers to be replaced. They also recommended that parish with government primary schools be identified and submitted for planning</li> <li>- In the meeting of 22nd March 2022, under Min. 09/2021, members discussed the issue of non-compliance private schools to SOPs and resolved all private schools should meet basic requirements and minimum standards in order to operate. Under Min. 11/2021, the committee resolved that the balance on the vehicle purchase be used to construct a latrine at Kibungo PS</li> </ul> <p>Hence, score 2</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, score: 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school. The DEO held a meeting on 17th June 2022, where she sensitized the PTA on their roles and management of post-COVID-19 effects among pupils while at home so that they report to school. In this meeting, the area member of parliament was in attendance. On 19th March 2022, the DEO was invited to attend the PTA AGM in Bweibaare PS, where she sensitized the participants about the role of SMC, PTA committee and parents in ensuring that pupils report to schools on time. She noted that the challenge of low enrolment is caused by non-supportive parents. Hence, score 2</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 information on the LG education department consolidated asset register for FY 2021/22 and school asset registers of the sampled 3 UPE schools was verified in the sampled 03 UPE schools.

Specific details are documented below:

□ Bitooma PS: The education department merged school asset register for FY 2021/22 showed that the school had (10) classrooms, (16) latrines, (118) desks and (02) teacher accommodations while the school asset register had (10) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (178) desks and (01) teacher accommodation. This information was not consistent.

□ Ryakahimbi PS: The education department merged school asset register for FY 2021/22 showed that the school had (12) classrooms, (14) latrines, (140) desks and (03) teacher accommodation meanwhile there was no evidence of school asset at school for verification.

□ Kirambi PS: The education department merged school asset register for FY 2021/22 showed that the school had (12) classrooms, (14) latrines, (140) desks and (03) teacher accommodations while the school asset register had (10) classrooms, (17) latrine stances, (92) desks and (2) teacher accommodation. This was not consistent.

Therefore; the information was not 100% consistent , score 0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP 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>The LG conducted desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget and investments were obtained from the LGDP III-2019/2020 -2024/2025. The projects were appraised by; DEO, District Planner, DCDO and Senior Environment Officer on 08/07/2021</p> <p>The following projects were appraised;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a latrine at Kibungo primary School in Kanyabwanga Subcounty</li> <li>2. Renovation of a classroom block at Kibungo P/S in Kayabwanga SC</li> <li>3. Renovation of a classroom block at Nyakanoni P/S in Kanyabwanga SC</li> <li>4. Supply of furniture at Bitooma P/S in Katenga SC</li> <li>5. Supply of furniture at Ruhungye P/S in Kiyanga SC</li> <li>6. Latrine construction at Katerera P/S</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
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>The LG provided a field appraisal for, technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs. The appraisal dates were; 12/07/2021 and 14/07/2021. The appraisals were carried out by; DEO, Inspector of Schools, District Planner, DCDO and Senior Environment Officer.</p> <p>The following projects were appraised;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a latrine at Kibungo primary School in Kanyabwanga Sub county.</li> <li>2. Renovation of a classroom block at Kibungo P/S in Kayabwanga SC.</li> <li>3. Renovation of a classroom block at Nyakanoni P/S in Kanyabwanga SC.</li> <li>4. Supply of furniture at Bitooma P/S in Katenga SC.</li> <li>5. Supply of furniture at Ruhungye P/S in Kiyanga SC.</li> <li>6. Latrine construction at Katerera p/s.</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	Review of the approved LG Procurement plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 12th/08/2022 Ref. CR/105/2, there was evidence that seed secondary school at Kitojo was incorporated. The project had a budget of UGX 777,640,580/= with open domestic bidding as the proposed procurement method.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was evidence that the school infrastructure were approved by the contracts committee. For instance, rehabilitation of classrooms at Kibungo Primary School and Nyakanoni Primary School was approved but the contracts committee in the meeting held on 18th/01/2021 under minute number MIN:124/CC/2021-22	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The established Project Implementation Team did not meet the requirements of the indicator. The presented team included Superintendent of Works, Environment Officer and Principal Community Development Officer. This fell short of inclusion of key members like Project Manager (Head of User department) Labour officer and Clerk of Works.	<b>0</b>
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>	In the financial year under review, the LG did not implement a seed school project. The indicator was tagged to seed secondary schools.	<b>1</b>
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>	The indicator was tagged to seed secondary schools which the LG did not implement in FY 2021/2022.	<b>1</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of supervision of school infrastructure projects by technical officers during critical stages. Reviewed were supervision reports including report dated 7th/03/2022 for rehabilitation of Nyakanoni Primary School. The report was compiled by project supervisor. Presented for review was social and environment monitoring report for the rehabilitation of Nyakanoni Primary School. Report indicated general cleanliness of site, free from waste, debris generated were removed. The report was signed by CDO and Environment Officer.</p> <p>The construction of classroom block and 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Kibungo Primary School. The supervision report pointed out good progress of physical works and adherence to technical specifications. The CDO and Environment Officers equally compiled reports about the project as evidenced by reports dated 13th/04/2022 and 15th/04/2022.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The projects were certified by the DEO, District Engineer, DCDO, Senior Environment Officer, but not paid within the timeframe of 14 days. The the sector infrastructure projects payments to contractors were not made within the mandatory 14 days timeline.</p> <p>The sample projects were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Katerera P/S by Bitereko Hardware &amp; Building construction. MITO601/WKS/21-22/00009. Requisitioned on 11/12/2021. Certified works on 13/12/2021. Paid on 14/01/2022 by EFT. 41490528, UGX.18,843,337.</li> <li>2. Construction of 2 classroom block &amp; 5 stances lined latrine at Kibungo P/S by Twin Technical &amp; Building construction Co. Limited. MITO601/WKS/21-22/00020. Requisitioned on 06/06/2022. Certified works on 13/06/2022. Paid on 29/06/2022 by EFT. 444582721, UGX.85, 380,840.</li> <li>3. Construction of classroom block at Nyakanoni P/S by Twinka enterprises (U) Ltd. MITO601/WKS/21-22/00008. Requisitioned on 03/03/2022. Certified works on 09/03/2022. Paid on 07/04/2022 by EFT. 42657032, UGX.53,004,184.</li> </ol> <p>The paymetns to the contactors were not made within the mandatory 14 days mandatory days.</p>	0



13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	The LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to Procurement Unit. This was on 23rd/03/2021.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	The indicator was tagged to seed secondary school which the LG did not implement such projects.	<b>1</b>

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, <i>score: 3, else score: 0</i>	No grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework under Education.	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation  <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence availed to show that the DLG had disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, energy and water conservation.	<b>0</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that costed ESMPs were incorporated within the the BOQs of education projects;  Construction of classroom block at Nyakanoni primary school had a costed ESMP of UGX: 630,000 in the BoQs.  Construction of classroom block at Kibungo primary school had a costed ESMP of UGX: 350,000 in the BoQs.  Construction of classroom block at Katerera primary school had a costed ESMP of UGX: 100,000 in the BoQs.	<b>2</b>

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of land ownership for projects implemented under Education. These included;</p> <p>Construction of classroom block at Nyakanoni primary school .</p> <p>Construction of classroom block at Kibungo primary school.</p> <p>Construction of classroom block at Katerera primary school.</p>	<b>0</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO did not conduct support supervision and monitoring on a monthly basis for projects under Education.</p>	<b>0</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p>Construction of classroom block at Nyakanoni primary school had an E&amp;S certification prepared and signed on 01/04/2022.</p> <p>Construction of classroom block at Kibungo primary school had an E&amp;S certification prepared and signed on 21/06/2022.</p> <p>Construction of classroom block at Katerera primary school had an E&amp;S certification prepared and signed on 08/07/2022.</p>	<b>1</b>

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG registered more than 20% increase in utilization of health care services in deliveries.</p> <p>The sampling done from Health facilities conducting deliveries indicated 29.12% increment.</p> <p>This was evidenced as below;</p> <p>Financial year 2020-2021 total deliveries indicated a total of 4285</p> <p>Financial year 2021-2022 total deliveries indicated a total of 5533</p> <p>Previous financial year -the year before divided by year before * 100.</p> <p>Therefore, <math>5533-4285=1248</math> divided by <math>4285*100=29.12\%</math></p>	<b>2</b>
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG budgeted and spent UGX. 1,101,002,000 (ABPR, page, 16) on health sector development grant projects as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of staff house at Bukuba HCIII, UGX. 150,000,000 (ABPR 52).</li> <li>2. Renovation of Kabira and Rwoburunga HCIII, UGX. 152,608,000 (ABPR, page, 53).</li> <li>3. Construction of theatre at Bitereko HCIII, UGX. 316,404,000(ABPR, page 53)</li> <li>4. Supply and installation of medical equipment of Nyakishojwa and Ryengyerero HCII,UGX. 360,000,000 (ABPR page, 53).</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	The DHO, District Engineer, District Natural Resource Officer, DCDO, certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors and suppliers.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		The payments made were as follows;	
			1. Bukuba HC 11 Staff House Construction by Bitereko Hardware & Building Construction. MITO 601/WRKS/21-22/00012. Requisitioned for funds on 14/02/2022. Certified works on 01/03/2022. Paid on 22/03/2022 by EFT.42251099, UGX. 36,159,627.	
			2. Renovation of Kabira Inpatient Ward by Twinka Enterprises (U) Ltd. MITO601/WRKS/21-22/00021. Requisitioned for funds on 30/05/2022. Certified works on 06/06/2022. Paid on 29/06/2022 by EFT.44582595, UGX. 50,646,444.	
			2. Bukuba HC11 Staff House Construction by Bitereko Hardware& Building Construction. MITO 601/WRKS/21-22/00012. Requisitioned on 14/06/2022. Certified works on 15/06/2022. Paid on 29/06/2022 by EFT.8089254,UGX.8,089,254.	
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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	According to the LG Procurement Plan FY 2021, the upgrade of Mayanga Health Centre II to III had a budget of UGX 820,848,000/= . Review of contract agreement signed between Mitooma District LG and M/S Kaleeta Construction Co.Ltd dated 17th/02/2021 the contract price was UGX 645,500,575/= . The variation was 21%. This was above +/- 20%	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	The contract agreement for Mayanga Health Centre upgrade was signed on 17th/02/2021 between Mitooma District LG and M/S Kaleeta Construction Co. Ltd. From the annual performance report 2021/2022, the project was reported at 70% completion. By the time of assessment, the project was still on-going. This was captured during exit meeting.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>		

4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	According to the Health staffing structure, the approved staff positions are 141 and 187 are filled making an average staffing of 78%	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	The LG health infrastructure construction project of upgrade of Mayanga Health Centre II to III met the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the site visit, it was established that the contractor was still on site and works were still on going. Existing on site was a structure for maternity ward/general constructed with in the approved standard drawings providing for waiting circulation area, Female, pediatric, PNC &amp; male wards, records room, kangaroo room, Pre-Natal, midwifery and Doctor's rooms, Linen store, sterilizing, delivery, and sluise rooms and a 4-stance VIP latrine, a placenta pit, medical waste disposal pit. On spot measurements were taken on the maternity ward structure as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Male ward dimensions:4.2M/5.16M</li> <li>• Front windows were 8 and measured 1.5M/1.5M against standard.</li> <li>• Front and back doors were 3 and measured 1.5M/2.4M standard</li> <li>• Apron was 0.6M standard</li> <li>• Side ramp measured 1.8M width</li> </ul> <p>The contractor had equally planted creeping grass as required</p>	

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The information on positions of health workers filled was accurate. This was evidenced on the deployment staff lists from the DHO of 30th October 2022 and that on the staff lists and attendance registers at the 3 sampled health facilities of Mitooma Health centre IV, Kashenshero Health centre III and Kabira Health centre III as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At Mitooma Health center IV, 43 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 43 staff list of November 2022 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility</li> <li>2. At Kashenshero Health center III, 15 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 15 staff list of 1st November 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit.</li> <li>3. At Kabira Health center III, 12 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 12 staff list dated 1st July 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board.</li> </ol> <p>The information on positions of health workers filled was accurate</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 information on health facilities upgraded or constructed was accurate.</p> <p>Mayanga health facility was upgraded from health center II to III in the previous financial year as reflected in the PBS report</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Work plans and budgets to the DHO for the previous financial year.</p> <p>The sampled health facilities of Mitooma, Kashenshero and Kabira submitted as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitooma Health centre IV did not submit</li> <li>2. Kashenshero health center III submitted on 10th March 2021 and;</li> <li>3. Kabira Health centre III did not submit</li> </ol> <p>Of the 3 sampled health facilities, only Kashenshero submitted the annual work plan and budget</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 Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The sampled Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>The submissions were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitooma Health center IV submitted on 13th July 2022</li> <li>2. Kashenshero Health center III submitted on 15th July 2022 and;</li> <li>3. Kabira Health center III submitted on 18th July 2022</li> </ol> <p>Kabira Annual budget did not comply to the timeline submission by July 15th of the current FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines as it submitted on 18th July 2022.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	---	--	----------

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 Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The health facilities developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporated performance issues identified in assessment reports for the current financial year as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitooma IV submitted on 16th Aug 2022</li> <li>2. Kashenshero III submitted on 16th June 2022 and;</li> <li>3. Kabira III submitted on 1st July 2022.</li> </ol> <p>The performance issues identified from the improvement plans included; purchase of medicines, conducting immunization and antenatal integrated outreaches, conducting regular review meetings and conducting regular mentorships.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	---	--	----------

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 Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The health facilities submitted 100% up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter).</p> <p>Monthly and quarterly reports for the 3 sampled health facilities of Mitooma health center IV, Kashenshero health center III and Kabira Health center III as evidenced below;</p> <p>Mitooma health facility submitted as follows; 7th Aug, 4th Sept, 3th Oct, 4th Nov, 5th Dec, 6th Jan, 5th Feb, 7th March, 6th April, 5th May, 6th Jun and 4th July</p> <p>Kashenshero health facility submitted as follows; 6th Aug, 4th Sept, 4th Oct, 6th Dec, 5th Jan, 6th Feb, 5th March, 6th April, 6th May, 4th Jun and 7th July</p> <p>Kabira Health facility submitted as follows; 4th Aug, 7th Sept, 5th Oct, 6th Nov, 7th Dec, 5th Jan, 6th Feb, 6th Mar, 6th April, 5th May, 5th Jun and 5th July</p> <p>The submissions of 3 facilities were timely of all monthly (12) and quarterly (4) reports for the previous FY</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 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>The health facilities submitted 100% of the Results Based Financing (RBF) invoices but not timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter).</p> <p>The sampled health facilities submitted as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitooma IV submitted on 23rd July 2021</li> <li>2. Kashenshero III submitted on 27th July 2021 and,</li> <li>3. Kabira III submitted on 23rd July 2021</li> </ol> <p>The dates of submission however did not comply to the timelines as it was beyond 15th July.</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>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 verified and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all the 9 RBF Health Facilities. This was evidenced by submission letter for quarter 4 dated 26th April 2022 to Mbarara RBF region and a submission letter from CAO to PS Ministry of Health dated 26th April 2022. However, this submission was not timely as it was beyond the 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter.</p>	0															
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>																			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports in time.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="796 824 1401 1120"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Deadline for submission</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q 1-</td> <td>30/10/2021</td> <td>26/10/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 2 -</td> <td>31/01/2022</td> <td>05/01/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 3 -</td> <td>30/04/2022</td> <td>28/04/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 4 -</td> <td>31/07/2022</td> <td>30/07/2022</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The reports were submitted within the one month deadline after the quarter.</p>		Deadline for submission	Date	Q 1-	30/10/2021	26/10/2021	Q 2 -	31/01/2022	05/01/2022	Q 3 -	30/04/2022	28/04/2022	Q 4 -	31/07/2022	30/07/2022	1
	Deadline for submission	Date																	
Q 1-	30/10/2021	26/10/2021																	
Q 2 -	31/01/2022	05/01/2022																	
Q 3 -	30/04/2022	28/04/2022																	
Q 4 -	31/07/2022	30/07/2022																	
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>																			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). This was evidenced from the undated PIP signed the DHO and approved by the CAO and DPTC Chairman</p> <p>The PIP however did not incorporate plans for the weakest performing Health facilities for implementation.</p>	0															
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>																			

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The plans for the weakest performing health facilities were not implemented as the PIP did not incorporate improvement plans.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not budget for health workers following guidelines / staffing norms. Under vote 893, the approved wage of 3.823.106.000/=, the LG budgeted for 321 staff instead of the 386 approved structure.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not deploy health workers as per guidelines as the health facilities did not have at least 75% as staff required in accordance with the staffing norms.</p> <p>The staff lists of the facilities against the staffing norms were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitooma IV had 43 out of 49=87.7%</li> <li>2. Kabira III had 17 out of 19 =89.45</li> <li>3. Kanywabwanga III had 13 out of 19=68.4%</li> <li>4. Rwoburungwa HC III had 11 out of 19=57.8</li> <li>5. Kashenshero III had 15 out of 19=78.9%</li> <li>6. Bitereko III had 15 out of 19=78.9%</li> </ol> <p>Kanywabwanga III (68.4%) and Rwoburungwa III (57.8%) did not make it to at least 75% as a requirement.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

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

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

The health workers were working in health facilities where they were deployed.

The reviewed Health workers' staff lists, facility attendance book/register (DHMT supervision/ monitoring reports; Automated Attendance Analysis (AAA) indicated that the health workers were working where they were deployed as reflected from the 3 sampled facilities below;

1. At Mitooma Health center IV, 43 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 43 staff list of November 2022 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility

2. At Kashenshero Health center III, 15 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 15 staff list of 1st November 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit.

3. At Kabira Health center III, 12 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 12 staff list dated 1st July 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board.

3

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

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

There was evidence that the LG had publicized health worker's deployment and disseminated as evidenced by the display of the list of deployed health workers on health facilities notice boards.

The displayed lists indicated the name of the facility, name of the staff, cadre, and gender among others as they appeared on the deployment list from the DHO's office

1. At Mitooma Health center IV, 43 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 43 staff list of November 2022 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility

2. At Kashenshero Health center III, 15 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 15 staff list of 1st November 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit.

3. At Kabira Health center III, 12 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 12 staff list dated 1st July 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility

2

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

There was evidence to show that all health in charges were appraised for the previous FY. 10 files of In-charges were reviewed and indicated as follows;

1. Kobusingye Cleopas of Kabira HC III was appraised on 14/7/2022
2. Abaireho Lydia of Kashenshero HC III was appraised on 7/7/2022
3. Otunga Anselimu of Mitara HC III was appraised on 14/7/2022
4. Aryaturinda Ananias of Bitereko HC III was appraised on 14/7/2022
5. Nabimanya Tananzo of Bikumba HC II was appraised on 4/7/2022
6. Muhwezi Nelson of Kanabwanga HCIII was appraised on 2/9/2022
7. Bwitirire Justine of Bikongoro HCII was appraised on 2/7/2022
8. Kyomugisha Dafroza of Iramira HC II was appraised on 5/7/2022
9. Atuhairi Sannet of Kibaare HC II was appraised on 12/7/2022
10. Natukwasa Berline of Mayanga HCII was appraised on 12/7/2022

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	<p>There was evidence that facility in charges conducted appraisals for health workers in the previous FY. A sample of 10 files of health workers was reviewed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Akampwera Agatha a nursing office was appraised on 14/7/2022</li> <li>2. Kyomugisha Mary a nursing officer was appraised on 22/7/2022</li> <li>3. Kambabazi Dezirata an Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 5/7/2022</li> <li>4. Kamajani Bonny a Nursing officer was appraised on 6/7/2022</li> <li>5. Natukunda Monic a Nursing officer was appraised on 22/7/2022</li> <li>6. Nampa Abius an Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 14/7/2022</li> <li>7. Musimenta Pamela a Nursing officer in psychiatry was appraised on 24/7/20022</li> <li>8. Kamondo Ivan an Assistant Inventory Management Officer was appraised on 14/7/2022</li> <li>9. Nyakato Passy an assistant nursing officer was appraised on 23/7/2022</li> <li>10. Mbabazi Paskalina an assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 8/7/2022</li> </ol>	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	<p>There was evidence of corrective action by DHO based on appraisal reports. The DHO compiled and submitted staff training needs for health workers arising out of appraisal reports which were incorporated in the annual training gaps for the health department. (HRM training needs submitted to CAO, dated 21/9/2022)</p>	2
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	<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 conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the training report on Disease surveillance (DSR/VDPS) Strengthening dated 3rd December 2021 where 12 health workers attended.</p>	1

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG documented training activities in the training CPD database. This was evidenced on the DHOs health workers training list.</p>	<b>1</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

**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 letter from the CAO notifying the MOH in writing of the list of facilities accessing the PHC NWR Grants (GoU and PNFP that received PHC NWR grants) was not required.</p> <p>All the health facilities in the LG received PHC funds for the 4 quarters annually for the previous financial year.</p>	<b>2</b>
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Mitooma LG PHC budget for FY 2021/2022 was UGX. 283,918,000 (ABPR, page, 16) and allocated, UGX. 48,725,000 (page, 50) for monitoring and service delivery. This was 17.2% which was beyond the requirement of 15% maximum.</p>	<b>0</b>

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 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG did not timely warrant direct transfers to health facilities in accordance to the requirements of not more than 5 working days. Time taken;

Q 1-9 days

Q 2-13 days

Q 3- 21 days

Q 4- 21days

The warrants were made on the following dates;

Notification of Expenditure Limits	Warranted
Q 1 -06/07/2020	15/07/2021
Q 2 -30/09/2020	13/10/2021
Q 3 -22/12/2021	12/01/2022
Q 4 -04/04/2021	25/04/2022

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 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG did not invoice and transfer PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter.

For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular was dated 06/07/2021, warranted by CAO on 15/07/2021, invoiced on 21/07/2021 and transferred funds to LLGs and facilities on 28/07/2021.

For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30/09/2021, warranted by CAO on 13/10/2021, invoiced on 17/10/2021 and transferred funds to LLGs and facilities on 29/10/2021.

For Quarter 3, the MoFPED circular is dated 22/12/2021, warranted by CAO on 12/01/2022, invoiced on 17/01/2022 and transferred funds to LLGs and facilities on 20/01/2022.

For Quarter 4, MoFED circular is dated 04/04/2022, warranted by CAO on 25/04/2022, invoiced on 27/04/2022 and transferred funds to LLGs and facilities on 28/04/2022.

In all the four quarters, the transfer of PHC NWR grants was not effected within the 5 days deadline.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG did not publicize all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED. Time taken;</p> <p>1 Q-21 days Q 2- 29 days Q 3-29 days Q 4- 24 days.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="794 510 1252 913"> <thead> <tr> <th>Cash release Publicized</th> <th>Communicated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q 1- 06/07/2021 28/07/2021</td> <td>22/07/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 2- 30/09/2021 29/10/2021</td> <td>20/10/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 3 -22/012/2021 20/01/2022</td> <td>18/01/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 4 -04/04/2022 28/04/2022</td> <td>28/04/2022.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Cash release Publicized	Communicated	Q 1- 06/07/2021 28/07/2021	22/07/2021	Q 2- 30/09/2021 29/10/2021	20/10/2021	Q 3 -22/012/2021 20/01/2022	18/01/2022	Q 4 -04/04/2022 28/04/2022	28/04/2022.	0
Cash release Publicized	Communicated													
Q 1- 06/07/2021 28/07/2021	22/07/2021													
Q 2- 30/09/2021 29/10/2021	20/10/2021													
Q 3 -22/012/2021 20/01/2022	18/01/2022													
Q 4 -04/04/2022 28/04/2022	28/04/2022.													
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG health department implemented the actions recommended by the DHMT quarterly performance review meetings held during the previous FY.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the implementation reports and quarterly review minutes below as required by the assessment procedure.</p> <p>The evidenced quarterly review meeting minutes and implementation reports of;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dated 17th November 2021</li> <li>2. Dated 7th December 2021</li> <li>3. Dated 28th February 2022 and;</li> <li>4. Dated 20th June 2022</li> </ol> <p>Recommendations noted from 28th February 2022 under minute 5/2022 (Matters arising and way forward) included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Follow up on RBF by the DHO for Kashenshero HC III.</li> <li>2. Special recognition for the best performing health facilities.</li> <li>3. The midwives were appraised for the tremendous work in all the health facilities.</li> <li>4. The medicine supervisor to periodically update the district health team</li> </ol>	2										



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG performance review meetings did not involve all the 10 health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs and key LG departments.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the attached attendances of the minutes of the meetings held on;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dated 17th November 2021 had 7 attendants.</li> <li>2. Dated 7th December 2021 had 10 attendants</li> <li>3. Dated 28th February 2022 had 11 attendants and;</li> <li>4. Dated 20th June 2022 had 10 attendants</li> </ol> <p>The participants included Health facility In-charges, focal persons, RHITES, JCRC project, DHT members and the DHO</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>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 did not supervise 100% of HC IV of Mitooma at least once every quarter in the previous FY</p> <p>The Assessment team reviewed the supervision reports for quarters 1, 3 and 4 for FY 2021/2022 Quarter 2 reports were not availed. The supervision was conducted as indicted below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. QTR 1 dated 4th October 2021</li> <li>2. QTR 2 -Not availed</li> <li>3. QTR 3 dated 8th April 2022 and,</li> <li>4. QTR 4 dated 30th June 2022.</li> </ol> <p>Supervision was not conducted 100% as quarter 2 reports were not availed to the assessment team.</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>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>	<p>The DHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY but not all quarter reports were availed for evidence.</p> <p>The supervision and monitoring reports for the health sub districts indicated that HSD supervision was done as evidenced below;</p> <p>Q1 dated -Not availed</p> <p>Q2 dated 13th January 2022</p> <p>Q3 dated -Not availed and;</p> <p>Q4 dated 10th June 2022</p> <p>Only two quarters out of 4 were supervised.</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 recommendations for specific corrective actions were not followed up as evidenced from the 3 quarterly supervision reports that were availed to the assessment team</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>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The medicine supervision report dated 10th August 2021 did not indicate whether the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies in FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>The report did not have an attachment of the health facilities supported. The recommendations did not also address feedback to In-charges of health facilities.</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG DHOs health office budget was UGX. 48,725,000. The total amount allocated to health promotion and prevention activities was UGX. 23,277,000 (ABPR-page, 53). This was a proportion of 48% which was more than 30% maximum.</p>	2

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities were conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the Health Promotion Activity reports and DHMT meeting minutes which established that implementation of health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in the previous FY were conducted.</p> <p>The documentary evidence availed during the assessment time included reports dated 4th February 2022, 1st December 2021 and 13th April 2022 of the conducted activities below;</p> <p>The evidenced implementation reports included; social mobilization for community COVID 19, Radio talk shows and Polio house to house mobilization.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

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 DHT followed up the actions taken by the DHT on health promotion and disease prevention from the Health promotion.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the Quarterly progress reports, DHT/ MHT minutes follow-up actions were taken on the health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization.</p> <p>Actions included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Controlled spread of Covid-19 as a result of mass awareness and sensitization radio talk shows</li> <li>2. Community response towards polio vaccination</li> <li>3. Community health awareness</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**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 LG did not avail an updated asset register that set out the health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards as per the format.</p> <p>There was no documentary evidence provided to the assessment team during the time of assessment.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were:

(i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (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));

score 1 or else score 0

The LG provided evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the FY 2021/2022 were developed from LGDPIII) . The LG carried out the desk appraisals and were and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding sources. These were discussed in the TPC meeting held on 08/07/2021.

These were profiled in LG DP III, pages 133-188.

Projects were appraised by; DHO, District Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment Officer and District Engineer.

Projects appraised were.

1. Upgrade of Nyakishojwa HCIII in Mitooma sub county
2. Upgrade of Ryengyerero HCIII in Mutara subcounty
3. Rehabilitation of Kabira HCIII in Kabira town council.
4. Upgrade of Bukuba HCIII in Kashenshero sub county
5. Construction of staff houses at Bukuba HCIII.
6. Renovation of Rwoburunga HCIII in Rwoburunga sub county.
7. Supply and installation of medical equipment at Ryengyerero HCII in Mutara SC.
8. Supply and installation of medical equipment for Nyakishojwa in Mitooma SC.

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</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 LG provided evidence that field appraisals were conducted to check for technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability, and customized designs to site. These were profiled in the LG DP III, pages, 133-188, AWP- page, 58.</p> <p>The projects were appraised by; DHO, District Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment Officer 12/07/2021 and 14/07/2021</p> <p>Appraised projects were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upgrade of Nyakishojwa HCIII in Mitooma sub county</li> <li>2. Upgrade of Ryengyerero HCIII in Mutara subcounty</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of Kabira HCIII in Kabira town council.</li> <li>4. Upgrade of Bukuba HCIII in Kashenshero sub county</li> <li>5. Construction of staff houses at Bukuba HCIII.</li> <li>6. Renovation of Rwoburunga HCIII in Rwoburunga sub county.</li> <li>7. Supply and installation of medical equipment at Ryengyerero HCII in Mutara SC.</li> <li>8. Supply and installation of medical equipment for Nyakishojwa in Mitooma SC.</li> </ol>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that 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;</p> <p>Construction/ upgrading of Mayanga HC II to HC III was screened on 23/03/2021 with environment ad social mitigation measures costed at UGX: 43,850,000.</p> <p>Construction of staff house at Bukuba HC III was screened on 12/07/2021 with environment ad social mitigation measures costed at UGX: 9,300,000.</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>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG health department submitted all its procurement requests for FY 2022/2023 to PDU late. This was on 5th/07/2022</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>The LG health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to PDU for the construction of 2-in 1 staff house at Mayanga HC III on 25th/10/2022. This was beyond the first quarter of FY 2022/2023</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The was evidence that health infrastructure investments for FY 2021/2022 were approved by the contracts committee. Reviewed was committee meeting minutes dated 18th/01/2021 where under minute MIN:124/CC/2020-21 consideration of request for approval of evaluation report for upgrade of Mayanga HC II to III. Contract awarded to M/S Kaleeta Construction Co. Ltd at UGX 645,500,575/= . The was evidence of clearance by Solicitor General in a letter dated 8th/02/2021 Ref.DLAS/MBR/015/2021</p> <p>Minutes of contracts committee meeting held on 18th/10/2021 under minute number MIN:031/CC/2021-22 approval of an evaluation report for construction of two in one staff house at Bukuba HCII. Contract awarded to M/S Bitereko Hardware and Building Construction Co. Ltd at a cost of UGX 148,750,037/= VAT Inclusive</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>Presented was a memo dated 1st/12/2020 Ref.CR.207/1 in which the Ag. District Engineer, District Natural Resources Officer, District Health Officer, Physical Planner and District Community Development Officer were appointed members of the Project Implementation Team. The composition lacked inclusion of Labour Officer and Clerk of Works.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>The LG health infrastructure construction project of upgrade of Mayanga Health Centre II to III met the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p>	<b>1</b>
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Existing on site was a structure for maternity ward/general constructed with in the approved standard drawings providing for waiting circulation area, Female, pediatric, PNC &amp; male wards, records room, kangaroo room, Pre-Natal, midwifery and Doctor's rooms, Linen store, sterilizing, delivery, and sluise rooms and a 4-stance VIP latrine, a placenta pit, medical waste disposal pit. On spot measurements were taken on the maternity ward structure as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Male ward dimensions:4.2M/5.16M</li> <li>• Front windows were 8 and measured 1.5M/1.5M against standard.</li> <li>• Front and back doors were 3 and measured 1.5M/2.4M standard</li> <li>• Apron was 0.6M standard</li> <li>• Side ramp measured 1.8M width</li> </ul>	
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>There was no evidence that the Clerk of Works maintained records that are consolidated weekly to District Engineer in copy to the DHO. The presented copies of report were compiled monthly and not copied to DHO. This was pointed out during exit meeting.</p>	<b>0</b>
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The indicator required monthly site meetings. Presented were few sets of minutes including one held on 18th/01/2021 (during the launch) and minutes of meeting held 27th/09/2021. The evidence provided was not sufficient enough for the LG to score on this performance indicator</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>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects. Among the reviewed monthly supervision reports were; supervision report dated 27th/09/2021 on implementation activities for Mayanga Health Centre upgrade. Report indicated that construction was at 50%, placenta pit at 60%, medical waste pit at 60%, 4-stance VIP latrine at 40%, Septic tank at 30%. The report pointed out missing essential equipment and personnel on the site. Report dated 6th/06/2021 regarding environment and social component was among the reports presented for Mayanga Health Centre upgrade. Report indicated that the contractor did not provide PPE to workers, site not hoarded and small pit excavated for generated waste.</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>The DHO , District Engineer, DCDO, Senior Environment Officer did not verify works and initiate payments of contractors within the timeframe of 14 days.</p> <p>The sample of payments were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bukuba HC 11 Staff House Construction by Bitereko Hardware &amp; Building Construction. MITO 601/WRKS/21-22/00012. Verified works on 14/02/2022 and initiated payments on 01/03/2022. EFT.42251099, UGX. 36,159,627.</li> <li>2 .Renovation of Kabira Inpatient Ward by Twinka Enterprises (U) Ltd. MITO601/WRKS/21-22/00021. Verified works on 30/05/2022 and initiated payments on 06/06/2022, EFT.44582595, UGX. 50,646,444.</li> <li>3. Bukuba HC11 Staff House Construction by Bitereko Hardware&amp; Building Construction. MITO 601/WRKS/21-22/00012. Verified works on 14/06/2022 and initiated payment on 15/06/2022 EFT.8089254,UGX.8,089,254.</li> </ol>	0
----	--	--	---	---

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had complete procurement files for health infrastructure contracts with all records as required by PPDA law. For example, the health centre upgrade of Mayanga HC (a hybrid procured contract) The evaluation report for technical compliance using Form 16 of PPDA was duly signed by evaluation committee members dated 4th/01/2021. The contracts committee approved the evaluation report on 18th/01/2021 under minute number MIN:124/CC/2020-2021 awarding contract to M/S Kaleeta Construction Co. Ltd at contract price of UGX 645,500,575/=</p> <p>Contract agreement was signed between the LG and M/S Kaleeta Construction Co. Ltd on 17th/02/2021 after clearance from Solicitor General.</p>	1
----	--	---	--	---

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

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

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not issue guidelines on medical waste management and followed up on the implementation of the health care waste management guidelines by HCs. There was no documentary evidence availed to the assessment team indicating dissemination of the guidelines to the health facility In-Charges.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management and a central infrastructure for managing medical waste. Green label services limited was the service provider managing medical waste. This was evidenced from the contract letter dated 26th November 2021</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had conducted trainings and created awareness in healthcare waste management. This was evidenced from the Health care waste management training report dated 30th November 2021.</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that costed ESMPs were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY. The projects included;</p> <p>Upgrading of Mayanga HC II to HC III</p> <p>Construction of staff house at Bukuba HC III</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Except for Mayanga HC III which had a land title, the other health project which was Bukuba HC III had no proof of land ownership.</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>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>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports,</p> <p>Upgrading of Mayanga HC II to HC III had monitoring reports dated; 13/06/2022, 20/04/2021, 02/09/2021 and 04/03/2022.</p> <p>Construction of staff house at Bukuba HC III had monitoring reports dated; 07/05/2022, 28/03/2022 and 31/01/2022.</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>Upgrading of Mayanga HC II to HC III had an environment and social certification form prepared and dated on 01/06/2022.</p> <p>Construction of staff house at Bukuba HC III had an environment and social certification form prepared and dated on 01/06/2022.</p>	2

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the Ministry MIS for current FY, the % of rural water sources that are functional is 83%.</p>	<b>1</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the Ministry MIS for current FY, the % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs) is 92%.</p>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Above 80% score 2</li> <li>b. 60 -80%: 1</li> <li>c. Below 60: 0</li> </ul> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	N/A.	<b>0</b>

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

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

From the 4th quarter report dated  
12th July 2022, the district  
implemented 3 projects:

1. Construction of a piped water  
supply system (gravity flow  
scheme) at Mushunga -  
Nkinga, Phase I in **Mitooma  
S/C.**
2. Construction of a ferro-cement  
tank at Ryakanimbi P/S in  
**Mitooma T/C.**
3. Construction of a ferro-cement  
tank at Kakimba P/S in  
**Kiyanga S/C.**

**From the ministry MIS, the  
district rural access was 92%  
for the previous FY.**

Mitooma T/C is supplied by NWSC,  
and Kiyanga S/C accesss to water  
was 65% for the previosu FY.  
Therefore, one (01) out of three (03)  
projects was constructed in a sub-  
county county with safe water  
coverage below the district average  
representing 33.33%.

**Conclusion**

Fail

2

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

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

c. If variations in the contract  
price of sampled WSS  
infrastructure investments for the  
previous FY are within +/- 20% of  
engineer's estimates

- o If within +/-20% score 2
- o If not score 0

The district signed two (02) contract  
agreements and these were  
captured as follows:

- **1. Construction of  
Mushunga - Nkinga GFS,  
Phase I, contract reference  
number:  
MITO601/WRKS/21-  
22/00011.**
- 
- Contractor: M/S Eikon  
Construction Limited.
- Contract sum: UGX  
159,485,909/=
- AWP/Budget figure: UGX  
234,685,991/=.
- **The variation was -  
32.04%.**
- 
- **2. Construction of 2 ferro-  
cement tanks, one at  
Ryakanimbi P/S in Mitooma  
T/C and the other at  
Kakimba P/S in Kiyanga  
S/C.**
- 
- Contractor: M/S Zeph  
Costruction Limited, P.O.Box  
129, Ntungamo.
- Contract sum: UGX  
29,635,393/=
- AWP/Budget figure: UGX  
17,500,000/= for each tank.
- **The variation was -  
15.33%.**
- 

0

2

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

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

- o If 100% projects completed:  
score 2
- o If 80-99% projects completed:  
score 1
- o If projects completed are below  
80%: 0

The district had planned 4 projects  
according to the annual work plan.  
According to the DWO, due to  
budget cuts 3 projects were  
implemented and completed within  
the planned FY. Note that the  
district had planned to construct 3  
rainwater harvesting tanks at a  
total budget of UGX 52,500,000/=  
in the previous FY but they only  
constructed two (2) tanks. This  
represented 75% of WSS  
infrastructure projects completed as  
per annual work plan by end of FY..

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> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>From the Ministry MIS, the functionality of water facilities for previous FY but one was 83% and the functionality of water facilities for the previous FY was also 83%. Therefore, there was no percentage increase in functionality of water supply facilities.</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 &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>From the Ministry MIS, the functionality WSCs for previous FY but one was 92% and the functionality of WSC for the previous FY was 92%.. Therefore, there was no percentage increase in functionality of WSCs.</p>	0

### **Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>From the DWO, the annual performance report for previous FY was obtained and the list of constructed WSS facilities were reviewed.</p> <p>Three (3) WSS facilities were visited to determine whether WSS facilities were constructed and are functional as reported. Note that the district implemented only 3 projects in the previous FY. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A piped water supply system (gravity flow scheme) constructed at Mushunga - Nkinga vilage, Phase I in Mitooma S/C.</li> <li>2. A ferro-cement tank constructed at Ryakanimbi P/S in Mitooma T/C.</li> <li>3. A ferro-cement tank constructed at Kakimba P/S in Kiyanga S/C.</li> </ol>	3
---	---	--	---	---

### **Findings**

They were all functional as reported. Therefore, the DWO accurately reported WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported.

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>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>From the DWO quarterly WSS reports there was evidence that the DWO collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage hygiene, and community involvement.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO availed the following as evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of filling form 4s in the fourth quarter. The submission letter was dated 23/07/2022 and the forms were received by the ministry of water and environment on 23/08/2022. <b>However, form 1 for new sources was never filled.</b></p> <p><i>Therefore, the evidence presented 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 was unsatisfactory to warrant a score.</i></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>N/A.</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**



6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff	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	There was evidence that the District Water Officer budgeted for critical staff (Water officer, Assistant Engineering officer and Assistant water officer for mobilization) to a tune of 31,933,000/=for the current financial year. (LG approved budget estimates, 2022/23, Vote 601	2
6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff	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	There was evidence that the District Natural Resources Officer budgeted for critical staff (District Natural Resources officer, Senior Environment officer, Forestry officer, Senior Land management officer and Physical planner) to a tune of 150,707,000/- for the next financial year. (LG approved budget estimates 22/23, Vote 601	2
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.	a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3	There was evidence that the District Water officer staff were appraised during the previous FY.  1. The Water Officer Tumusiime Geoffrey was appraised o 10/7/2022  2. The Borehole Maintenance officer Tushemereirwe Shallon was appraised on 20/7/2022  3. The Water officer for Mobilization Nimusiima Abe was appraised on 20/7/2022	3
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.	b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3	There was no evidence that the DWO identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities were conducted	0

**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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>•</li> <li>• If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY</li> </ul>	From the DWO, the district average safe water coverage figures, AWP and budget were obtained. <b>The projects planned for the current FY are as follows:</b>  A. Construction of a piped water supply system (GFS), Mishunga - Nkinga scheme phase II, in <b>Mitooma S/C</b> at a budget of UGX	0
---	---	--	---	---

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

this performance measure

is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: 263,270,665/= **(Fund: UgiFT)**.

Score 3

- If 80-99%: Score 2
- If 60-79: Score 1
- If below 60 %: Score 0

B. Rehabilitation of springs and shallow wells at UGX 20,000,000/= **(Fund: DWSCG)**. The source names and sub-counties are listed below:

1. Kwatampola Abias source, Karimbiro village, Karimbiro parish, in **Bitereko S/C**.
2. Kaziko source, Kaziko village, Kigarama parish, in **Bitereko S/C**.
3. Omukapera source, Omuburembo village, Kigarama parish, in **Bitereko S/C**.
4. Kanyamwata Kitunzi Shaban source, Kanyamwata villg, Busherenyenyi parish, in **Bitereko S/C**
5. Late Kanabahita source, Kazira village, Rukararwe parish, in **Katenga S/C**.
6. Burinda's land source, Nyabwina village, Igambiro parish, in **Katenga S/C**.
7. Kyamushongora P/S source name, Nyakaziba village, Igambiro parish, in **Katenga S/C**.
8. Owakacuncu, Tibijuka John source, Sanga 11 village, Sanga ward, **Rutookye T/C**.
9. Mugisha Godfrey source, Nteebe/Kibare 1 village, Kibare parish, in **RutookyeT/C**.
10. Katsigazi Abdul source, Nyerambire village, central ward, **Rutookye T/C**.

**From the ministry of water and environment MIS, the district average access for the current FY is 92%.**

Access by sub-county:

1. **Bitereko, 95%**
2. Kabira, 95%
3. Kanyabwanga, 95%
4. Kashenshero, 95%
5. Kashenshero TC, NWSC
6. **Katenga, 95%**
7. Kiyanga, 65%
8. Mitooma TC NWSC
9. **Mitooma, 95%**
10. Mutara, 95%
11. Mayanga, 95%
12. Rurehe, 95%

Note: Rutookye T/C originated from Bitereko S/C. According to the ministry MIS statistics, Kiyanga S/C has a very low water access compared to others and no project is planned in the current FY.

**Therefore, sub-counties with**

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

***safe water coverage below the district average were not prioritized in the allocation of funds.***

**Evidence was availed that advocacy meetings were held.**

1. At Bitereko S/C, it was held on 12/11/2021, attendance list appended to the report dated 21/11/2021. Other LLGs officials who attended were from the following S/Cs: Kiyanga, Rwoburunga, Kanyabwanga, Kigyende, Bitereko, and Rutookye T/C.
2. At Kabira S/C, it was held on 15/11/2021. Other LLGs officials that attended were from the following S/Cs: Mutara, Nyakizinga, Kasheshero, Mitooma, Katenga, Rurehe, Kabira, and Mayanja. Officials from T/Cs: Mutara, Kabira, Kasheshero, and Mitooma also attended.
3. At district headquarters, it was held on 01/10/2021. Under Minute 06/2021 of the advocacy meeting report, the DWO shared projects to be constructed in the current FY with their locations and the attendance list was appended to the report.
4. At Mitooma T/C Hall, it was held on 30/09/2022. Among other agenda, budget allocations per source were shared with attendees. On page 5 of the advocacy meeting minutes, under ***work plan for capital projects 2022/2023FY, the following projects were shared with budget allocations.***

a) Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga Phase II (4-km of pipeline and source completion) at a budget of UGX 240,000,000/=.

b) Rehabilitation of 10 springs in Bitereko S/C, Rutookye T/C, and Katenga S/C at a budget of UGX 2,000,000/= per spring.

### **Conclusion**

Satisfactory

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

The DWO claimed to have monitored some schemes.

***A monitoring report dated 19/08/2021 for Kibazi - Katenga gravity flow scheme was presented as evidence.*** Some of the recommendations from the report were that:

1. The scheme should be budgeted for rehabilitation.
2. The S/C chief of Katenga S/C would be responsible for O&M until the new WSC is formed.

***No other reports were availed.***

A monitoring plan was presented although not properly resourced and therefore, lacked in completeness. Inclement weather, for example, interrupts the plan, and the start and finish dates are key aspects to highlight in an effective monitoring plan. In the same way, tools and techniques to use and a critical path are key aspects to highlight in an effective monitoring plan.

#### **Conclusion**

Although the DWO monitored a few schemes, these could not warrant a score.

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

Evidence was availed that DWSCC meetings were held.

1. Quarter one DWSCC meeting was held on 30/9/2021.
2. Quarter two DWSCC meeting was held on 21/12/2021.
3. Quarter three DWSCC meeting was held on 10/3/2022.
4. Quarter four DWSCC meeting was held on 16/06/2022.

***Under Minute 06/2022 for coordination meeting held on 10/3/2022, presentation and discussion of reports: appointment of WSCs was decided in this coordination meeting, and this was incorporated in the current FY AWP.***

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><b>The DWO did not publicize the budget allocations per source for the current FY. No evidence was availed.</b></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"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>For the previous FY, the NWR budget was UGX 60,713,499/= out of which the DWO allocated UGX 49,173,499/= towards mobilization activities. This represented 80.99% of the NWR budget which was significantly above the minimum of 40% recommended as per sector guidelines.</p>	3
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p><b>Evidence of training WSCs was availed.</b></p> <p>The WSC for Nkinga - Mishunga GFS was established and trained on 23/06/2022 at Nkinga catholic church. All key members were appointed. The training content involved the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The members were trained on their roles and responsibilities, for example, wherever the district is developing a project, the WSCs have to mobilize people, secure land, and sensitize people to donate their land for development projects,</li> <li>2. Co-funding mechanisms. The WSC members were taught that some projects need community contributions and therefore, WSCs members should co-fund water projects for the benefit of society.</li> <li>3. Improving hygiene and sanitation, for example, keeping the source clean.</li> <li>4. To put in place the operation and maintenance plan. The DWO shared with WSC members a template on O&amp;M and instructed them how to fill it.</li> </ol> <p>The other two (2) rainwater harvesting institutional tanks were built t government schools and the DWO guided to budget for O&amp;M and to appoint the caretakers.</p>	3

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>An up-to-date asset register was not availed.</p>	<b>0</b>
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Evidence was provided which showed the, LG DWO, District Engineer, Senior Environment Officer conducted desk appraisals for all WSS projects for FY 2022/2023. The prioritized investments were profiled in the LG DP III and in the approved AWP. The plans are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines. The projects were appraised by, DWO, District Engineer, Senior Environment Officer and DCDO on 08/007/2021.</p> <p>The projects were.</p> <p>a. Construction of Mushunga – Nkinga Gravity Flow Scheme phase II at water sources at;</p> <p>a. Kwatampora Abias at Karimbiro parish.</p> <p>b. Kaziko at Kigarama parish.</p> <p>c. Omukapera at Kigarama parish.</p> <p>d. Kanyamwata Kitunzi Shaban at at Busherengyeny.</p> <p>e. Late kanabahita (Alex kamukama)</p> <p>f. Burinda’s land</p> <p>g. Kyamushongora p/s</p>	<b>4</b>

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><b>All community applications were availed. Three (03) community application were recorded as evidence.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kigarama village, Kagarama parish, Bitereko S/C applied for a borehole rehabilitation on 20/6/2016, letter was signed and stamped by chairman LC1 and addressed to the DWO.</li> <li>2. Karimbiro LC1, Bitereko S/C applied for borehole rehabilitation on 20/6/2016, letter signed and stamped by the LC1 chairman and addressed to the DWO.</li> <li>3. Sanga II, central ward, Rutookye T/C applied on 20/06/2016, letter signed and stamped by LC1 chairperson and addressed to the DWO.</li> </ol>	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>Evidence was provided that the LG DWO, Senior Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer conducted field appraisal to check technical feasibility, environmental social acceptability and customized designs for Water Supply and Sanitation Services projects. The field appraisal was carried out as per reports dated 12/07/2021 and 14/07/2021.</p> <p>The projects to be implemented are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Construction of Mushunga – Nkinga Gravity Flow Scheme phase II at water sources at;</li> <li>b. Kwatampora Abias at Karimbiro parish.</li> <li>c. Kaziko at Kigarama parish.</li> <li>d. Omukapera at Kigarama parish.</li> <li>e. Kanyamwata Kitunzi Shaban at at Busherengyeny.</li> <li>f. Late kanabahita (Alex kamukama)</li> <li>g. Burinda’s land</li> <li>h. Kyamushongora p/s .</li> </ol>	2

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents.</p> <p>Score 2</p>	<p>While water infrastructure projects were screened for E&amp;S with ESMPs prepared, the costed ESMPs were not incorporated in the BOQs. The projects included;</p> <p>Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga GFS.</p> <p>Construction of water tank at Kakimba p/s</p> <p>Construction of water tank at Ryakahimbi p/s</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved:</p> <p>Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Review of the LG procurement Plan dated 15th/10/2021 Ref.CR/105/2 (Page 2) water projects were incorporated. These included construction of two Rainwater Harvesting Tanks (Ferro cement) at a cost of UGX 48,000,000/=.</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 10 springs and shallow wells at UGX 50,000,000 and construction of Mushunga-Nkinga Gravity Water Scheme at UGX 190,000,000</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction</p> <p>Score 2:</p>	<p>Water supply and public sanitation infrastructure were approved by contracts committee. Minutes of contracts committee meeting held on 18th/10/2021 under minute number MIN:024/CC/2021-22 the committee approved evaluation report and awarded contract to M/S EFKON Construction Ltd at a cost of UGX 159,485,909/= VAT Inclusive.</p> <p>Contracts committee meeting held on 18th/10/2021 under minute MIN:030/CC/2021-22 the committee approved evaluation committee recommendations and awarded contract for the construction of Rainwater harvesting tanks to M/S Zeph Construction Co. Ltd at UGX 29,635,393/=</p> <p>The construction of Mushenga-Nkinga GFS phase 1b the contracts committee in a meeting held on 8th/02/2022 under minute MIN:075/CC/2021-22 approved the recommendations of evaluation committee and awarded contract to M/S EFKON Construction Ltd at a cost of UGX 139,981,669 VAT Inclusive.</p>	2



12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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 established Project Implementation Team as indicated in a letter dated 12th/10/2021 Ref.CR/207/1 did not include Labour Officer and Clerk of Works as required by the guidelines.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>All the three (3) projects constructed in the previous FY were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Piped water supply system (gravity flow scheme) at Mushunga - Nkinga, Phase I in Mitooma S/C.</li> <li>2. A ferro-cement tank at Ryakanimbi P/S in Mitooma T/C.</li> <li>3. A ferro-cement tank at Kakimba P/S in Kiyanga S/C.</li> </ol>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>The LG presented reports of supervision for example, report dated 25th/02/2022 for progress of the implementation activities for construction of Mushunga-Nkinga GFS, supervision report dated 30th/06/2021 for construction of RWHTs. The provided evidence was not enough to prove that technical officers supervised projects on a monthly basis as required by the assessment indicator.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

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

The DWO, District Engineer, CDCO, and Senior Environment verified works and initiated payments of contractors, but were not paid within the 14 days timeframe.

Sample of 3 payments were.

1. Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga gravity flow scheme by

Efkon construction company Ltd.  
MITO/601/WRKS2021-2022/00011.

.Requisitioned for funds on 14/02/2022. Certified the works on 28/02/2022. Paid on 18/03/2022 by EFT.4218968, UGX.56,632,018.

2. Construction of 2 ferro cement rain water harvest tanks at Ryakahimbi and Kakimba primary schools by Zeph construction co Ltd. Mito/601/works/2021-2022/00010.

Requisitioned for funds on 31/01/2022. Certified the works on 28/02/2022. Paid on 18/03/2022 by EFT. 4218073, UGX. 25,790,084.

3. Retention payment for the construction of 3 rain water harvest tanks by Kamoja Enterprises Ltd. MITO601/wrks/20-21/00006. Requisitioned for funds on 01/02/2022. Certified the works on 07/02/2022. Paid on 02/03/2022 by EFT. 42047560, UGX. 2,148,606.

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of complete procurement file as required by PPDA law.</p> <p>Procurement requisition for Mushunga-Nkinga GFS was signed by relevant officers on 23rd/08/2021 and 3rd/01/2022 for phase 1 and 1b respectively. The contracts committee approved open domestic bidding, Technical Evaluation Committee and bidding documents in a meeting held on 25th/08/2021 under minute MIN:013/CC/2021-22 for both the GFS and Rainwater harvesting Tanks. Evaluation report dated 18th/10/2021 and approval made under minute MIN:030/CC/2021 for Rainwater harvesting tanks and MIN:025/CC/2021-22 for the Gravity Flow Scheme.</p> <p>Contract agreements dated 3rd/11/2021 signed between M/S EFKON Construction Ltd and M/S Zeph Construction Co. Ltd for GFS and Rainwater harvesting tanks respectively</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to show 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>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>Guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management were disseminated to CDOs as per minute 30/2021 involving extension workers of Mitooma district under which the guidelines were disseminated to CDOs. The minutes were dated 20/12/2021.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that that all WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Evidence that showed Environment and Social Safeguards Certification forms were completed and signed by the Senior Environment Officer and DCDO prior to payments of contractor invoices and certificates at interim and final stages of projects.</p> <p>The sample projects were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga gravity flow scheme by Eikon construction company Ltd. MITO/601/WRKS2021-2022/00011. .Requisitioned for funds on 14/02/2022. Certified the works on 28/02/2022. Paid on 18/03/2022 by EFT.4218968, UGX.56,632,018.</li> <li>2. Construction of 2 ferro cement rain water harvest tanks at Ryakahimbi and Kakimba primary schools by Zeph construction co Ltd. Mito/601/works/2021-2022/00010. Requisitioned for funds on 31/01/2022. Certified the works on 28/02/2022. Paid on 18/03/2022 by EFT. 4218073, UGX. 25,790,084.</li> <li>3. Retention payment for the construction of 3 rain water harvest tanks by Kamoja Enterprises Ltd. MITO601/wrks/20-21/00006. Requisitioned for funds on 01/02/2022. Certified the works on 07/02/2022. Paid on 02/03/2022 by EFT. 42047560, UGX. 2,148,606.</li> </ol>	2
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>While the CDO and environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for water projects, this was done once and not on a monthly basis as per requirement.</p>	0

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two previous FYs.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two previous FYs, hence no increased acreage of newly irrigated land during FY 2021/2022 as compared to FY 2020/2021.</p>	<b>0</b>
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence there was no procurement and installation of irrigation equipment under micro-scale irrigation program.</p>	<b>0</b>
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts.</p>	<b>0</b>

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence there were no contract documents for establishment of micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites under micro-scale irrigation program.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence supplier contracts were not signed and no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment was installed under micro-scale irrigation program.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2 • If 75 - 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	The LG approved structure and staff establishment of 2017 had a total of 71 extension workers for the Lower Local Government facilities. However, the LG has a total of 46 extension workers making a 65% recruitment	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment was installed under micro-scale irrigation program.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment was installed under micro-scale irrigation program.	0

## 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	There was evidence that positions of extension workers deployed in the LLGS visited was accurate.	2
	Maximum score 4		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitooma TC had 2 extension worker deployed there and these were available</li> <li>2. Kashenshero Sub county had 2 extension worker deployed there and these were available</li> <li>3. Katenga Sub country had 3 extension workers deployed there and these were available</li> </ol>	
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	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment was installed.	0
	Maximum score 4			
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no information collected on functionality of installed irrigation equipment as there was no irrigation equipment installed under micro-scale irrigation program	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	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no information entered in MIS / Irritrack on LLGs, as evidenced by lack of MIS reports	0
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	No quarterly reports prepared using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS since there was no information entered in MIS.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Development and approval of Performance Improvement Plans for the lowest performing LLGs was not carried out during FY 2021/2022.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Implementation of Performance Improvement Plans for the lowest performing LLGs was not carried out during FY 2021/2022.	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	As per the approved Budget Estimates for FY 2022/2023, under the Vote 893, there was Ugx 837,423,000 /- allocated for the wages of full positions for extension staffs	1
---	--	---	--	---



7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	As per the production Department deployment register, deployment of extension workers was as follows; 11 Agricultural Officers, 01 Assistant Agricultural Officer and 12 Assistant Animal Husbandry Officers. Therefore 24 extension staffs deployed at 15 LLGs, hence the deployment was inadequate as per the guidelines.	0
	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	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed according to the staff lists obtained from HRM Division and the staff lists, attendance register and TPC minutes in the LLGs.	2
	Maximum score 6		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In Mittooma Town Council:- Atwine Calorine an Agriculture officer and Amany Bruce Asst. Animal Husbandry officer</li> <li>2. In Kashenshero Sub County:- Tashobya Dickson an Agriculture Officer and Ashaba Nathon an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer</li> <li>3. In Katenga Sub County:- Mugizi Peter an Agriculture officer and Tumwebaze Nicholas an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer</li> </ol>	
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	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	There was evidence of publicizing of extension workers in the LLGs on noticeboards in sub counties visited. Staff list with contact details were on the LLGs noticeboards.	2
	Maximum score 6			

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 extension workers were appraised by the District Production officer for the previous FY and copies submitted to HRO. A sample to 10 appraisal files for extension workers was reviewed as follows;

1. Muhebwa Bruce an Agriculture officer was appraised on 20/7/2022
2. Mugizi Peter an Agriculture officer was appraised on 31/8/2022
3. Tumwebaze Nicholas an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer was appraised on 30/6/2022
4. Tumuhimbie Caroline an Agriculture officer was appraised on 30/6/2022
5. Muhereza Ignaitious on Assistant Animal Husbandry officer was appraised on 20/7/2022
6. Atuhaire Modrine an Assistant Animal husbandry officer was appraised on 15/8/2022
7. Keminyeto Naome an Agriculture officer was appraised on 5/8/2022
8. Tashobya Dickson an Agriculture officer was appraised on 25/7/2022
9. Namara Ronald an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer was appraised on 20/7/2022
10. Atwine Caroline an Agriculture Officer was appraised on 30/6/2022

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 evidence that corrective action was taken for extension workers arising out of their appraisal reports. The DPO consolidated Capacity needs assessment for the extension workers and submitted to HRM for incorporation into the department's training plans for the year.

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	As per the training report dated 7th September 2022, titled "Technical backstopping of Livestock Extension staff in LLGs", LG trained extension staffs in 12 LLGs that were visited. The training was aiming at providing technical support on livestock husbandry practices including housing, feeding or nutrition, animal health and breeding. The training was done under the Parish Development Model.	1
	Maximum score 4			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	There was no staff training database availed at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum score 4			

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

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 - 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts.	0
	Maximum score 10			
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts.	0
	Maximum score 10			

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no information disseminated on the use of farmer co-funding.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> </ul> <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no Irrigation demonstration equipment was installed and thus DPO did not do any monitoring activity.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence LG did not oversee approved farmer training and support as there were no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment installed under micro-scale irrigation program.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence LG did not provide hands on support to extension staffs at LLGs since the implementation of complementary services was not carried out.	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 during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence LG did not establish and run farmer field schools since no micro-scale irrigation demonstration site was installed.	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 during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence LG did not conduct any activity to mobilize and sensitize farmers through farmer meetings and farmer to farmer visits as evidenced by lack of attendance sheets, field based reports and photos. No demonstrations by irrigation equipment suppliers since irrigation demonstration sites were not installed.	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 during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence LG did not train staff and sensitize political leaders at the District and LLG levels as evidenced by lack of training reports	0

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>LG had no database of applications (EOIs) for current and previous FYs, even no copies of application for EOIs from LLGs.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>LG did not make any farm visit because there were no Expressions of Interest submitted to the District as evidenced by lack of farm visit reports.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of publishing approved farmers on noticeboards by the Senior Agriculture Engineer.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable in the FY under review</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable in the FY under review	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable in the FY under review	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment installed and no technical designs generated from IrriTrack App.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment installed, and no technical supervision of irrigation demonstration sites done.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no micro scale irrigation equipment was installed and no evidence that LG had overseen the irrigation equipment supply, installation and testing the functionality of the equipment under micro-scale irrigation program.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence no micro scale irrigation equipment was installed and no evidence that LG had overseen the irrigation equipment handover to the approved host farmer.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable in the FY under review	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable in the FY under review	0

## Environment and Social Safeguards



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

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Mitooma district for the year under review.	0
----	--	--	---	---

### Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	Not applicable during previous FY because Mitooma DLG was not part of the 40 pilot Districts, hence LG did not disseminate any micro-scale irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access, proper use of agro-chemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Mitooma district for the year 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	Not applicable to Mitooma district for the year under review.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Mitooma district for the year under review.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable to Mitooma district for the year under review.	0

**Micro-scale Irrigation  
Minimum Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited;  a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer  <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	The LG substantively appointed Musinguzi Duncan as Senior Agriculture Officer under Min. 429/2018, in a letter dated 2/1/2019, Ref. CR/156/1	<b>70</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.  <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG:  Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening  <i>score 30 or else 0.</i>	The indicator was not applicable to Mitooma DLG for the year under assessment.	<b>0</b>

**Water & Environment Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Tumusiime Geoffrey as a Civil Engineer (water officer) under Min 598/03/2022, in a letter dated 18/3/2022, Re. CR/156/4/1	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Nimusiima Abe as Assistant water officer for mobilization under Min. 607/03/2022, in a letter dated 23/3/2022, Ref. CR/160/1	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Tumwine Elly as Assistant Engineering Officer under Min 597/03/2022, in a letter dated 18/3/2022, Ref. CR.156/4/1	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	This position is not in the LG structure	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Kagumire Godwine as Environment Officer under Min 508/2019, Ref. 10/6/2019, Ref. CR/156/4/1	<b>10</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	---	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG:  a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for sampled water projects was carried out as follows;  Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga gravity flow scheme was screened on 29/07/2021 with ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 250,000.  Construction of a water tank at Kakimba primary school was screened on 05/07/2021 with ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 550,000.  Construction of a water tank at Ryakahimbi primary school was screened on 05/07/2021 with ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 550,000.	<b>10</b>
---	---	--	---	-----------

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 infrastructure projects implemented the previous FY didnot qualify undergoing an Environment and Social Impact Assessment. The projects included;	<b>10</b>
			Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga gravity flow scheme.	
			Construction of a water tank at Kakimba primary school.	
			Construction of a water tank at Ryakahimbi primary school.	
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Mitooma DLG did not implement any piped water system project the previous financial year.	<b>10</b>

**Health Minimum Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Byamugisha Sadic as DHO under Min. DSC/560/12/2020, in a letter dated 11/12/2020, Ref. CR.156/5/1	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Gumusiriza Robert as Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health under Min. 511/06/2019, in a letter dated 27/06/2019, Ref. CR/160/2	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Tusiime Edson as Principal Health Inspector under Min. 565/01/2021, in a letter dated 8/1/2021, Ref. CR/156/4/1	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Murangi K. Richard under Min. 510/06/2019, in a letter dated 27/06/2018 Ref. CR.160/2	<b>10</b>

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 LG substantively appointed Mwiru Arthur as Biostatistician under Min. DSC/MIT/211/2017, in a letter dated 2/5/2017, Ref.CR.156/4/2</p>	<b>10</b>
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 LG substantively appointed Beshumbusha Fred as Cold Chain Assistant under Min. 206/2015, in a letter dated 25/6/2015, Ref. CR.156/4/1.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>		

**Environment and Social Requirements**



2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for sampled civil works for Health sector projects was carried out as noted below;  Up grading of Mayanga HC II to HC III was screened on 22/03/2021 with ESMPs prepared and costed at UGX: 43.850,000  Construction of staff house at Bukuba HC III was screened on 12/07/2021 with ESMPs prepared and costed at UGX: 9,300, 000.	<b>15</b>
	Maximum score is 30			
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)	b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	None of the civil works project implemented under Health qualified undergoing an Environment and Social Impact Assessment. These included;  Up grading of Mayanga HC II to HC III.  Construction of staff house at Bukuba HC III .	<b>15</b>
	Maximum score is 30			

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Birungi Peace Gloria as District Education Officer under Min. 4/4/2018, in a letter dated 6/6/2018, Ref. CR/160/2	<b>30</b>
	<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	<p>The LG substantively appointed the following as Inspectors of schools:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Namudu Aisha appointed under Min 600/03/3022(2) in a letter dated 18/3/2022, Ref. CR/156/4/1</li> <li>2. Atwine Angella appointed under Min. 600/3/3033(1) in a letter dated 18/3/2022, Ref. CR/156/1</li> <li>3. Kyomugisha Shallon, appointed under Min. 432/2018, in a letter dated 2/1/2018, Ref. CR.156/2</li> <li>4. Rughina Baryayebwa Joshua appointed under Min. 60/3/222, in a letter dated 18/3/2022, Ref. CR/160/2</li> <li>5. Tushabe Jane appointed under Min 386/2018, in a letter dated 30/5/2018, Ref. CR.160/2</li> </ol>	<b>40</b>
	<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.

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for civil works under education was carried out as thus;

Renovation of classroom block at Nyakanoni primary school was screened on 03/07/2021 with ESMPs costed at UGX: 6,050,000 on 29/07/2021.

Construction of a classroom block at Kibungo primary school was screened on 04/07/2021 with ESMPs costed at UGX: 12,600,000 on 06/07/2021.

Construction of 5 stance latrine with urinal at Katerera primary school was screened on 05/07/2021 with ESMPs costed at UGX: 470,000 on 08/07/2021.

The Maximum score is 30

15

2

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

If the LG carried out:

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

The civil works implemented the previous FY under Education did not require undergoing an Environment and social Impact Assessment. The civil works included;

Renovation of classroom block at Nyakanoni primary school.

Construction of a classroom block at Kibungo primary school .

Construction of 5 stance latrine with urinal at Katerera primary school.

The Maximum score is 30

15

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Tumuhame Juliet Olive as CFO under Min 514/06/2019, in a letter dated 27/6/2019, Ref. CR.160/2	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Baguma Naboth Vincent as DNRO under Min. DSC/MIT/248/2016(i), in a letter dated 18/4/2016, Ref. CR.160/2	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Monday Swaibah Lwanga as District Production Officer under DSC. Min. No. 428/2018, in a letter dated 2/1/2019, Ref. CR/156/5/1, in a letter dated 2/1/2019	<b>3</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Beyendeza Saverinus as District Community Development Officer under Min. 246/1/2016, in a letter dated 18/4/2016, Ref. CR.160/2.	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	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	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.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Kyomukama Florence as Senior Procurement officer under DSC. Min. 10/2011, in a letter dated 6/4/2011, Ref. CR.156/1	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Atamba Kelet, as Procurement officer under Min. 380/2018, in a letter dated 17/5/2018, ref. CR.156/4	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Abenawe Honest as Principal Human Resource Officer under 03/2021(i), in a letter dated 5/3/2012, Ref. CR/160/1	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	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.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Muhwezi Anthony as Senior Land Management Officer under DSC.Min.431/2018, in a letter dated 2/1/2019, Ref. CR.156/4/1	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Tumwesigye Seriano as Senior Accountant under DSC. Min. No 568/01/2021, in a letter dated 8/1/2021, Ref. CR/156/4/1	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	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.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	0

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

Maximum score is 15

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

There was no evidence that the LG substantively appointed SAS in all sub counties and Town Clerks in all town councils. The LG has a total of 18 Lower Local governments: 13 Sub Counties and 5 Town Councils. There was evidence that the LG substantively appointed 8 of these, as follows;

1. Ssali Yusufu, appointed under Min 502/2019, in a letter dated 1/6/2019, Ref. CR.156/4/1
2. Rugambwa Vicent appointed under Min. 582/02/2021, in a letter dated 12/2/2021, Ref. CR.156//1
3. Bitenihirwe Jonah appointed under Min. 12/2011(3), in a letter dated 6/4/2011, Ref. CR.156/4
4. Rwabihengye Robert appointed under Min. 377/1/2018, in a letter dated 17/5/2018, Ref. CR.156/4/1
5. Baryebijuma Ntugura William George appointed under Min. 11/2011, in a letter dated 6/4/2011, Ref. CR.156/4
6. Tayebwa Patrick, appointed under Min. 12/2011(6), in a letter dated 6/4/2011, Ref. CR.156/4
7. Musiime Daanah, appointed under Min. 502/2019(i), in a letter dated 10/6/2019, Ref. CR.156/4/1
8. Nzeimana Arthur Hakiza appointed under Min 110/2013, in a letter dated 28/6/2013, Ref. CR.160/1

The rest of the LLGs have no sub counties

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.

There was no evidence that the substantively appointed 18 Community Development officers or Senior CDOS for the 13 sub counties and 5 town councils. The recruited CDO/SCDOs are as follows;

1. Mugisha Nelson appointed under Min. 496/2019(i), in a letter dated 10/6/2019, Ref. CR.156/4/1
2. Taremwa Edidah appointed under Min. 496/2019(ii), in a letter dated 10/6/2019, Ref. CR.156/4/1
3. Twinamastiko Justus appointed under Min 11/2010, in a letter dated 20/12/2010, Ref. Cr.156/5/1
4. Atuasibwa Susan appointed under Min. 497/2019, in a letter dated 10/6/2019, Ref. CR.156/156/4/1
5. Turyakira Yonna appointed under Min. 513/06/2019(i), appointed under Min. 513/06/2019(i), in a letter dated 27/06/2019, Ref. CR.160/1
6. Nasasira Oliver appointed under Min. 403/3/2018, in a letter dated 30/5/2018, Ref. CR.160/2
7. Musasizi Oliver appointed under Min. 513/06/2019(3), in a letter dated 27/6/2019, Ref. CR.160/1.
8. Turyasingura Wilber appointed under Min 513/06.2019(2), in a letter dated 27/6/2019, Ref. CR.156/4/1
9. Kiconco Sarah appointed under Min. 403/2018, in a letter dated 30/5/2018, Ref. CR.156/4/1
10. Kusasira Jovlet, appointed under Min. 497/2019(i), in a letter dated 10/6/2018, Ref. CR.156/4/1
11. Kasinge Elva appointed under Mn 375/2018, in a letter dated 17/5/2018, Ref. CR.156/4/1
12. Kyarisiima Judith appointed under Min 376/2018, in a letter dated 17/5/2018, Ref. CR.156/1\4/1

For the rest of the Sub counties/Town Councils, the LG did not provide evidence of their recruitment



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.

There was no evidence that the LG recruited Senior Accounts Assistant of Accounts assistants in all the 18 LLGs as follows;

1. Nowomutano Victor appointed under Min DSC/588/02/2021 in a letter dated 18/2/2021, Ref. CR.156/4/1
2. Katusabe Praise, appointed under Min. DSC/552/12/2020, in a letter dated 11/12/2020, Ref. CR.156/4/1
3. Mwesigwa Aston appointed under Min. 489/2019(i) in a letter dated 10/6/2019, Ref. CR.156/4/1
4. Aheereza Lydia appointed under Min. 189/2015(3), in a letter dated 23/1/2015, Ref. CR.156/4/1
5. Asiiimwe Amon appointed under Min. 189/2015(3), in a letter dated 23/1/2015, Ref. CR.156/4/1
6. Mugarura Adson, appointed under Min. 489/2019, in a letter dated 10/6/2019, Ref. CR/156/4/1
7. Muhumuza Smith appointed under Min 408/2018, in a letter dated 30/5/2018, Ref.CR.156/4/1
8. Bakyenga Seviano appointed under Min 54/2004(5), in a letter dated 15/11/2004, Ref. CR/160/1
9. Kamusiime Glorious appointed under Min. 408/1/2018, in a letter dated 30/5/2018 Ref. CR.156/4/1
10. Mugabe Henry appointed under Min. DSC/576/02/2021, in a letter dated 12/2/2021 Ref. CR.156/4/1
11. Atukwatse Ronald appointed under Min DSC/576/02/2021(i), in a letter dated 12/2/2021, Ref. CR.156/4/1
12. Bariyo Gilvaz Tumwebaze appointed under Min DSC/552/12/2020(2), in a letter dated 11/12/2020, Ref. CR.156/4/1

The rest of the Sub counties have not substantively appointed CDOs/SDCOs

## Environment and Social Requirements

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	For Mitooma LG Natural Resources Department, the amount allocated for FY 2021/2022, was UGX. 265,105,029 (ABPR, page, 10), and amount released was, UGX. 265,105,029. This was a ratio 100%.	2
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 0		
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	For Rukungiri LG Community Based Services Department, the amount allocated for FY 2021/2022, was UGX.197,453,957,(ABPR, page,10) and amount released UGX. 197,453,957.This was a 100%.	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.  score 2 or else 0.		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,  score 4 or else 0	There was evidence that Mitooma DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the project implemented using DDEG for the previous FY,  Construction of main block up to ground slab (phase II) was screened on 16/07/2019 and with mitigation measures prepared.	4
	Maximum score is 12			
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),	The only project implemented using DDEG in the previous FY did not require undergoing an Environment and Social Impact Assessment. The only project Implemented was construction of the District Main Administration Block (Phase IV)	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The Environment and Social Management plan for the DDEG project for the previous FY was not costed. The project was Construction of main block up to ground slab (phase II)</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>LG has a clean audit opinion.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG 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). The Internal Auditor General's office on the implementation status of AG for FY 2020/2021 was submitted by the CAO Mr.Akileng Simon Peter on 20/12/2021. The report contained actions taken on 19 recommendations against all findings (pages, 1-3). The submission was made before the end of February deadline.</p>	10
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG in Pursuant to the Public Financial Management Act of 2015, Part VII and according to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the Mitooma DLG. Performance Contract for FY 2022/2023, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) Akileng Simon Peter was submitted and acknowledged by PS/ST on 02/08/2022. This was before the deadline of 31st August.</p>	4

8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year  maximum score 4 or else 0	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,  score 4 or else 0.	According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/22, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) Akileng Simon Peter was submitted on 08/09/2022. This was beyond the 31st August deadline.	0
9	Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year  Maximum score is 4	If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,  score 4 or else 0.	According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG, Quarterly Performance Reports for FY 2021/22, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) Akileng Simon Peter were submitted as follows.  Quarter 1 report on 10/11/2021 Quarter 2 report on 14/02/2022 Quarter 3 report on 12/05/2022 Quarter 4 report on 02/09/2022  All the reports were submitted but the 4th Quarter was not submitted before the mandatory August 31 deadline.	0