



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kikuube District

(Vote Code: 628)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	34%
Education Minimum Conditions	60%
Health Minimum Conditions	30%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	56%
Educational Performance Measures	59%
Health Performance Measures	60%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	48%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	There was physical evidence that infrastructure project of Muntene –Kaigo Kdoma Road 8Km Construction of Office Administration block DDEG funding was functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project. This was evidenced from field inspection of the projects that was carried out by the Performance Assessment Team.	4
2	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	N/A	0
2	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	There was documentary evidence that investment projects implemented in the previous FY 2019/2020 were Completed as per performance Contract (with AWP) by the end of the FY 2019/2020. For instance the project of Grading of Munteme –Kaigo road 8.Km was reflected on page 19 of the performance contract FY 2019/2020 .It appeared on page 8 of the Annual Budget Performance report FY2019/2020	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 and spent all the DDEG for the
previous FY 2019/2020 on eligible projects /activities
as per the DDEG grant budget and implementation
guidelines

The LG budgeted for the 2 DDEG Projects and
Spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible
projects/ activities as per the DDEG grant ,budget
and implementation guidelines.

The Local Government Budgeted for Shs 47,500,000
as evidenced from page 44 of the Budget for grading
of Munteme – Kaigo Road 8.0 Km and spent Shs
47,530,000 as per Technical and Accountability
Report dated 30th May 2020 and Authenticated by
the Road Inspector /Project Manager by the names of
David Kisembo

Construction of Administration Block

The LG budgeted for Shs 65,677,000 as evidenced on
page 9 of the Budget FY 2019/20 for purchase of
Land before embarking on Construction of Office
Administration block and Spent Shs a total of shs
75,000,000 as per Payment t Vouchers

Indicated below

Number1/10,dated 1st October a total 2019 and
Voucher Number 9/11 dated 6th November 2019 The
LG overshot the Budget for purchase of Land towards
c Construction of District Administration Block by Shs
9,323,,000

The District Planner and the Senior Accountant Could
not give reasons for the variance at the time of
Assessment.

0

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

The LG did not have a DDEG funded infrastructure
project so it was not possible to assess this indicator

2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

A sample of 3 LLGs were visited to affirm the minimum staffing standards being accurate and the results were as follows;

1.Kukuube Town Council-there were 15 staffs both in the staff list at the District, at the Town Council and physically as well as the monthly attendance analysis report dated 5th/August/2020.

2.Bugambe Sub County had 9 staff in the staff list at the District, 11 Staff in the staff list at the Subcounty and only one person-Senior Accounts Assistant found present at the time of assessment.

3.Kizanfumbi Sub County Office couldn't be accessed during the time of assessment.

All in all, the report showed that there was a gap in the the staffing at the LLGs and hence rendering the information inaccurate.

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG was in place as per the reports produced by the LG.</p> <p>The 2 DDEG infrastructure Projects were as indicated as follows</p> <p>Grading of Munte-me –Kaigo Road 8Km</p> <p>Appeared on page 20 of the of the Budget FY 2019/20</p> <p>It also appeared on page 19 of the Approved Performance Contract FY 2019/20 Finally the said project was reported on page 21 of the Annual Performance Report Quarter 4s as Complete.</p> <p>There was a Technical Report and Accountability dated 30th May 2020 that was prepared by the Project Manager /Road Inspector by the names of David Kise-mbo. The report was in relation to f Grading of the road Munte-me Kaigo 8km.which indicated that the Scope of work was carried out</p> <p>Construction of Administration Block</p> <p>Construction of f Administration Block appeared on page 11 of the Annual Work Plan , page 9 of the Annual Budget FY 2019/20 and page 8 of the Annual Performance Report FY 2019/20</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	N/A	0

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results. Score: 2 or else score 0	N/A	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	N/A	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	The recruitment plan for 2021/2022 dated 27th/September/2020 was sent and received by the Ministry of Public Service on the 6th/October/2020	2
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	The summary of the staff attendance report for July to December 2019 showed that the attendance was average with 50% of the staff scoring above 50% and submitted to the PHRO for review for recommendation to Rewards & Sanctions committee. The summary of the staff attendance report for July to December 2019 showed that the attendance was average with 50% of the staff scoring above 50% and submitted to the PHRO for review for recommendation to Rewards & Sanctions committee.	2
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0	The HODs were appraised in the previous FY as below; Appraised; - Kwikiriza Magambo Nicholas the DHO was appraised on the 27th/ June/2020, - Ntume Barnabas the District Production Officer	0

was appraised on the 30th/June/2020

- Kusiima Julian the CFO was appraised on the 1st/July/2019

- Arinaitwe Emma the District Engineer was appraised on the 29th/July/2020

- Byakagaba Deogratias the DEO was appraised on the 14th/August/2020

The following were not appraised:

- Twesigye F. Baguma the District Planner was not appraised

- Luswata Ibrahim the acting District Engineer was not appraised

- Kabahaguzi Annet the DCDO was not appraised

- Businge Ftuma the District Commercial Officer was not appraised

- Atugonza Hillary Winnyi the DWO was not appraised

The appraisal report showed that the not all HODs were appraised, appraisals were also not done on time.

7

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:

Score 1 or else 0

The Rewards and Sanctions committee had the following members;

1. Byakagaba Deogratias – Chairperson
2. Kiiza Flavia- Secretary
3. Kabahaguzi Annet- Member
4. Dr.Kwikiriza Nicholas Magambo- Member

-The rewards and sanctions committee minutes dated

1

2nd/June/2020 with the following members;

- 1 . Mr. Byakagaba Deogratias -Chairperson
2. Ms. Kiiza Flavia-Secretary
- 3.dr. Kwikiriza Nicholas M-Member

Absent with apology,

.Ms. Kabahanguzi Annet-Member

In Attendance:

- 1.Mr. Munyagire Joel – Human Rrsource Officer
- 2.Kyomuhendo Noeline – Pool Stenographer
3. Mboineki Stanley- Ag.DCDO
- 4.Musabe Fredrick - Teacher

Cases handled;

Min.02/06/2020, listed the cases handled by the committee as below;

1 Accusations;

- Collecting money worth 600,000= from 6 groups that were to supposed to be paid to the District as Local Revenue but was swindled by him.
- - Falsification of documents through scanning CAO's signature and obtaining his stamp by tricking the Pool Stenographer

Mboineki Stanley was invited with other two people one of which he claimed to have signed on the original certificates and the other he claimed to have handed over the original certificates to deliver them to 6 groups who turned up Mr.Mboineki did not turn but the secretary informed the committee that she served him the invitation letter which he received but refused to sign for it and went ahead to inform her that he was to turn up because he was not seeing any reason as to why he was being re invited yet he had already appeared to the same committee and gave it his defense. However, the committee decided to take statements from the two invited persons who had turned up one by one.

Mr. Balikenda Stephen said he was given the certificates by Stanley Mboineki and he took them to the committee

Mr. Moses Chuna denied having signed the original certificates.

In observation, Stanley was not remorseful given the fact that he requested to be given one week to bring the original certificates he claimed to have signed with CAO but the committee gave two weeks which certificates he has not yet submitted to date and the fact that he was re invited but deliberately chose not to turn up.

Recommendations;

-His interdiction be lifted but be relieved of duties of HOD and Vote controller.

-Ask him to making good of the loss or damage of public property/assets.

- He should not be tasked to handle activities to do with group registration.

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	The committee was not in existence at the time of assessment.	0
---	--	--	---	---

8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	The recruited number of staff in the previous FY were 69 and a sample of 10 files were taken among others as below; - Muganzi Samuel was appointed on the 16th/September/2019 and accessed the payroll in November/2019. - Kwesiza Bakanyuraki was appointed on the 28th/May/2020 and accessed the pay roll in June/2020 - Ndagono Faridah started work on the 16th/September/2020 and accessed the payroll in November/2020 - Katugume Sunny started work on the 15th/January/2020 and accessed payroll in February/2020 - Sentala Farida started work on the 16th/September/2019 and accessed payroll in November/2019	1
---	---	---	---	---

- Kyomuhendo Noeline started work on the 16th/September/2019 and accessed payroll in November/2019.

- Mboneko Hildah started work on the 16th/September/2019 and accessed payroll in November/2019.

- Ndagire Scovia started work on the 16th/September/2019 and accessed payroll in November/2019.

- Katusiime Kenneth started work on the 16th/September/2019 and accessed payroll in November/2019.

- Kisembo Innocent started work on the 16th/September/2019 and accessed payroll in November/2019..

All the recruited staffs accessed payroll within 2 months of assumption of duty.

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 were 9 retirees in the previous FY and they accessed the pension payroll as below;

- Basaliirwa Everline retired on the 16th/September/2019 and accessed the pension payroll in October/2019.
- Nyamaize Constance retired on the 12th/February/2020 and accessed the pension payroll in March/2020
- Katende Patrick retired on the 21st/June/2020 and accessed the payroll in September/2020
- Bagonza Moses retired on the 24th/January/2020 and accessed payroll in February/2020
- Mutuke Francis retired on the 27th/July/2019 and accessed payroll in March/2020
- Irumba Peter retired on the 1st/January/2020 and accessed payroll in February/2020.
- Birigenda Zahura Sam retired on the 10th/October/2019 and accessed payroll in November/2019.
- Kaahwa Francis retired on the 21st/January/2020 and accessed the payroll in February/2020.
- Ssekyanzi Charles retired on the 21st/January/2020 and accessed the payroll in February/2020.

AS per the above, not all the retirees accessed payroll within 2 months from the date of retirement.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

Effective Planning,
Budgeting and
Transfer of Funds for
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on
this Performance
Measure

a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:

Score 2 or else score 0

Direct transfers to LLG were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY 2019/20 This was evidenced from a Schedule of transfers to LLGS by the CFO D

Dated 20TH November 2020. That was IFMS System generated information

Kyangwali Subcounty

Received a total of Shs 57,169,000 against the budget of 57,169,000 as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers dated 20th h November 2020

Kabwoya Subcounty

Received a total of Shs 42,911,000 against a budget of Shs 42,911,000 as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers dated 20th November 2020I

Buhimba Subcounty Received a total of Shs 22,533,000 against a budget of Shs 22,533,0000 constituting 100% as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers dated 20th h November 2020I

Kizira mfumbi Sub county

Received a total of Shs 27,590,000 against a budget of Shs 27,590,000 as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers dated 20th th November 2020I

Bugambe Subcounty.

Received a total of Shs 25,119,000 against a Budget of Shs 25,119,000 as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers dated 20h November 2020I

Buhimba Town Council

Received a total of Shs 56,130,000 against a budget of shs 56,130,0001 as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers dated 20th November 2020I

Kikuube Town Council

Received a total of Shs 53,340,000 against a budget of Shs 53,340,000 as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers dated 20th November 2020.

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:

Score: 2 or else score 0

The LG did not adhere to the 5 working days requirement from the date of receipt of releases from MOFPED warranting/verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLG for the Las FY in accordance with the requirements of the Budget

Q1- funds totaling Shs 91,148,333 were received on 20th h July 2019 and invoiced to LLGS on 31st July 2019 against a budget of Shs 91,148,333 h as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers to LLGS dated 20TH h November 2020I and duly authenticated by the CFO

The LG was not Compliant as there was a delay of 11days

Q2-

Funds totaling Shs 91,148,333 were received on 20th October 2019 and invoiced to LLGS on 24th th October 2019 against a budget of Shs 91,148,333 as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers to LLGS dated 20th th November 2020 and duly authenticated by the CFO.

The LG was Compliant as Funds were released to LLGS within a period of 4days

Q3-

Funds totaling Shs 91,148,333 were received on 17th dJanuary 2020 and invoiced to LLGS On 24th h January 2020 as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers to LLGS dated 20th h November 2020 and duly authenticated by the CFO

The LG was not Compliant as there was a delay 7days

Qtr. 4

Funds totaling Shs 91,148,333 were received on 16th April 2020 and invoiced to LLGS on 23 rd. April I 2020

as per CFO's Schedule of Transfers dated 20th November 2020 and duly Authenticated by the CFO.

The LG was not Compliant as there was a delay of 7days .

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that the LG had communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Quarter 1</p> <p>Communicated as per the letter dated 31st h July 2019,after receipt of Funds on 31st h July 2019</p> <p>Quarter 2, Communication was made on 17th th October 2019 after receipt of Funds on 17st October 2019 as per release letter</p> <p>Quarter 3</p> <p>LG Communicated tp LLGs on 17th January J 2020 after receipt of Funds on 17th th January 2020</p>	2
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that LG Supervised or mentored all LLGS</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>This area was not applicable since the District did not Supervise/mentor LLGS</p>	0

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>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The District did not have the required 3 categories of Assets Registers outlined on Pages 167to Page 168 of the Local Governments financial and Accounting Manual 2007.</p> <p>The District had one Single Assets Register which covered Furniture, Fittings ICT Equipment , Machinery and Medical Equipment</p> <p>The Assesse was taken through the dynamics of preparing the 3 required categories of Assets Registers outline on pages 167-168 of the Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007 The Three Categories of Assets Register through which the Assesse was taken through were Assets Register General, Assets Register for Motor Vehicles and heavy Machinery. Assets Register for Land and Buildings The emphasis was put on Separate 3 categories of the Assets registers outline in Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual</p> <p>The mentoring was done to the Satisfaction of the Assesse s .</p>	0
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>There was no Documentary evidence that the District had 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>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District had a functional physical planning committee . The physical Planning Committee produced 4 sets of minutes and Submitted them to MoLHUD</p> <p>1st Quarter Set of Minutes dated 31st October 2019 was Submitted to MoLHUD on 7TH September 2019</p> <p>2nd Quarter set of minutes dated 27th January 2020 WAS Submitted to MoLHUD on 7th September 2020</p> <p>3rd Quarter set of minutes dated 18th March th 2020 was Submitted to MoLHUD on 7th September 2020</p>	2

4th Quarter set of minutes dated 15th June 2020 were Submitted to MoLHUD on 7th September 2020

The Physical Planning Committee was established in accordance with Section 11 of the Physical Planning Act 2010 with 13 members. The members were appointed by CAO as indicated below

The Following Persons were appointed by the CAO to Kikuube Physical Planning Committee under Ref CR214/19 on 12th February 2020

Chairperson

Muganzi Samuel Principal Assistant Secretary

Mrs Kabahanguzi Annet Member Acting District Community Development Officer .

Secretary

Mr Bahungule Ronnie Physical Planner

Mr Bwami Hussein Member Acting Town Clerk ,Kikuube Town Council

Mr Kyahurwa Philip Member Town Clerk Buhimba Town Council.

Mr Arinitwe Emmy Member Acting District Engineer

Nrs Nsita Gertrude Member Environment Officer

Mrs Nambi Pauline

Member Senior Education Officer

Mr Kahesi Samuel

District Agricultural Officer (DAO)

Member

Agondeza Hillary Winyi Member District Water Officer

Byagaba Deogratious Member District Education officer

Kwikiriza Nicholas Magambo Member Acting District Health Officer.

Apollo Makumbi Member Private Physical Planner
The District had a Physical Development dated September 2018 that was Approved by the district Council in a Meeting of 28th September 2020 Under Minute Number 044 9/2020 . The Draft District Physical Development Plan was Submitted to MoLHUD on 11th November 2020 in order to be approved by the National Physical Planning Board . The Submission letter was dated 10th November 2020

Building plan Registration Book was in place
Submissions for new investments were being
Considered with a period of 30days

For instance a Developer by the names of J Gideon
Byakagaba of Kiswaza Trading Centre Submitted a
Building Plan for a Commercial Building on 10th
February 2020 Another Developer called Ntambe
Dezidelio of Kidoma Submitted a Building plan for
aCommercial Building on 23rd February 2020 .

tHE performance Assessment Team found out that
said BuLDING pLans were Approved by the District
planning Committee on 18th March 2020 Under minute
Number APP03/PPC/2020

12

Planning and
budgeting for
investments is
conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on
this Performance
Measure

d.For DDEG financed
projects;

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

Score 2 or else score 0

There was no documentary evidence that the District
had Conducted desk appraisal for all the projects in
the budget The information that all the prioritized
investments were derived from the LGD was not
availed to the Performance Assessment Team. For
instance the only infrastructure project funded under
DDEEG of Nyamirima-- Bujwaya – Kakindo 8Km
of road. That is the Only information the Team
managed to get.

0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that the District had Conducted appraisals for all projects to check for technical feasibility Environment and social acceptability</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Project T Profiles were not availed to the Assessment team for verification</p> <p>However the minutes indicating discussion of Projects Profiles were in place , The TPC meeting of 24th October 2019 IN the Council Hall discussed project profiles under Min 044/KDLGe</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that the LG had screened for Environmental and social risk/ impact and put mitigation measures required before being approved for construction.</p> <p>Construction and rehabilitation of Munteme Kaigo – Kidoma 8.0 was screened and these were mitigation measures as mention below;</p> <p>Sensitization of communities on road reserves limits</p> <p>Allow for drainage off waste water to 1000m soak pit</p> <p>Provide first aid kit and sensitize on how to use kits, provide protection gears to the road workers</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan Score 1 or else score 0	The LG did plan for DDEG funded instructed projects in the FY 2020/21 As per the procurement plan signed by the CAO on 30th July,2020 and submitted to PPDA on 3rd August,2020	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	The LG did not implement any DDEG funded project so it was not possible to assess this indicator	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	There was Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) as specified in the sector guidelines It was only the education sector which had the Project Implementation Team was appointed by CAO on 3rd May ,2020 and included the following: Arinaitwe Emmy (Acting District Engineer) as Project Manager Byarugaba Deogratias (District Education Officer) as Contract Manager Nambi Pauline (District Environment Officer) as a member Mwanje Nelson (District Community Development Officer) as a member Health sector and water sector did not have Project Implementation Teams	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no infrastructure project implemented using DDEG so it was not possible to assess this parameter.	1

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

e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence that the LG had provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in the previous year as shown below:

For example in education:

Construction of a 5 Stance latrine at Wairagaza Primary School

KIKU628//WRKS/019-020/00007

A awarded to Zoom Sounds Limited

Payment certificate was;

Certified by Water Engineer on 4th May,2020

Certified by DEO on 6th May,2020

Verified by Principal Internal Auditor on 6th May,2020

Certified by Chief Finance on 4th May,2020

Approved by the CAO on 7th May,2020

Health

The construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at Bugambe HC III

A awarded to Akaal Construction Company Limited

Contract Sum: 21,971,436

Verified by the District Engineer on : 4th June,2020

Forwarded by DHO on 4th June,2020

Verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 10th June,2020

Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 11th June,2020

Approved by CAO on 11th June,2020

Payment made on 11th June,2020

Drilling of 7 boreholes

KIKU 628/WRKS/019-20/00002

Contract Sum: 148,198,657

Contractor: MSR technologies Limited

Payment sheet: 16th June,2020

Verified by the District Water Officer on

Verified by Principal Internal Auditor

Approved by: Chief Administrative Officer

Payment made on 24th June, 2020

Voucher No: 7/6

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the sector infrastructure projects had been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract.</p> <p>For example, in education sector;</p> <p>There was evidence that DEO, certified the works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors. However, the CDO and the Environment officer did not certify as seen below:</p> <p>Construction of a 5 Stance latrine at Wairagaza Primary School</p> <p>KIKU628//WRKS/019-020/00007</p> <p>A awarded to Zoom Sounds Limited</p> <p>Certified by Water Engineer on 4th May,2020</p> <p>Certified by DEO on 6th May,2020</p> <p>Verified by Principal Internal Auditor on 6th May,2020</p> <p>Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 4th May,2020</p> <p>Approved by the CAO on 7th May,2020</p> <p>There was evidence that the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors! Suppliers. For example:</p> <p>The construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at Bugambe HC III</p> <p>A awarded to Akaal Construction Company Limited</p> <p>Contract Sum: 21,971,436</p> <p>Verified by the District Engineer on : 4th June,2020</p> <p>Forwarded by DHO on 4th June,2020</p> <p>Verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 10th June,2020</p> <p>Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 11th June,2020</p> <p>Approved by CAO on 11th June,2020</p> <p>Payment made on 11th June,2020</p>
---	---	---

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: According to the PPDA Act, a complete procurement file is supposed to contain; the evaluation report, works</p>
---	---	--

Measure

Score 1 or else 0

contract and minutes of the Contracts Committee.

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Kirimbi Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00009

A awarded to Prozeka Enterprises Limited

Contract sum: UGX 21,606,196

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Construction of Kikuube HC IV Gate house

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00003

A awarded to Kona Company Limited

Contract sum: UGX 19,869,967

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Construction of Kikuube HC IV Gate house

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00003

A awarded to Kona Company Limited

Contract sum: UGX 19,869,967

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 2

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00020

Contract Sum: 33,696,307

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.

Score: 2 or else score 0

The LG designated Ms. Ndagano Faridah as focal person for coordinating response to feed-back as per letter dated 6th January, 2020 under reference no CR: 159/1 by Moses Chuna Kapolon Ag. Chief Administration Officer.

The grievance redress committee was comprised of nine members as mentioned below;

Mr. Mugisha Moses,

Ms. Kabahanguzi Annet,

Ms. Katugume Sunny,

Ms. Ndagano Faridah,

Mr. Ruhweza Protus,

Mr. Muhanuzi Stuart

Minutes of the grievance committee meeting held on 20th February, 2020 at the Council chambers and it was by six members.

2

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievance at the time of assessment</p> <p>Kikuube district local government</p> <p>Grievance policy and procedures.</p> <p>The following were noted from the Policy and Procedures document:</p> <p>ALL GRIEVANCE WILL BE PROMPTLY AT ALL STAGES OF THE PROCEDURE</p> <p>A FULL INVESTIGATION WILL BE CARRIED OUT TO ESTABLISH THE FACTS AND TRY TO RESOLVE THE GRIEVANCE.</p> <p>THE PERSON BRINGING THE GRIEVANCE WILL BE KEPT INFORMED OF THE PROGRESS AT ALL STAGES OF THE PROCEDURE AND GIVES AN OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND BEFORE ANY DECISION/ACTIONS ARE TAKEN.</p> <p>NOTE WILL BE TAKEN FOR ALL MEETINGS.</p> <p>THERE WILL BE A RIGHT OF APPEAL AGAINST ANY FORMAL DECISION AND THE APPEAL CHAIR WILL BE SELECTED ON THEIR IMPARTIALITY.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that the grieved parties know where to report at the time of assessment.</p> <p>ALL GRIEVANCE WILL BE PROMPTLY AT ALL STAGES OF THE PROCEDURE</p> <p>A FULL INVESTIGATION WILL BE CARRIED OUT TO ESTABLISH THE FACTS AND TRY TO RESOLVE THE GRIEVANCE.</p> <p>THE PERSON BRINGING THE GRIEVANCE WILL BE KEPT INFORMED OF THE PROGRESS AT ALL STAGES OF THE PROCEDURE AND GIVES AN OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND BEFORE ANY DECISION/ACTIONS ARE TAKEN.</p> <p>NOTE WILL BE TAKEN FOR ALL MEETINGS.</p> <p>THERE WILL BE A RIGHT OF APPEAL AGAINST ANY FORMAL DECISION AND THE APPEAL CHAIR WILL BE SELECTED ON THEIR IMPARTIALITY.</p>	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environmental social and climate intervention had been integrated in the DLDP on page 4-6, 16 and on page 68 -117</p> <p>Approved Annual work plan environmental and climate change issues are found on page 103 - 125 and social issues on page 126 – 136</p> <p>Approved budget estimates environmental and climate issues are found on page 51 - 53 and social issues on page 54 - 57.</p>	1
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>Training of sub county chiefs, town clerks and sub accountants in PBS held from 11th to 13th February, 2019 report DDEG guideline were discussed under objectives and structure of the DDEG and it was attended by 12 members.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had not incorporated costed ESMPS into design, BoQs bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects for previous FY at the time of assessment.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no costing of additional impact from climate change at the time of assessment.</p>	3

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no documentary evidence availed to the Assessment Team that all projects implemented under DDEG were on land where the LG had a proof of ownership.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	The Environmental Officer and CDO did not conduct support supervision and monitoring of all projects implemented to ascertain compliance at the time of assessment.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	The LG had no documentary evidence that E & S certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and PCDO prior to payment of contractors invoice at interim and final stage of projects	0

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations up to end of FY 2019/20 as at 30th June 2020 and were up to date at the time of the Assessment. This was evidenced from the following 3 Sampled reconciled Bank Accounts .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Resources bank Account 9030015011288 at at Stanbic Bank Hoima Branch had been reconciled to 30th June 2020 and reconciled up to date as at 30th October • Production department Bank Account 9030015092083 at Stanbic Bank Hoima Branch had been reconciled up to 30th June 2020 and was reconciled up to date as at 30th October 2020 at the time of Assessment. • Water Sector Bank Account 9030015011598 at Stanbic Bank Hoima Branch had reconciled to 30th June 2020 as at the end of Financial Year 2019/2020 and reconciled to date as at 30TH JUNE at the time of Assessment. 	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that the LG had produced all Quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY 2019/2020 and submitted them to relevant Authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarterly Internal Audit report was produced and submitted to District Council Speaker on 19th December 2019 • 2nd Quarterly Internal Audit report was produced and Submitted to District Council Speaker on 28th February 2020h • 3rd Quarterly Internal Audit report was produced and Submitted to District Council Speaker on 16th August2020. • 4th Quarterly Internal Audit report was produced and Submitted to District Council Speaker on 31th st August 2020. 	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that the Local Government had provided information to the Council C Chair person ..</p> <p>The Performance Assessment Team found out that Kikuube District Local Government did not have a Local Government Public Accounts Committee in place. This is because since its inception the District has been having an interim Council which did not have powers to nominate members of the Organs of the Council including members of the ;Local Government Public Accounts Committee. The implication of this situation was that all the Quaterly Internal Audit reports were not reviewed as required,In FY 2019/20</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was documentary evidence that internal audit reports were produced and submitted to LG Accounting Officer And LGPAC</p> <p>1st Quarterly internal audit report was t produced and submitted to Accounting Officer on 19th December 2019</p> <p>2nd Quarterly internal audit report was produced and submitted to Accounting Officer on 28th February t 2020</p> <p>3rd Quarterly internal audit report was produced and Submitted to Accounting Officer 16th August 2020 On 23rd September 2020.</p> <p>4th Quarterly internal audit report was Submitted to Accounting Officer on 31st August 2020.</p> <p>The Internal Audit Reports fir FY 2919/2020 were not reviewed because the Local Government Public Accounts Committee which is mandated to review the Internal Audit reports was non existent.</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>Local Revenue Collected FY 2019/20 was Shs 366,300,956 Page 19 of Draft final AccountsFY2919/20</p> <p>Original Budgets for Local Revenue FY 2019/20 was Shs</p> <p>4,324,746,000 Page 1 of the Original Budget FY 2019/20</p> <p>Percentage Budget Realization was Shs1330,236,000 Page 1 of the Original Budget FY 2019/2020 Shs</p> <p>366,300,956 Page 19 of the draft final Accounts FY 2019/2020</p> <p>4,324,746,000 Page 1 of the Original Local revenue Budget- Relisation was Shs 8,47% resulting into a deficit of 92%</p> <p>Reasons that were advanced for this dismal performance hinged on the COVID 19 Pandemic which affected all sources of local revenue in all aspects There was an element of unrealistic budgeting for Local revenue.</p> <p>Budgeting for Local revenue was based on fantasy other than the reality on the ground</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% - 10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>Local revenue increased from 312,481,788 page 22 of the Audited Final Accounts 2018/2019 to Shs 366,300,956 page 19 of Draft Final Accounts FY 20192020</p> <p>Shs 366,300,956 page 19 of the Draft Final Accounts - minus Shs 312,481,788 Page 12 of the Audited Final Accounts = an increase of Shs 53,819,168</p> <p>FY 2018/2019</p> <p>Percentage was Shs 53,819,168 X 100 -- 17%</p> <p style="text-align: right;">shs 312,481,788</p> <p>Increase of 17 %</p> <p>There were no reasons given for the increased Local revenue</p>	2
----	--	---	--	---

20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	Local revenue Subjected to mandatory LLGs share of Local revenue during the previous FY 2019 was not AVAILED TO THE performance Assessment Team for verification’.	0
----	---	---	--	---

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	<p>There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts were published for display given below;</p> <p>PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. SUBJECT OF PROCUREMENT BEST EVALUATED BIDDER TOTAL CONTRACT PRICE (UGX)</p> <p>KIKU 628/WRKS/020-021/00001 Survey, sighting and drilling of boreholes Icon Projects Ltd 313,496,500/=</p> <p>KIKU 628/WRKS/020-021/00002 Construction of a 2(two) Classroom block with Ramps at Kabiira Primary School Aine Building & Civil Engineering Ltd 86,231,798/=</p> <p>KIKU 628/WRKS/020-021/00003 Construction of a 2(two) Classroom block with Ramps at Muhwiju Primary School Crystal Consult (U) Ltd 86,550,717/=</p> <p>KIKU 628/WRKS/020-021/00004 Construction of a 2(two) Classroom block with Ramps at Kitoole Primary School Karki Builders & Engineers Ltd 85,986,600/=</p> <p>Date of Display: 12th October 2020</p> <p>Date of Removal: 23rd October 2020</p> <p>Display of this Notice does not constitute acceptance of the bids described above or the formation of contracts.</p> <p>Bids acceptance and contracts placement shall be in accordance with the Regulations.</p> <p>Authorised for display on the Procurement and Disposal Notice Board</p> <p>Name: CHRIS BYARUGABA Signature: _____</p> <p>Position: SENIOR PROCUREMENT OFFICER Date: _____</p> <p>LIST OF UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS AND REASONS FOR FAILURE IN RESPECT TO PROCUREMENT NOTICE No. 2, 2020/2021 FY</p> <p>PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. SUBJECT OF PROCUREMENT UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDER</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

REASON FOR FAILURE

KIKU 628/WRKS/020-021/00001

Survey, sighting and drilling of boreholes 1.Mama Bore wells Africa Ltd

2.MSR Technologies (U) Ltd 1.Inadequate specific experience

2. Non submission of academic documents of Key personnel required for the project.

1.Higher price than the Best evaluated bidder

KIKU 628/WRKS/020-021/00002

Construction of a 2(two) Classroom block with Ramps at Kabiira Primary School 1.Munda Holdings Ltd

1.Submission of the wrong format of the bid security

KIKU 628/WRKS/020-021/00003

Construction of a 2(two) Classroom block with Ramps at Muhwiju Primary School

1. Basingo Construction Co.

2.Mutembe & Company Ltd

1.Submission of Partnership Deed instead of a certificate of incorporation,

2.Non declaration of the Nationality of the Bidder

3.Non submission of the specific registered powers of Attorney for the project

4.Submission of a wrong format of the bid security

1.Submission of forged PPDA Certificate

2.Non submission of the specific registered powers of Attorney for the project

3.Submission of a wrong format of the bid security

KIKU 628/WRKS/020-021/00004

Construction of a 2(two) Classroom block with Ramps at Kitoole Primary School

1.Crystal Consults (U) Ltd

2. Higher price than the Best evaluated bidder

Date of Display: 12th October 2020

Date of Removal: 23rd October 2020

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications were published on public notice board but there was no evidence that the performance assessment results were published on the budget website.</p> <p>The performance assessment results were pinned on the public notice board on 25th July 2020 as per the information given by the District Planner by the names of Faustine Twesigye.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the recordings on CD dated 26th May 2020 that the LG conducted barazas with public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation .</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: at the time of this Assessment.</p>	0
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared an IGG report which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The CAO wrote a letter dated 25th November 2019 to District Service Commission having been directed by the Inspectorate of Government The IGG wanted Nabwire Flavia the Former Town Clerk Buhimba Town Council to be Submitted to District Service Commission for appropriate disciplinary action for her involvement in dubious land deals at Buhimba Town Council while She was a Town Clerk there</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates. Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0	The LG PLE pass rate improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year by 8.822% as shown below; 2018 G1+G2+G3 129+1174+835=2138 $(2138/3218)*100=66.438\%$ 2019 G1+G2+G3 151+1545+811=2507 $2507/3331*100=75.26\%$ $75.26\%-66.438\%=8.822\%$ improvement	4

1

Learning Outcomes:
The LG has improved
PLE and USE pass
rates.

b) The LG UCE pass rate has
improved between the previous
school year but one and the previous
year

The UCE pass rate declined between the
previous school's year but one and the
previous year by -0.62% as shown below;

0

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

- If improvement by more than 5%
score 3
- Between 1 and 5% score 2
- No improvement score 0

2018

D1+D2+D3

8+49+98=155

$(155/483)*100=32\%$

2019

D1+D2+D3

5+42+87=134

$134/427*100=31.38\%$

$31.38\%-32\%=-0.62\%$ decline in performance

2

Service Delivery
Performance: Increase
in the average score in
the education LLG
performance
assessment.

a) Average score in the education LLG N/A
performance has improved between
the previous year but one and the
previous year

0

Maximum 2 points

- If improvement by more than 5%
score 2
- Between 1 and 5% score 1
- No improvement score 0

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The education development grant was used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines.

Local government quarterly performance report FY 2019/2020. Vote:628 Kikuube District stamped and dated 5/8/2020, page 67;

Classroom construction and rehabilitation of 1 block with 2 classrooms at Musajja Makuru PS, Musajja Mukuru East Parish, Buhimba SC

Latrine construction and rehabilitation of 10 latrine stances at Nyawaiga and Wairagaza PS in Kabwoya and Kyangwali SC, PAGE 68.

Provision of furniture to 4 primary schools

Musajja Mukuru 40

Ruguse 40

St Anatoli Karama 40

Munteme 40

Administrative capital

A double cabin vehicle procured, monitored and supervised, environmental screening, evaluation carried out, office furniture procured, 1 laptop, 1 office cabinet, page 76.

2

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that DEO, certified the works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors. However, the CDO and the Environment officer did not certify as seen below:

Construction of a 5 Stance latrine at Wairagaza Primary School

KIKU628//WRKS/019-020/00007

A awarded to Zoom Sounds Limited

Certified by Water Engineer on 4th May,2020

0

Certified by DEO on 6th May,2020

Verified by Principal Internal Auditor on 6th
May,2020

Certified by Chief Finance on 4th May,2020

Approved by the CAO on 7th May,2020

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at
Nyawaiga Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00008

Awarded to Heavy Investments Ltd

Payment certificate No.1

Certified by District Engineer on 29th
May,2020

Recommended by DEO on 29th May,2020

Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 29th
May,2020

Approved by the CAO on 29th May,2020

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at
Mwihwiju Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00011

Awarded to Basingo Construction Company

Payment certificate No.1

Certified by District Engineer on 27th
May,2020

Recommended by DEO on 4th June,2020

Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 8th
June,2020

Approved by the CAO on 8th June,2020

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

c) If the variations in the contract price
are within +/-20% of the MoWT
estimates score 2 or else score 0

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at
Nyawaiga Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00008

Engineer's estimates: 30,000,000

Contract price: 28,911,632

Variance: 6.76 % Approximately 6.8%

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at
Mwihwiju Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00011

Engineer's estimates:22,500,00

Contract price: UGX 21,536,645

Variance 4.47% Approximately 4.5%

Construction of a -Two Classroom block at
Musaijamukuru Primary School- Education
Dept

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00001

Engineer's estimates: UGX90,000,000

Contract price: UGX 88,785,211

Variance: 1.36% Approximately 1.4%

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	There was evidence that education projects were completed as per work plan in the previous FY as shown below: Construction of a 5 Stance lined latrine with a wash room at Nyawaiga Primary School. Completed on 26th May,2020 Construction of a 5-Stance lined pit latrine at Kirimbi Primary School. Completed on 28th May,2020 Construction of a 5 Stance lined latrine with a wash room at Muhwiju Primary School. Completed on 27th May,2020 Construction of a two-classroom block at Musaijamukuru Primary School. Completed on 25th June,2020 Construction of a 5-Stance lined pit latrine at Kitondora Primary School. Completed on 4th June,2020	2
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0	Ceiling =822 Filled=596 Gap =226 $(596/822)*100%$ = 72.506% The percentage showed a big staffing gap of 226 staff in the District.	1
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines, • If above 70% score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0	The LG did not have a consolidated Asset Register with a list of all registered UPE and USE schools for the previous two financial years	0

5 Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance. Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG accurately reported on teachers and where they were deployed.

Kigaaya COU in Buhimba SC had 10 teachers on ground and this was the same number I found at the DEO's office

Ruguse PS in Bugambe SC had 16 teachers on ground and this was the same number I found at the DEO's office

2

5 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 LG did not have a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools. There was no consolidated asset register at the DEO's office.

However, when I visited the sampled schools,

Kigaaya COU in Buhimba SC had an asset register for only 2019 showing 102 desks, 1 table, 1 chair, 12 sports wear t-shirts for boys, 11 cupboards, 6 classrooms, 6 latrine stances for boys, 5 latrine stances for girls, 1 latrine stance for male teachers, 1 latrine stance for female teachers

Kikuube BSC PS in Kiziranfumbi TC had an asset register for only 2019 showing 196 desks, 12 benches, 11 tables, 28 office chairs, 2 office desks, 11 wooden cupboards, 2 metallic cupboards, 20 slashes, 11 hoes.

However, Ruguse PS in Bugambe SC didn't have an asset register

0

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>Only 45 schools out of 71 schools had complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chairperson of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30.</p> <p>$45/71*100=63.38\%$</p> <p>The assessor was able to sample 3 annual performance reports as shown below;</p> <p>Ruguse PS Head Teacher Mr Mwesigwa Gerald submitted on 31st December 2019</p> <p>Ngurwe PS</p> <p>Head Teacher Mr Ndyanabo Joshua submitted on 19th December 2019</p> <p>Bukinda PS</p> <p>Head Teacher Mr Byamugisha David submitted on 20th December 2019</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>Document on funding by UNICEF authorized by the CAO for the Training of school management committees on development and implementation of school improvement plans (SIPS) and school development plans (SDPS) funded by UNICEF signed by the CAO on 12th December 2019</p> <p>All the 3 sampled schools that is Kigaaya COU in Buhimba SC,</p> <p>Ruguse PS in Bugambe SC,</p> <p>Kikuube BSC PS in Kiziranfumbi TC had School Improvement Plans for 2019/2020</p> <p>$3/3*100=100$</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

6

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:

- If 100% score: 4:
- Between 90 – 99% score 2
- Below 90% score 0

The LG collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year.

This was evidenced by a document from the CAO to the office of the commissioner education planning MoES dated 12th September 2019

On list of schools and submission of enrolment data for primary and secondary schools for Kikuube DLG.

The total Number of Schools was 71 Primary Schools with an enrollment of 40,425 Pupils.

6 secondary schools with 2769 students

This was the same on PBS

Percentage = $(71/71) * 100 = 100\%$

4

Human Resource Management and Development

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:

Score 4 or else, score: 0

The LG Education Department had a final approved work plan for FY 2020/21 with a wage bill of UGX 4,191,371,000 for 596 teachers on ground as per the staff list as at June 2020, and the Kikuube District Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2020/21, Vote: 628, Page 28, dated 2nd June, 2020. This was for 71 schools in the current financial year as per the staff list.

$596/71 = 8.394$ teachers per school

4

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

The LG deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY. From the teachers staff list availed by the DEO and as per sampled 3 primary schools, for instance ,

It was evidenced that a number of schools had more than 7 teachers.

Kigaaya COU in Buhimba SC had 10 teachers on ground and this was the same number I found at the DEO's office

Ruguse PS in Bugambe SC had 16 teachers on ground and this was the same number I found at the DEO's office

Kikuube BSC PS in Kiziranfumbi TC had 11 teachers on ground and this was the same number I found at the DEO's office

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

Teacher deployment data was disseminated or publicized on school notice boards on manila papers written by the school Heads.

This was evidenced as seen below;

The DEO's office had a list of staff dated 2nd July 2020

From the sampled schools the following was found displayed;

Kigaaya COU in Buhimba SC had 10 teachers on ground and this was the same number I found at the DEOs office

Ruguse PS in Bugambe SC had 16 teachers on ground and this was the same number I found at the DEO's office

Kikuube BSC PS in Kiziranfumbi TC had 11 teachers on ground and this was the same number I found at the DEO's office

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

10 Appraisal forms of Primary School Head teachers had been sampled to see if appraisals were done in the previous Calendar Year and on time as below;

- Kaahwa Eriab was appraised on the 28th/November/2019
- Kyategeka Robinson was appraised on the 29th/November/2019.
- Ahangaare William was appraised on the 25th/September/2019
- Kagoro Robert was appraised on the 18th/January/2020
- Kato Yahaya was appraised on the 10th/February/2020
- Nyakoojo Fredrick was not appraised in the last Calendar Year
- Rubiito JohnBosco was not appraised in the last Calendar Year.
- Businge Elias was not appraised in the last Calendar Year.
- Tekereza J. Alfred was not appraised in the last Calendar Year.
- Ayesiga Geoffrey was not appraised in the last Calendar Year.

This showed that a few head teachers had been appraised in the previous Calendar year(2019) with the majority not being appraised.

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM</p>	<p>There was no Evidence to show that the secondary School Head teachers had been appraised during the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p>	<p>Structure of Kikuube DLG issued on 18th/July/ 2018; issued by the ministry of public service, the LG had 7 staff under the Education Department of which 3 positions had been filled and were appraised as below;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Zondera Amon the Inspector of Schools was appraised on the 17th/September/2020 - Talemwa Amon the Education Assisstant , Guidance & Counselling was not appraised . 	
			<p>As per the above information, not all of the staff in the Education department were appraised in the previous Financial Year</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>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p>	<p>There was no evidence during time of assessment</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</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.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.

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

The LG confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually as per the document below;

This was evidenced by a document from the CAO to the office of the commissioner education planning MoES dated 12th September 2019

On list of schools and submission of enrolment data for primary and secondary schools for Kikuube DLG.

The total Number of Schools was 71 Primary Schools with an enrollment of 40,425 Pupils.

6 secondary schools with 2769 students

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

b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.

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

The LG confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually as per the document below;

This was evidenced by a document from the CAO to the office of the commissioner education planning MoES dated 12th September 2019

On list of schools and submission of enrolment data for primary and secondary schools for Kikuube DLG.

The total Number of Schools was 71 Primary Schools with an enrollment of 40,425 Pupils.

6 secondary schools with 2769 students

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The Local Government did not make timely warranting verification of direct grant transfers for the last FY in accordance n to the requirement of the Budget For instance Funds totaling Shs 73,154,000 FOR the First Quarter were warranted on 20th July 2020 invoiced on 31st July 2020 for the First Quarter FY 2019/20m There was adelay of 11days</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that that the LG invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated! publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>Q1 & Q2 2019 on 31st July 2019</p> <p>Q3 2019/2020 on 17th January 2020</p> <p>Q4 2019/2020 on 16th April 2020</p> <p>From the sampled schools the Assessment Team was able to see the displayed releases in all the schools namely;</p> <p>Kigaaya COU in Buhimba SC,</p> <p>Ruguse PS in Bugambe SC, and</p> <p>Kikuube BSC PS in Kiziranfumbi TC for 2019 and 2020</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education Department prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections as seen below;</p> <p>Annual school inspection workplan for Kikuube DLG for FY2019/2020 dated 2nd July 2019 from DEO to CAO which included a plan for full inspection</p> <p>February- May at 12,688,000</p> <p>May-August at 12,688,00</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>All 71 registered UPE schools were inspected and monitored in all the three terms for the FY 2019/2020 as per the reports submitted on the dates below;</p> <p>Term 3 2019 all 71 schools inspected as per the Inspection report for 3rd term 2019, dated 2nd December 2019</p> <p>Thus 100% inspection</p> <p>Term 1 2020- all 71schools inspected as per the Inspection report for 1st term 2020, dated 4th May 2020</p> <p>Thus 100% inspection</p> <p>Term 2 2020 all 71 schools inspected as per the Inspection report for 2nd Term 2020, dated 27th August 2020</p> <p>Thus 100% inspection</p>	2

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 that inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up as shown below;</p> <p>Kikuube District Education Department meeting held on 11th November 2019 minute 07/2019 presentation of inspection findings where it was mentioned that most teachers had schemes of work and lesson plans. Musitwa Winfred a CCT had been deployed to work as an associate assessor. There was slow completion of school construction projects.</p> <p>Minute 08/2019 was on reaction and way forward. There was a need to sensitise parents and teachers to support the schools on provision of mid day meals to their children. Need to recruit more teachers. Head teachers to supervise teaching and learning.</p>	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 that the DIS and DEO 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) as evidenced;</p> <p>Term 3 2019, Term 1 2020 and Term 2 2020 were also submitted to DES Kampala office on 1st September 2020</p> <p>From the sampled schools only Kikuube BSC PS in Kiziranfumbi TC had been inspected on 22nd October 2019 by Ms Nakamidi Sarah.</p> <p>Kigaaya COU in Buhimba SC, and Ruguse PS in Bugambe S didn't have inspection reports in school,</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 council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports on 1st October 2019 under Min No. 004/10/2019. The meeting particularly focused on UPE/USE releases and Development Grant and Inspection Grants. The DEO pointed out that Funding towards the sector had slightly increased and some schools are understaffed</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education Department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school as shown below;</p> <p>Training on VACis, RTRR, MHM, Gender mainstreaming, safe school initiative and school health to enhance adolescent engagement in issues affecting them held on 17th September, dated Monday 15th October 2019. It talked about school management mainstreaming gender issues, how to make schools attractive for learners, protecting against gender violence.</p> <p>Document addressed to the CAO from the DEO on meeting held by the DIS with Head Teachers dated 18th December 2019 on Mobilisation and sensitization of parents and community leaders on involvement into school programme enhance access, retention an attendance for improved learning outcomes if Kiswaza, Rusaka and Kikuube BSC, Kisambo and other areas in the District.</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>No evidence during time of assessment</p>	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; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There Was no documentary evidence that was provided at the time of Assessment</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that LG had conducted field Appraisal for: (i) technical feasibility; ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs aver the previous FY</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG Education department had budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects for FY 2020/21 had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan.</p> <p>The projects included:</p> <p>Two Classroom block with Ramps at Kabiira Primary School- Education Department at UGX 87,500,000 on pg.2</p> <p>Two Classroom block with Ramps at Muhwiju Primary School- Education Department at UGX 87,500,000 on pg.2</p> <p>Two Classroom block with Ramps at Kitoole Primary School- Education Department at UGX 87,500,000 on pg.2</p> <p>As per the procurement plan signed by the CAO on 21st September,2020 and submitted to PPDA on 21st September,2020</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction as shown below:</p> <p>Construction of Nyairongo Seed Secondary School</p>	1

As per the Solicitor General's letter dated
11th April,2019 under reference:
DLAS/FPT/026/2019 Contract price:
1,847,996,900

The Contract a Warded on 20th March,2020
under Minute No:33.3.19

Other school infrastructure projects which
were approved by the Contracts Committee
included:

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine
with a wash room at Nyawaiga Primary
School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00008

A warded to Heavy Investments Limited

Contract sum: UGX 28,911,632

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No:
33.3.20

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine
with a wash room at Kirimbi Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00009

A warded to Prozeka Enterprises Limited

Contract sum: UGX 21,606,196

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No:
33.3.20

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine
with a wash room at Wairagaza Primary
School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00007

A warded to Zoom Sounds Limited

Contract sum: UGX 21,052,196

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No:
33.3.20

Construction of a two-classroom block at
Musajamukulu Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00001

A awarded to Karki Builders and Engineer's Limited

Contract sum: UGX 88,785,221

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Kitondora Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00010

A awarded to Muteme and Company Limited

Contract sum: UGX 22,235,069

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines</p> <p>The Project Implementation Team was appointed by CAO on 3rd May ,2020 and included the following:</p> <p>Arinaitwe Emmy (Acting District Engineer) as Project Manager</p> <p>Byarugaba Deogratias (District Education Officer) as Contract Manager</p> <p>Nambi Pauline (District Environment Officer) as a member</p> <p>Mwanje Nelson (District Community Development Officer) as a member</p> <p>The members included: District Engineer as Projects Manager</p> <p>District Education Officer as the Contract Manager</p> <p>Environment Officer as a member</p> <p>Community Development Officer as a member</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES.</p> <p>Technical designs:</p> <p>Boys</p> <p>Block:</p> <p>Floor plan:</p> <p>600mm wide conc splash apron surround</p> <p>Cement screed laid to falls</p> <p>Provision for urinal</p> <p>1:12 Ramp</p> <p>500*600mm precast conc cover</p> <p>150*150*4mm thick MS plate welded on hand rail</p> <p>Vent piped placed on stance one after urinal</p> <p>Section X-X</p>	1

Wire netting cover to 100mm dia P.v.C pipe

28 Gauge pre-painted galvanized sheets

100*50 mm wall plate

100mm*50mm rafters

Vents

Internal walls finished with cement lime plaster

75mm thick splash apron

Girls block same as a above except for the provision of shower instead of urinal

For example:

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Nyawaiga Primary School

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Kirimbi Primary School

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Wairagaza Primary School

All the above latrines were built according to design as summarized below:

5-stance latrine comprising of 4 stances for able bodied learners and one stance for PWDs with two hand rail support

500*600mm precast cone cover

Ramp was in place

Environment mitigation mechanism in place (grass cover

600mm wide cone splash apron surround

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the monthly site meetings were held in all sector infrastructure projects as shown below:</p> <p>Meeting held on 24th June,2019</p> <p>Attended by:</p> <p>Nambi Pauline (Senior environment Officer)</p> <p>Basisjja Robert (Manager , Kwik Build & Engineering Limited</p> <p>Nakamadi Sarah (Acting Education Officer)</p> <p>Ssenyange John (Clerk of Works</p> <p>Ijala Patrick (Site Supervisor)</p> <p>Kyalisiima Juliet (Adminstrator Kwik)</p> <p>Arinaitwe Emmy (Acting District Engineer)</p> <p>Moses Chuna Kapolon (Chief Administrative Officer)</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no 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., had been conducted.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the sector infrastructure projects had been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract.</p> <p>There was evidence that DEO, certified the works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors. However, the CDO and the Environment officer did not certify as seen below:</p> <p>Construction of a 5 Stance latrine at Wairagaza Primary School</p> <p>KIKU628//WRKS/019-020/00007</p> <p>A warded to Zoom Sounds Limited</p> <p>Certified by Water Engineer on 4th May,2020</p> <p>Certified by DEO on 6th May,2020</p>	1

Verified by Principal Internal Auditor on 6th May,2020

Certified by Chief Finance on 4th May,2020

Approved by the CAO on 20th May,2020

Payment made on 29th May,2020

Voucher No:141

Time frame 9 days

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at Nyawaiga Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00008

Awarded to Heavy Investments Ltd

Payment certificate No.1

Certified by District Engineer on 29th May,2020

Recommended by DEO on 29th May,2020

Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 29th May,2020

Approved by the CAO on 29th May,2020

Payment made on 10th June,2020

Time frame:12 days

Voucher No: Not indicated

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at Mwiwiju Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00011

Awarded to Basingo Construction Company

Payment certificate No.1

Certified by District Engineer on 27th May,2020

Recommended by DEO on 4th June,2020

Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 8th June,2020

Approved by the CAO on 10th June,2020

Payment made on; 10th June,2020

Time frame: 1 day

Voucher No: Not indicated

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The was no evidence that the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30,</p> <p>Instead the department submitted the procurement plan which was prepared by the DEO on 6th July,2020 and received by the Procurement and Disposal Unit on 28th July,2020</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The files contained: approved evaluation reports, Works contract and the minutes of the Contracts Committee</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>There was 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 as shown below:</p> <p>Construction of Nyairongo Seed Secondary School</p> <p>As per the Solicitor General's letter dated 11th April,2019 under reference: DLAS/FPT/026/2019 Contract price: 1,847,996,900</p> <p>The Contract a Warded on 20th March,2020 under Minute No:33.3.19</p> <p>Other school infrastructure projects which were approved by the Contracts Committee included:</p> <p>Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Nyawaiga Primary School</p> <p>KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00008</p> <p>A warded to Heavy Investments Limited</p> <p>Contract sum: UGX 28,911,632</p> <p>Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020</p> <p>Contract signed on 19th March,2020</p> <p>Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20</p>	1

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Kirimbi Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00009

A warded to Prozeka Enterprises Limited

Contract sum: UGX 21,606,196

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Wairagaza Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00007

A warded to Zoom Sounds Limited

Contract sum: UGX 21,052,196

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Construction of a two-classroom block at Musajamukulu Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00001

A warded to Karki Builders and Engineer's Limited

Contract sum: UGX 88,785,221

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Kitondora Primary School

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00010

A warded to Muteme and Company Limited

Contract sum: UGX 22,235,069

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework at the time of assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the education guideline were disseminated through Kibuube District head teachers meeting held on 14th October, 2019 at Sir Tito Winyi primary school under min 5/9/2019.</p>	3

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, *score: 2, else score: 0*

All projects implemented had Costed ESMP incorporated within the BOQ and contractual document as mentioned;

Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Muhwiju primary school in Bugambe sub county. Costed ESMP were on page 2 of 8 and 8 of 8 of the BoQ. (Excavate oversite to remove top soil average 250 thick and remove from site at UGX 113,000

Disposal of excavated materials at UGX 501,000

Ramps, in suspended slabs and steps at UGX537,500

Site restoration, land scaping, importing of vegetation soil, planting of approved grass and trees at UGX 600,000)

Construction of 5 Stance lined pit latrine at Kirimbi primary school. Costed ESMP were on page 2 of 8 and 8 of 8 of the BoQ.

Excavate over site to remove top soil average 250 thick and remove from site at UGX 113,000

Disposal of excavated materials at UGX 501,000

Ramps, in suspended slabs and steps at UGX537,500)

Site restoration, land scaping, importing of vegetation soil, planting of approved grass and trees at UGX 600,000

Construction of 5stance lined pit latrine at St Joseph Wairagaza primary school. Costed ESMP were on page 2 of 8 and 8 of 8 of the BoQ.

(Excavate oversite to remove top soil average 250 thick and remove from site at UGX 113,000

Disposal of excavated materials at UGX 501,000 and ramps, in suspended slabs and steps at UGX537,500

Site restoration, land scaping, importing of vegetation soil, planting of approved grass and trees at UGX 600,000)

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 documentary evidence that all school construction projects had proof of land ownership at the time of assessment as shown below;</p>	0
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 conducted support supervision but did not prepare monthly monitoring reports for education sector projects to ascertain compliance for previous FY</p> <p>Report on monitoring the status of activities carried out in various schools in the District was done on 27th May, 2020 by the Environmental Officer.</p> <p>This was just one report that cannot qualify for Monthly reports</p>	0
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&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 no documentary evidence that LG had E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>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 OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>OPD total attendance and deliveries in the FY 2019/2020 were compared with FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>The 3 sampled facilities were:</p> <p>WAMBABYA HC III, OPD attendance FY 2018/2019 = 9828, FY 2019/2020 = 6462. Deliveries FY 2018/2019 = 74, FY 2019/2020 = 298.</p> <p>MUHWIJU HC III,</p> <p>OPD attendance FY 2018/2019 = 9108, FY 2019/2020 = 9727. Deliveries FY 2018/2019 = 167, FY 2019/2020 = 65.</p> <p>BUHIMBWA HC III,</p> <p>OPD attendance FY 2018/2019 = 10114, FY 2019/2020 = 10531. Deliveries FY 2018/2019 = 466, FY 2019/2020 = 342.</p> <p>OPD Attendance decreased by 8,02%, and Deliveries by 0.28% from FY 2018/2019 to FY 2019/2020.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 2 • 50 – 69% score 1 • Below 50%; score 0 	Not Applicable.	0

2

Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

Note: To have zero wait for year one

b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs is:

- Above 75%; score 2
- 65 – 74%; score 1
- Below 65% ; score 0

The RBF health facilities in Kikuube had not submitted their RBF quality facility assessment for the last quarter of the FY.

0

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.

The LG budgeted and Spent all the Health Development Grant

Health Development grant was 66,576,000 Page 22 of the Budget FY 2019/2

At the end of the FY 2019/20 there was NIL balance in the cash book for Health sector Development AC NO 9030015011660 at stanbic bank at Hoima BranchThe ba

Was certified by Board of Survey

The following were the Projects .

Construction of Latrine at Bugambe Health Centre at a cost of Shs 22,000,000

Page 22 of the Budget

Renovation of OPD at Kikuube Health Centre at a cost of Shs 19,00,000 Pa

Ge 27 of the Budget

Construction of the Gate at Kikuube Health Centre at a cost of Shs 22,00,00

0 Page 27 Total Cost was Shs 63,526,000 Page 27

Expenditure was 99% Page 16 Of the Budget Performance Report

2

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors! Suppliers. For example:

The construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at Bugambe HC III

A warded to Akaal Construction Company Limited

Contract Sum: 21,971,436

Verified by the District Engineer on : 4th June,2020

Forwarded by DHO on 4th June,2020

Verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 10th June,2020

Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 11th June,2020

Approved by CAO on 11th June,2020

Payment made on 11th June,2020

The renovation of Kikuube HC IV

A warded to Akabibamba Enterprises

Contract Sum: 18,673,093

Verified by District Engineer on 18th May,2020

Forwarded by DHO on 19th May,2020,2020

Verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 19th May,2020

Approved by CAO on 20th June,2020

Payment made on 20th May,2020

Voucher No:141

2

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0

The LG Government did not have a DDEG funded infrastructure projects in the Health department so it was not possible to assess this indicator

2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

The following infrastructure projects were implemented in the FY 2019/20:

Construction of a- 5 Stance lined VIP latrine at Bugambe HC III

Completion date: 4th June,2020

Renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC IV

Awarded to Akibamba Enterprises

Contract sum:18,673,093

Completion date:11th June,2020

Construction of Kikuube HC IV Guest House

A warded to Kona Company Limited

Contract sum: 19,869,967

Completion date: 22nd June,2020

Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure

- If above 90% score 2
- If 75% - 90%: score 1
- Below 75 %: score 0

There's 1 HCIV with an approved number of 48 staff but only 36 are filled ,

There are 14 HCIIIs with the total being 266 with each HCIII having 19 staff as per the structure but the filled positions in all HCIIIS are 148.

Gap=118

Aiapproved= 266

Filled =148

Gap =118

(filled/approved)*100%

(148/266)*100%

=55.639%

This showed that the staffing levels are not to standard staffing levels.

<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <p>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MOH as illustrated below:</p> <p>Construction of a 5 Stance Pit latrine at Bugambe HC III</p> <p>Technical designs</p> <p>15° Roof Pitch of</p> <p>- IT4 Roofing Sheets Gauge 26</p> <p>Metallic Facia Board</p> <p>Ramp 1:12</p> <p>Metallic Steel grille door side hung double swinging thru.900fixed on Steel frame Including door signage</p> <p>Renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC IV</p> <p>The renovation work was carried out on an existing structure.</p> <p>The works included</p> <p>Removal of weak peeled wall ad troweling with cement, sand, mortar and also painting</p> <p>Ceiling repairs</p> <p>Replacement of broken glasses, iron monger, fixing and repair of doors</p> <p>Fixing and painting of facia boards and repair of verandah</p> <p>Construction of Kikuube HC IV Gate house</p> <p>There were no standard gate house designs from MoH and the structure was built based on the Engineer's specification as seen below:</p> <p>Steel works:</p> <p>High yield steel bar reinforcement to BS4449</p> <p>16mm Diameter</p> <p>12mm diameter bars</p> <p>8mm bars</p> <p>Masonry</p> <p>250 mm thick basaltic stone masonry foundation bedded in cement sand mortar (1:3) below ground beam level</p> <p>Solid burnt brick walling bedded and jointed in 1:4 cement and mortar reinforced every after three courses</p>
---	---	--

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>3 HCs were sampled as below,</p> <p>The information on the staff list at the district matches that of Kikuube HCIV for they both had 38staff.</p> <p>Buhimba HCIII had 12 staff in both the district staff list and at the Health Facility.</p> <p>Bugambe HCIII had 10staff in both the district and Health Facility staff list.</p> <p>There was Evidence that the information had been 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>There was no Upgraded or constructed health facilities in the Previous Financial year.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The sampled 3 health facilities of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sebigoro HC III, -Lucy Bisereko HC III, and -Bujugu HC III, <p>Had ther reports on “4 PART 3, 2 – FACILITY REPORTING TEMPLATES AND FORMS” ‘4.1 Annual Health Facility Report and Budget’</p> <p>These forms presented submitted Annual Work plans and narrative budgets to the Ag. DHO with Past Financial Year 2019/2020 and New Financial year 2020/2021 information dated 10th July, 2020; 10th July, 2020; and 8th July, 2020 for Sebigoro, Lucy, and Bujugu HC IIIs respectively.</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>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>From File: Health Facility Work plans and Per. Improvement plans</p> <p>All the 3 sampled facilities submitted their Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY on time as follows:</p> <p>Lucy Bisereko HC III was submitted on 9th July, 2019.</p> <p>Kikuube HC IV = 9th July, 2020.</p> <p>Kyehoro HC III = 13th July.2019.</p> <p>Reports conformed to the Budget and Grant Guidelines.</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 have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>From documents:</p> <p>April 2020 FORMAT 4: FACILITY – IMPROVEMENT – PROGRESS REPORT.</p> <p>Submission from the sampled 3 health facilities of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lucy Bisereko HC III on 3rd July, 2020 • Kisiiha HC II submitted on 4th July, 2020 • Bujalya HC III submitted on 12th July, 2020 <p>All the 3 Health facilities developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporated performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment report titled “Political monitoring Report for Health Department Held on 11th September, 2019 for both DEC members and Sectoral” the main issues were around facility staffing, mapping out catchment area needs and land grievances.</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>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was timely submission of Monthly (12 reports) and quarterly (4 reports) reports from NGURUWE HC II, KIKUUBE HC IV, and RWENYAWAWA HC III that were sampled.</p> <p>NGURUWE HC II,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -May HMIS 105 submitted on 5th June 2020. -June HMIS 105 submitted on 5th July 2020. -April HMIS 105 submitted on 5th May, 2020. -January HMIS 105 submitted 6th Feb, 2020. -February HMIS 105 submitted on 6th March, 2020. -December HMIS 105, submitted on 4th January. 	2

2020.

-November HMIS 105 was submitted on 7th December. 2019.

-October HMIS 105 submitted on 6th November, 2019.

-September HMIS 105 submitted on 4th October, 2019.

-August HMIS 105 submitted on 2th September,2019.

-July HMIS 105 was submitted on 5th August. 2019.

QUARTERLY REPORTS (HMIS 106) FOR KIKUUBE HC IV

Quarter.1 July – September 2019 submitted on 04/10/2019.

Quarter.2 October – December 2019 submitted on 06/01/2020.

Quarter.3 January – March 2020 submitted on 7th April, 2020.

Quarter.4 April – June submitted 7th July, 2020.

KIKUUBE HC IV

-May HMIS 105 submitted on 2nd June 2020.

-June HMIS 105 submitted on 6th July 2020.

-April HMIS 105 submitted on 4th May, 2020.

-January HMIS 105 submitted 5th Feb, 2020.

-February HMIS 105 submitted on 6th March, 2020.

-December HMIS 105, submitted on 6th January. 2020.

-November HMIS 105 was submitted on 5th December. 2019.

-October HMIS 105 submitted on 5th November, 2019.

-September HMIS 105 submitted on 4th October, 2019.

-August HMIS 105 submitted on 4th September,2019.

-July HMIS 105 was submitted on 4th August. 2019.

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was no evidence of submission at the time of assessment.</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>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of DHMT submission of Facility RBF invoices to MOH.</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>No evidence was availed at the time of Assessment.</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>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From Kikuube Ag.DHO's office, PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR FY 2020/2021. Bugamba HC III.</p>	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>File: MED: 213/9. Document – Kikuube District Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for poor Performing Health Facilities FY 2020/2021.</p>	1

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</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>Vote: 628 Kikuube District LG Approved Performance Contract FY 2019/2020, Generated 19/07/2019 02:16 Page 24, section B: Breakdown of Work plan Expenditures, Recurrent Expenditure, wage was budgeted and allocated 4,784,381,000/=.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</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>Kikuube District Health Department Staffing as of April 2020.</p> <p>Kikuube HC IV has 75% staffing levels. They had 36 staff out of approved 48</p> <p>Buhimba HC III was 63.16% staffed having 12 staff out of the approved 19 staff for HC III.</p> <p>Wambabya HC II</p> <p>Had 33.33% staffing.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>Kikuube District Health Department Staffing as of April 2020.</p> <p>Work Attendance Book of;</p> <p>I. Kikuube HC IV</p> <p>II. Buhimba HC III</p> <p>III. Wambabya HC III</p> <p>Staff lists on the Health Facility noticeboards.</p> <p>All Health workers were working where they were deployed.</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>In the 3 visited Health Facilities of --Kikuube HC IV</p> <p>-Buhimba HC III</p> <p>-Wambabya HC III</p> <p>there were staff lists displayed on Health facilities notice boards</p> <p>Document: dated January 03, 2019. To: All the Health Centre in-charges Kikuube District</p> <p>Staff list, read -</p> <p>Kindly received a list of staff at your Health Centre. You are required to ensure that the list is displayed on the Health Facility Notice Boards where it can be accessed by both staff and public. Signed by Dr, Kwikiriza Nicholas Magambo, Ag.DHO .</p>	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

9 personnel Files of Health Facility in-charges were sampled to see if they were appraised in the previous FY(2019/2020) as below;

Appraised staffs;

- Talemwa Ausi the in-charge of Nsozi HCIII was appraised on the 3rd/July/2019

- Tumusiime Rehemah the in-charge of Kisiiha HCII was appraised on the 30th/June/2020

- Mugabe Thadex the in-charge of Bujugu HCIII was appraised on the 3rd/July/2019

- Ssebandeke Allen the in-charge of Kisaru HCII was appraised on the 3rd/July/2019.

- Nyamukiza Gloria the in-charge of Kaseeta HCIII was appraised on the 14th/September/2020

- Fred Kamuhanda the in-charge of Bugambe HCIII was appraised on the 5th/October/2020

- Tugume Racheal the in-charge of Bujalya HCIII was not appraised

- Muteesi Maureen the in-charge of Mparanga HCIII was appraised on the 6th/July/2020.

- Businge Solomon the in-charge of Sebigoro HCIII was not appraised.

The above showed that not all in-charges were appraised and on time in the last FY.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

As per the 10 sampled Files, the Health Workers were appraised in the previous FY as below,

- Nakityo Annet was appraised on the 16th/September/2020
- Monday Harriet was appraised on the 21st/July/2020
- Nyakake Justin Bendebule was appraised on the 23rd/October/2020

- Alitwala Stella was appraised on the 23rd/October/2020

- Basemera Roselyne was appraised on the 23rd/October/2020.

Un appraised;

- Mutegeki Solomon was not appraised.
- Enzama Geoffrey was not appraised
- Muhangi Gerevasio was not appraised
- Bainomugisa Gordon was not appraised
- Byamukama Sarapio was not appraised

The information above showed that few of the Health Facility Workers were appraised with the majority not being appraised in the last FY.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

A financial and Human Resource Management Training for Health Centre In-charges and DHT members 24-25 September 2020 at Kikuube District Hall was done to address the Gap of Financial Management.

TOPICS.

- 1.Health Units Accounts.
- 2.Budgeting
- 3.Payment processing cycle
- 4.Cash book
- 5.Maintenance of the Vote 6.Books
- 7.Accounting of Assets
- 8.Fixed Assets.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Document titled: Kikuube District Health Department Training Needs FY 2020/2021, not dated. Had a total of 31 courses lined up to take place in a duration of 1 week each with only few taking 2 weeks. The cadres to attend each course was also identified. The course example included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Leadership and governance for DHT, MO, CO, EN and NO -Finance Management. -Emergency Obstetric Care. <p>Etc.</p> <p>However, No training report was provided for the previous FY apart from the list of participants in TB Detect Training that took place at Kijungu Hotel from 1st to 5th April 2019 (Which was Previous FY but one)</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

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

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Gmail:</p> <p>A printed copy of email from the mail address of Kwikiriza Nicholas Magambo kwikiriza@gmail.com Sun, Sep 8, 2019 at 11:50 PM.</p> <p>Kikuube district</p> <p>ASABA GERALD asabagerald16@gmail.com</p> <p>To: apiobrenda20@gmail.com</p> <p>CC: Kikuube District LG caokikuube@gmail.com</p> <p>Please find attached the copy of the facilities of Kikuube district,</p> <p>A list of 21 Health facilities (1 = HC IV, 4 = HC IIs, and 16 = HC IIIs) was attached.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>. There was no documentary evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHOJMMOH</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Local Government did not make timely warranting verification of direct grant transfers for the last FY in accordance n to the requirement of the Budget For instance Funds totaling Shs 73,154,000 FOR the First Quarter were warranted on 20th July 2020 invoiced on 31st July 2020 for the First Quarter FY 2019/20m There was adelay of 11 days.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Information was not availed to the Assessment Team despite numerous requests The CFO was reportedly in Hoima District Local Government trying to get the information from the IFMS.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was seen on the district notice board at the time of assessment.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Minutes of the DHMT meeting held on 3/4/2020. At the District Headquarters. Indicated issues to be emphasized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laboratory report like the % of Genexpert utilization. • Surveillance reports • EPI • HIV Reports • TB/Leprosy • Health Rducation • HMIS Data Reports MCH repts • RBF etc. <p>In a Health Department report update addressed to The Chairperson Sector committee Kikuube District Council, the District received 3 motor vehicles from (MOH/GAVI, UNHCR and UHSC) IDI support for HIV/AIDS, and this was to boost HIV services in the district, increase Surveillance and improve reporting.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Documents:</p> <p>Kikuube District Health Department Performance Review Meeting held on 15/4/2020.</p> <p>Was attended by:</p> <p>ACOA, Nabwire Flavia.</p> <p>Ag. DHO, Dr. Kwikiriza Nicholas.</p> <p>IDI, Nickson Ankunda</p> <p>World Vision, Elisha Nangosha.</p> <p>Inspector of Schools, Zondera Amony.</p> <p>Ag. DCDO. Kabahaguzi Annet.</p> <p>Baylor Uganda, Dr. Harriet Kenyanye.</p> <p>Medical Teams International, Dr. Businge Julius.</p> <p>In-charge Nsozi HC III, Talemwa Aus.</p> <p>And all other facility in-charges.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>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>Support supervisions took place 100% in all health facilities of Kikuube District including all quarterly support supervision, and reports were seen.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>DHT Joint Support supervision report dated, 20th, April, 2020</p>	
			<p>Activity report on joint technical support supervision of facilities in Kikuube District from 31/08/2020 to 11/09/2020.</p>	
			<p>Document;</p>	
			<p>Ref: No. CR.353/1, dated Monday, 17th June, 2020.</p>	
			<p>Was addressed to the DHO</p>	
			<p>Nutrition support supervision assessment mentorship report done by DHT in conjunction with UNICEF in Health Centers.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Report on support supervision of lower health Facilities in the district were conducted during the previous FY as evidenced by:</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Buhaguzi HSD support supervision report for 1st quarter 2019/2020 FY. Dated 3rd October, 2019,</p>	
			<p>Buhaguzi HSD support supervision report for 2nd quarter 2019/2020 FY. Dated January 5th, 2020.</p>	

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0

The visited 3 health facilities in Kikuube District were:

KIKUUBE HC IV

From the political monitoring report for health department held on 11th September, 2019 by DHMT, several findings were outlined by the team which included number vii, that stated "staffing level was 70% with the gap of 30%". As of 1st July, 2020, from Kikuube HC IV staff list 2020/2021, the staffing level has increased from 70% to 79.17% - An indicator that Kikuube District LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions whose implementations were followed up.

WAMBABYA HC III

Stock management was identified as an area of improvement and subsequently Stock cards, and use of stock book improved.

BUHIMBA HC III

From the document, Buhaguzi SHD support supervision report for 1st quarter FY 2019/2020. Submitted to the DHO Kikuube,

dated October 3rd 2019, the SWOT analysis found Buhimba HC III strong in:

Clean facility

Most staff found on duty

Daily health education being conducted

Fridge temperature monitoring done regularly.

Yet, unlash compound, staff absenteeism were some of the key weaknesses found in the supervision book and recommendations made prior to the HSD support supervision of October 2019.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>From the document;</p> <p>Medicines management supervision report for the months of July, August and September 2020, dated 05th October, 2020.</p> <p>Medicines management supervision report for the month of January 2020, dated 03rd Feb, 2020.</p> <p>And other integrated support supervision reports, guidance was given to facility in-charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies.</p> <p>From supervision books at the facilities, recommendations on drugs were observed in Kikuube HC IV and Wambabya HC III, and Buhimba HC III.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>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>4 quarterly sanitation reports FY 2019/2020 were seen;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quarter 1, 5th October, 2019 - Quarter 2, 4th January 2020. - Quarter 3, 5th April, 2020. - Quarter 4, 05th July, 2020. <p>All the reports were prepared and signed by Barongo Godfrey the Health Inspector, and submitted to the Ag.DHO Kikuube DLG.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>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>4 quarterly sanitation reports FY 2019/2020 were seen;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quarter 1, 5th October, 2019 - Quarter 2, 4th January 2020. - Quarter 3, 5th April, 2020. - Quarter 4, 05th July, 2020. 	1
----	---	--	--	---

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>DHO's office did not provide Health Facilities Asset Register for the previous FY.</p> <p>Health facilities visited had Facility Asset registers for example;</p> <p>Kikuube HC IV FY 2020/2021 Facility Asset Register, dated 01 July, 2020.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (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</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that desk appraisal was done by the LG.</p>	0
----	--	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence that field appraisal was done by the LG</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 no documentary 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</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>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for consolidation.</p> <p>Planned infrastructure projects for FY 2020/21</p> <p>Fencing of Muhwiju Health Centre III- Health Department at UGX 36,723,000 on pg.2</p> <p>5 stance lined pit latrine at Bugambe HC III at UGX22,000,000 on pg.4</p> <p>Renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC (IV) -Medical Department at UGX 19,000,000 on pg.6</p> <p>As procurement plan for FY 2020/21 signed by CAO on 31st September, 2020 and submitted to PPDA on 21st September ,2020</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) 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 the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY as per LG PP Form 1 dated 25th July,2020</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction as shown below:</p> <p>Renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC IV KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00005 A warded to Akibamamba Enterprises Limited Contract sum: UGX 18,673,093 Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020 Contract signed on 19th March,2020 Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20</p> <p>Construction of Kikuube HC IV Gate house KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00003 A warded to Kona Company Limited Contract sum: UGX 19,869,967 Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020 Contract signed on 19th March,2020 Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20</p> <p>Construction of Kikuube HC IV Gate house KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00003 A warded to Kona Company Limited Contract sum: UGX 19,869,967 Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020 Contract signed on 19th March,2020 Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20</p> <p>Construction of a 5 Stance Pit latrine at Bugambe</p>	1

HC III

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00015

Awarded to Akaal Construction Company

Contract sum: UGX 21,971,436

Evaluation report dated 28th February, 2020

Contract signed on 19th March, 2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No:
33.3.20

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i)
: score 1 or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

There was no evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation Team

0

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the M0H as illustrated below:</p> <p>Construction of a 5 Stance Pit latrine at Bugambe HC III</p> <p>Technical designs</p> <p>15° Roof Pitch of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IT4 Roofing Sheets Gauge 26 - Metallic Facia Board <p>Ramp 1:12</p> <p>Metallic Steel grille door side hung double swinging thru.900fixed on Steel frame Including door signage</p> <p>Renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC IV</p> <p>The renovation work was carried out on an existing structure.</p> <p>The works included</p> <p>Removal of weak peeled wall ad troweling with cement, sand, mortar and also painting</p> <p>Ceiling repairs</p> <p>Replacement of broken glasses, iron monger, fixing and repair of doors</p> <p>Fixing and painting of facia boards and repair of verandah</p> <p>Construction of Kikuube HC IV Gate house</p> <p>There were no standard gate house designs from MoH and the structure was built based on the Engineer's specification as seen below:</p> <p>Steel works:</p> <p>High yield steel bar reinforcement to BS4449</p> <p>16mm Diameter</p> <p>12mm diameter bars</p> <p>8mm bars</p> <p>Masonry</p> <p>250 mm thick basaltic stone masonry foundation bedded in cement sand mortar (1:3) below ground beam level</p> <p>Solid burnt brick walling bedded and jointed in 1:4 cement and mortar reinforced every after three courses</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>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no projects that required the Clerk of Works to maintain daily records that were to be consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project:</p> <p>For example, construction of a 5 Stance Pit latrine at Bugambe HC III did not require Clerk of Works. The same applied to the renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC IV and construction of a gate house at Kikuube HC IV.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility, the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no 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 officer</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 no 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.</p> <p>As per the Site inspection report for the renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC IV, dated 18th May,2020 ,prepared by the Acting District Engineer and addressed to the Chief Administrative Officer.</p> <p>Site inspection report dated 28th May,2020, prepared by the Acting district Engineer and addressed to the Chief Administrative Officer.</p>	0

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes such as:

There was evidence that the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors! Suppliers. For example:

The construction of a 5 Stance lined pit latrine at Bugambe HC III

A awarded to Akaal Construction Company Limited

Contract Sum: 21,971,436

Verified by the District Engineer on : 4th June,2020

Forwarded by DHO on 4th June,2020

Verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 10th June,2020

Certified by Chief Finance Officer on 11th June,2020

Approved by CAO on 11th June,2020

Payment made on 11th June,2020

Time frame: 1day

The renovation of Kikuube HC IV

A awarded to Akabibamba Enterprises

Contract Sum: 18,673,093

Verified by District Engineer on 18th May,2020

Forwarded by DHO on 19th May,2020

Verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 19th May,2020

Approved by CAO on 20th June,2020

Payment made on 20th May,2020

Time frame: 1 day

Voucher No:141

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance

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

There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The complete procurement files included: Evaluation report, works contract and Minutes of the contracts committee as shown below:

There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY were approved by

measure

the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction as shown below:

Renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC IV

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00005

A awarded to Akibamamba Enterprises Limited

Contract sum: UGX 18,673,093

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No:
33.3.20

Renovation of OPD at Kikuube HC IV Construction
of Kikuube HC IV Guest house

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00003

A awarded to Kona Company Limited

Contract sum: UGX 19,869,967

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No:
33.3.20

Construction of Kikuube HC IV Gate house

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00003

A awarded to Kona Company Limited

Contract sum: UGX 19,869,967

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No:
33.3.20

Construction of a 5 Stance Pit latrine at Bugambe
HC III

KIKU628/WRKS/019-020/00015

A awarded to Akaal Construction Company

Contract sum: UGX 21,971,436

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No:
33.3.20

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 availed to assessment team at the time of assessment.</p> <p>There was no case registered in the previous financial year</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities in Kibuube District on 7th July, 2019.</p> <p>Sampled facilities included Buhimba HCIII, Kibuube HCIV and Wambabya HC III</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>All the facilities sampled had the functional system for medical waste management for instance</p> <p>At Buhimba HCIII Health Centre III</p> <p>The Facility had a copy of Uganda National Infection Prevention and control guideline 2013 and there was evidence of wastes management system in place as shown below; existence of color coded waste lined bins with the following colors representing</p> <p>Red- high infectious waste (swabs from the lab)</p> <p>Yellow – infectious wastes</p> <p>Black -Noninfectious waste (paper)</p>	2

Brown – expired drugs

Placenta pit in place but not fenced

Waste burning area

Expired drugs are disposed through the district health office.

Kibuube HC IV The Facility had a copy of Uganda National Infection Prevention and control guideline 2013 and there was evidence of wastes management system in place as shown below; existence of color coded waste lined bins with the following colors representing

There was evidence of a placenta pit was under construction.

Coding of bins with lines inside as follows :

Black – noninfectious wastes

Red – highly infectious waste

Yellow – Infectious waste

Brown – pharmaceutical wastes

Waste burning area

Expired drugs are disposed through the district health office.

Wambabya HC III

The Facility had a copy of Uganda National Infection Prevention and control guideline 2013 and there was evidence of wastes management system in place as shown below; existence of color coded waste lined bins with the following colors representing

Red- high infectious
waste (swabs from the lab)

Yellow – infectious wastes

Black -Noninfectious
waste (paper)

Brown – expired drugs

Placenta pit in place but not fenced

Waste burning area

Expired drugs are disposed through the district
health office.

15

Safeguards for service
delivery: LG Health
Department ensures
safeguards for service
delivery

Maximum 5 points on
this performance
measure

c. Evidence that the LG has
conducted training (s) and
created awareness in
healthcare waste management
score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that LG disseminated
guidelines on health care / medical waste
management to health facilities. Baseline IPC
facility assessment report dated 3rd to 17th
December, 2019 prepared Barongo Godfrey Fred
senior Health Inspector at the time of assessment.

1

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects.

Rehabilitation of OPD at Kikuube Health Centre IV. Screening was done on 7th February, 2020 by the EO and DCDO and costed ESMP incorporated into the BoQs under element no. 1

Excavate for foundation trenches starting from stripped level and not exceeding 1.5mm deep at UGX 31,500

Return, fill in and ram selected excavated materials around foundation and column at UGX 13,500

Construction of 2 stance Ecosam latrine at Bugambe Health Centre III. Screening was done on 7th February, 2020 by the EO and DCDO and costed ESMP incorporated into the BoQs under element no.7 on page 8 of the BoQ

Soap pit size 2500mm on top taper to 1500mm and depth of 1500mm complete with hardcore and all accessories at and drainage at UGX 595,000

Site, landscaping, importing of vegetation soil, planting of approved grass and trees and maintenance to full growth approved at UGX 600,000.

Construction of a gate house at Kikuube HCIV Screening was done on 7th February, 2020 by the EO and DCDO and costed ESMP incorporated into the BoQs under element no. 1

Excavate for foundation trenches starting from stripped level and not exceeding 1.5mm deep at UGX 31,500

Return, fill in and ram selected excavated materials around foundation and column at UGX 13,500.

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	There was no proof for land ownership where the LG implemented project for the previous year.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	There was no evidence on environmental monitoring and supervision of health project for the financial year 2019/2020 at the time of assessment	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	There was no documentary 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 at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	The District Rural Water Source Functionality was 93%	2
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	The percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees for the District was 99%	2
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	Not Applicable because the LLG Assessment hadnt started	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	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	The District average safe water coverage as of June 2019 was 71.82%. The Sub County's coverage was as follow: Bugambe (75.51), Buhimba (101.48%), Kabwoya(47.82), Kiziranfumbi (108.55%), Kwangwali (58.32%)	0

measure

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The LG had planned to Protect 6NO Springs, Drill 7No Boreholes, Rehabilitate 9No. Boreholes, Construct a Latrine (1No) and Design of a Water Supply System.

Extracted from Annual Water Work Plan Budget estimates

Spring Protection (6No):

Bugambe (3no), Kizirafumbi (1No), Kaboya (1No), Kyangwali (1No).

This meant that only two springs were put in areas below the District average safe water coverage

Borehole Drilling (7No):

Buhimba (3No), Kizirafumbi(3No), Bugambe (1No), Kaboya (3No), Kyangwali(2No)

This meant that 5No Boreholes were put in areas below the District average safe water coverage

Latrine in Kyangwali

Borehole Rehabilitation (9No)

Kabwoya (3No), Kyangwali(2No), Buhimba(4No)

This meant that 5No Boreholes to be rehabilitated were in areas below the District average safe water coverage

Water System in Kyarushesha in Kyangwali that is also below the district average coverage

In total, 14 projects out of 25 projects were put in areas below the district safe water coverage average

Percentage = $(14/25)*100= 56\%$

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

There was evidence that variations in the
contract price of sampled WSS
infrastructure investments for the previous
FY are within +/- 20% of engineers
estimates as follows:

The Budgeted Projects were as follows:

Drilling of Boreholes

Engineer's Estimate was at UGX
28,800,000

Contract Price was UGX 28,079,010 as
per Contract with Freyline and
Construction Limited (Ref: CR/105/2)

Variance = UGX 720,990

%age Variance 2.5%

Rehabilitation of Boreholes

Budgeted Amount = UGX 110,841,878

Contract Price = UGX 109,455,307 as per
contracts with Aliko Consults Limited on
the three lots

Variance = 1,386,571

%age variance = 1.2%

Piped Water System at Kyarushesha

Engineers Estimate was UGX
178,540,597

Contract Price was UGX 161,486,311

Variance %age =9.6 %

Construction of 2 Stance Toilet in
Kyangwali

Engineer's Estimate = 11,311,700

Contract Price with Prozeka Enterprises
Limited = UGX 11,239,002

%age variance = 0.6%

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

All the projects were completed as per
PBS 4th Quarter report for FY2019/2020

Construction of an Ecological Toilet
(Page 5 of the PBS report)

Protection of Springs (Page 6 Of the PBS
Report)

Drilling of Boreholes (Page 7 of the PBS
Report)

Rehabilitation of Boreholes (Page 7 of the
PBS Report)

Construction of a piped water system
(Page 8 of the PBS Report)

2

3	<p>Achievement of Standards: 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>%age of Water supply facilities that were functioning for FY2018/2019 was 88%</p> <p>%age of Water supply facilities that were functioning for FY2019/2020 was 93%</p> <p>So the Increment in the %age of water supply facilities that were functioning was 5% (93-88)</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 5%: score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>%age of facilities with functional water and sanitation committee for the FY2018/2019 was 98%</p> <p>%age of facilities with functional water and sanitation committee for the FY2019/2020 was 99%</p> <p>So the Increment was 1%</p>	1
---	--	--	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>The report showed the Facilities constructed by the in FY2019/2020. This included</p> <p>Construction of an Ecological Toilet (Page 5 of the PBS report)</p> <p>Protection of Springs (Page 6 Of the PBS Report)</p> <p>Drilling of Boreholes (Page 7 of the PBS Report)</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Boreholes (Page 7 of the PBS Report)</p>	3
---	---	--	---	---

Construction of a piped water system
(Page 8 of the PBS Report)

The facilities inspected in three different sub counties were as follows.

-Kahoro Spring Well in Bugambe Sub County.

Contractor: FreyLine Construction Limited

Financial Year:2019/2020

Date:11.04.2020

It was protected, Fenced and in operation

-Borehole at Musaija Mukuru Village in Buhimba Sub County

Financial Year:2019/2020

Contractor: MSR Technologies Limited

Date: 9th May 2020

DWD No: 75486

Its protected, fenced and operational

Borehole at Mukunya, Gigoora Village in Kizirafumbi Buhimba Sub County

Financial Year:2019/2020

Contractor: MSR Technologies Limited

Date: 7th May 2020

DWD No: 75484

Its protected, fenced and operational

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

The LG Submitted Quarterly reports as follows.

Q1 Report: Dated 18th October 2019
Received by MoWE on 25th October 2019 and signed by the CAO on 18th October 2019.

Q2 Report: Dated 14/01/2020 Received by MoWE on 15/01/2020 and signed by the CAO on 14/01/2020

Q3 Report: Dated 14/04/2020 Received by MoWE on 13/07/2020 and signed by the CAO on 14/04/2020

Q1 Report: Dated 15/07/2020 Received by MoWE on 12/08/2020 and signed by the CAO on 15/07/2020

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 Local Government submitted Quarterly reports with Water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities and that information is used for planning.</p> <p>The LG Submitted Quarterly reports as follows.</p> <p>Q1 Report: Dated 18th October 2019 Received by MoWE on 25th October 2019 and signed by the CAO on 18th October 2019.</p> <p>Q2 Report: Dated 14/01/2020 Received by MoWE on 15/01/2020 and signed by the CAO on 14/01/2020</p> <p>Q3 Report: Dated 14/04/2020 Received by MoWE on 13/07/2020 and signed by the CAO on 14/04/2020</p> <p>Q1 Report: Dated 15/07/2020 Received by MoWE on 12/08/2020 and signed by the CAO on 15/07/2020</p>	3
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Not Applicable since there was no LLG Assessment that had been done.</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO budgeted for 1 Civil Engineer (Water), 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician but didn't budget for 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation and hygiene) & 1 Engineering Assistant(Water).</p> <p>Budget was Ugx 40,800,000=</p>	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Environment and Natural Resources Officer budgeted for 1 Environment Officer and 1 Forestry Officer but didn't budget for the Natural Resource Officer(not in the approved structure)</p> <p>Budget was Ugx Shs 134,400,000=</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>As per the approved staff structure dated 20th/June/2017, there are 5 staff under the DWO and were appraised in the previous FY as below;</p> <p>Luswata Ibrahim the Senior Water Officer was appraised on the 2nd/July/2020</p> <p>Nyakoojjo Denis the Borehole Maintenance Technician was appraised on the 30th/June/2020.</p> <p>The appraisal report showed that not all the staff in the Water department was appraised in previous FY and not all positions were filled.</p>	0

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

List of attendance;

1. Agondeze Hillary Winyi
2. Kiiza Robert
3. Barongo Godfrey
4. Kabahaguzi Annet.

The Gaps identified were;

5. Water Quality testing
6. Training in Geographic Information System(GIS)
7. Financial Management.

Water quality Testing , in FY 20-20221 budget for water quality testing is going to be done.

Training on Geographic Information System(GIS) , water officer/chairperson in conjunction with CARE sought for help in training and an offer was given for October in FY 2020/2021.

Financial Management: Training was held by the finance department to manage vote books, coding and timely delivery of requests and initiations on the 21st/May/2020.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

It should be noted that the District Safe Water Coverage was 67.76% with Bugambe (73.53%), Buhimba(96.18%), Kabwoya(44.39%), Kizaranfumbi (103.14%), Kyangwali (54.12%). Ref(Annual Water Work Plan FY 2020/2021)

The Development Budget was UGX 688,106,198 (Ref: Budget inserted in the Annual work plan, page 3 of 3)

The projects to be done were as follows:

Protection of 10No. Springs at UGX =50,000,000

Kizarafumbi (3No), Buhimba(1No),

Kabwoya(3No), Kyangwali(2No),
Bugambe (1No)

This meant that 5No Springs were put in
areas with a coverage below the District
safe water coverage.

Amount= $(5/10)*50,000,000=$ UGX
25,000,000

Drilling of 20No. Boreholes at UGX
449,450,000

Areas where the boreholes were
allocated: Bagambe(4No),
Kabwoya(5No), Kyangwali(3No),
Buhimba(4No), Kizirafumbi(3no).

This implied that 8No Boreholes had been
allocated to areas with water coverage
below the district water average coverage.

Borehole Rehabilitation: 17No at UGX
134,338,539

Bugambe(4No), Kabwoya (6No), Buhimba
(4No)Kizirafumbi(3No)

This implied that 6No. Boreholes had
been allocated to areas below the district
average safe water coverage

$= (6/17)*134,338,539 = 47,413,602$

Total Amount allocated to stressed areas=
25+179.79+15.7+47.413+267.89

Less Retention = UGX 38,617,151

Final %age $= (267.89/649.489)*100=$
41.2%

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>There was no evidence to show that the LG monitored each of the WSS facilities atleast quarterly.</p>	0

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

The DWO conducted two DWSCC meetings instead of the mandatory four.

The first meeting was held on 29th February 2020 and was attended by the District Technical Staff such as DWO, DEO, Labor Officer, and other development partners such as World Vision Uganda, CIUDI, Oxfam, LWF, and NRC. Among the issues discussed, there was need to sign MOU's with the partners, partners to report to the district on a quarterly basis, and the ministry to always give technical advice.

The second meeting was held on 13th March 2020 and was attended by the District Technical Staff such as DWO, DEO, CDO, Sub County Chief of Kabwoya, Labor Officer, and other development partners such as World Vision Uganda, ACF, CIDI, Oxfam, LWF, and NRC. Among the issues discussed, there was need for drillers partners, to be licenced, use of ground maps available to locate water sources, register online for the national water week, designs for the water sources to also be made for the host communities before construction.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DWO publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties as witnessed on the Notice Board of the Water Sector at the Local Government by the Assessment Team.

The Work Plan dated 13/07/2020 was put on the Notice Board on 14/08/2020 and had the details below in regard to Allocations.

Protection of 10No. Springs at UGX =50,000,000

Kizarafumbi (3No), Buhimba(1No), Kabwoya(3No), Kyangwali(2No), Bugambe (1No)

This meant that 5No Springs were put in areas with a coverage below the District safe water coverage (the areas were Kyangwali and Kabwoya)

Amount= $(5/10)*50,000,000=$ UGX 25,000,000

Drilling of 20No. Boreholes at UGX 449,450,000

Areas where the boreholes were allocated: Bagambe(4No), Kabwoya(5No), Kyangwali(3No), Buhimba(4No), Kizirafumbi(3no).

This implied that 8No Boreholes had been allocated to areas with water coverage below the district water average coverage. (The areas were Kyangwali and Kabwoya)

Borehole Rehabilitation: 17No at UGX 134,338,539

Bugambe(4No), Kabwoya (6No), Buhimba (4No)Kizirafumbi(3No)

This implied that 6No. Boreholes had been allocated to areas below the district average safe water coverage. (The area was Kabwoya)

Amount = $(6/17)*134,338,539 =$ 47,413,602

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>From the Budget, the Non Recurrent Budget was UGX 34,210,685</p> <p>Funds committed to Mobilisation was UGX 16,210,000 (Coordination, Training of WUCs, Training of Extension Workers and Establishing WUCs)</p> <p>$\%age = (16,210,000/34,210,685)*100= 47.4\%$</p> <p>This implied that DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities</p>	3
----	---	--	---	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities.</p> <p>Report dated 25th October 2019 showed the training of Water User Committees for springs and boreholes in Bugambe, Kabwoya and Buhimba Sub Counties. They were trained in Operation and Maintenance activities, Meaningful involvement of Women, Hygiene Promotion and Sanitation, Community Contributions. The training was carried out by Annet Kabahaguzi, the Senior Probation Officer attached to the Water Sector.</p>	3
----	---	--	---	---

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of an Asset Register at the time of Assessment and was last updated on 12th August 2020. The Asset Register had an ID Number, Parish, Village, Type of Source, Year of Construction, Source Name, Functionality and Fees.</p> <p>Some of the Equipment in the Asset Register were Boreholes and Springs</p>	4
----	--	---	---	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>b. 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 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>There was no evidence that the desk appraisal was done at the time of the Assessment.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>		
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>At the time of Assessment, There was evidence that only three Applications out of 20 needed had been received from the beneficiary communities such as.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>-An application was received from Kisiiga LC1 for a borehole. The Application was received on 20th January 2020 and was signed by the LC1 Chairman of Kisiiga LC1.</p>	
			<p>- An application was received from Ibanda LC1 for a Borehole. The Application was received on 13/08/2020.</p>	
			<p>-An application was received from Mpigizo LC1 for a borehole. The Application was received on 15th August 2020.</p>	
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</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>At the time of the Assessment, there was no evidence that the LG conducted technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and 1 customised1 designs for WSS Projects.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that projects for Financial year 2020/2021 were screened environment and social impact ESIA/ESMP prepared at the time of assessment.

All the sampled projects had environmental and social protection plan in the BoQ Sampled projects include;

Construction of Kahoro protected spring in Bugambe sub county, There was soak pit grass planted around and also well protected.

Construction of Kajoga protected spring in Kiziranfumbi sub county. it had soak pit, grass planted around it and well protected

Drilling deep borehole at Musaijamukuru in Buhimbi Sub county soak pit, protected and grass planted around it.

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan.</p> <p>Planned infrastructure projects:</p> <p>3 Stance lined pit latrine at Hohwa market- Water Department at UGX15,400,508 on pg.5</p> <p>10 Extra- large Spring Protection - Water Dept at UGX 47,000,000 on pg.5</p> <p>Spring well construction at Kaseeta- Kabwoya Sub- County at UGX 5,000,000on pg.5</p> <p>Survey, sighting & drilling of 15 boreholes -Water Department at UGX 319,992,000 on pg.5</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 12 boreholes- Water Department at UGX94,827,204 on pg.5</p> <p>Repair of boreholes-Bugambe Sub-County at UGX 6,000,000on pg.5</p> <p>As per the procurement plan for FY 2020/21 signed by the Chief Administrative Officer on 21st September,2020 and submitted to PPDA on 21st September,2020.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction as shown below:</p> <p>Construction of 6 Spring wells in various Sub-Counties</p> <p>KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00018</p> <p>Contract Sum: 28,097,010</p> <p>Contractor: Freyline Supplies and construction Limited</p> <p>Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020</p> <p>Contract signed on 19th March,2020</p> <p>Contract Award approved under Minute</p>	2

No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 3

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00021

Contract Sum: 39,584,000

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th
February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute
No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 2

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00020

Contract Sum: 33,696,307

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th
February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute
No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 2

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00020

Contract Sum: 33,696,307

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th
February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute
No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 1

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00019

Contract Sum: 36,175,000

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th
February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute
No: 33.3.20

12

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:

There was no evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines

0

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO:

Required standard technical designs include the following aspects:

Label Placard cast in screed

Fence post

Soak pit 1.2 diameter

1.8 M deep

Foundation concrete forming a verge above ground level

Drainage channel length: 6M at 5% slope

PVC pipe 1.2 m long buried, draining into the soak pit.

For example:

Contractor:

The Soak Pit was 1.2m Diameter as per the Technical designs. In addition, the Drainage Channel was 6Metres as per designs and Fence posts are 1.5m High as pe designs.

..... Borehole

Contractor:

The Soak Pit was 1.2m Diameter as per the Technical designs. In addition, the Drainage Channel was 6Metres as per designs and Fence posts are 1.5m High as per designs.

Bukona Borehole

Contractor: Msr. Technologies (U) Limited

The Soak Pit was 1.2m Diameter as per the Technical designs. In addition, the Drainage Channel was 6Metres as per designs and Fence posts are 1.5m High as per designs.

12

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects

Despite the availability of the supervision reports, there was no evidence that other technical officers like; Community development officer, District Environment Officer participated in the monthly supervision as shown below;

Supervision report on Spring protection

Dated: 6th May,2020

Prepared by: District Water Officer

Addressed to CAO

The report did not mention the participation of any other technical officers

Supervision report on Spring protection

Dated: 29th May,2020

0

12

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

There was evidence that the DWO had verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts as seen below:

Borehole rehabilitation at Bugambe P/S

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00019

Contract Sum: 36,175,000

Contractor: Aliko Consults

Payment certificate No.1

Verified by the District Water Officer on

Approved by: Chief Administrative Officer

Payment made on

Voucher No:

Drilling of 7 boreholes

2

KIKU 628/WRKS/019-20/00002

Contract Sum: 148,198,657

Contractor: MSR technologies Limited

Payment sheet: 16th June,2020

Verified by the District Water Officer on

Verified by Principal Internal Auditor

Approved by: Chief Administrative Officer

Payment made on 24th June,2020

Voucher No: 7/6

Protection of 6 springs

KIKU 628/WRKS/019-20/000018

Contract Sum: 148,198,657

Contractor: Freyeline Supplies and
construction Ltd

Payment sheet: 7th May,2020

Verified by the District Water Officer

Verified by Principal Internal Auditor
certified on 7th May,2020

Certified by CFO on 7th May,2020

Approved by: Chief Administrative Officer

Payment made on 8th May,2020

Voucher No: 01/5

Rehabilitation of Boreholes lot 1

KIKU 628/WRKS/019-20/000019

Contract sum:36,175,000

Contractor; Aliko Consults Ltd

Payment sheet:17th June,2020

Verified by the District Water Officer on
17th June,2020

Approved by: Chief Administrative Officer

Payment made on 18th June,2020

Voucher :4/6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence of a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the

PPDA Law. Each complete procurement file consisted of; evaluation report, works contract and minutes of the contracts committee as shown below:

There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction as shown below:

Construction of 6 Spring wells in various Sub-Counties

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00018

Contract Sum: 28,097,010

Contractor: Freyline Supplies and construction Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 3

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00021

Contract Sum: 39,584,000

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 2

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00020

Contract Sum: 33,696,307

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th
February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute
No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 2

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00020

Contract Sum: 33,696,307

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th
February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute
No: 33.3.20

Rehabilitation of Boreholes Lot 1

KIKU/WRKS/2019-20/00019

Contract Sum: 36,175,000

Contractor: Aliko Consults Limited

Evaluation report dated 28th
February,2020

Contract signed on 19th March,2020

Contract Award approved under Minute
No: 33.3.20

Environment and Social Requirements

13

Grievance Redress:
The LG has established
a mechanism of
addressing WSS
related grievances in
line with the LG
grievance redress
framework

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:

Score 3, If not score 0

There was no evidence of grievance
redress committee recorded investigated,
responded to and reported water and
environment grievance availed to
assessment team at the time of
assessment.

0

*Maximum 3 points this
performance measure*

14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0	There was no documentary evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	There was no documentary evidence availed to assessment team of water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for the WSS facilities prepared and implemented.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0	The LG had no proof of land ownership where LG all implemented projects for the FY 2019/2020	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	The projects implemented had E & S certification form was completed and signed by Environmental Officer and DCDO Environment and social mitigation certification form Kahoro protected spring was made on 19th June, 2020 by EO and DCDO. Payment was made on 8th May 2020 Environment and social mitigation certification form Kajoga protected spring was made on 19th June, 2020 by EO and DCDO. Payment was made on 8th May 2020 Environment and social mitigation certification form Musaijamukuru borehole was made on 18th June, 2020 by EO and DCDO. Payment was made on 24th June 2020	2

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

d. Evidence that the CDO and
environment Officers undertakes
monitoring to ascertain compliance with
ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:

Score 2, If not score 0

The CDO and Environment Officer had
not undertaken monitoring to ascertain
compliance with ESPM and provide
monthly reports

Environmental and social supervision and
monitoring of higher local government
projects under water department dated
16th June, 2020.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 4 • 60 – 69%; score 2 • Below 60%; score 0 <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not Applicable	0
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	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	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	Not Applicable	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	0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 6			

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 4			

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	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	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	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	Not Applicable	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	Not Applicable	0
---	--	---	----------------	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	Not Applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

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	Not Applicable	0
	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	Not Applicable	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	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 Not Applicable	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</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</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</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"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	<p>Not Applicable</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	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	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	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	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	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</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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</p>	<p>0</p>

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	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	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 was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	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	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 Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	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	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	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	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	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	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	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	0

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
----	---	---	-----------------------	---

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
----	---	--	-----------------------	---

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
----	---	--	-----------------------	---

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
----	---	--	-----------------------	---

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
----	---	---	-----------------------	---

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
----	---	--	-----------------------	---

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The LG appointed Atugonza Hillary Winyi substantively as the Water Officer on the 16th/September/2019 under Ref:CR.156/2 DSC Minute no.246/2019(vi).	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The position was vacant at the time of assessment	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG appointed Kiiza Robert substantively as the Assistant Engineering/Borehole Technician Officer on the 4th/August/2015 under Ref:CR.156/1 and DSC Minute No. DSC 137/2011(iii).	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	As per the structure dated 18th/July/2018, the position didn't exist.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG appointed Nsita Getrude substantively as the Environment Officer on the 1st/August/2018under Ref: CR.156/1 and DSC Minute no.87/2017	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position was vacant at the time of assessment and had not been advertised	0

Environment and Social Requirements

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

If the LG:

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

The LG water sector carried out environmental social and climate change

Construction of Kahoro protected spring in Bugambe sub county KIKU 628/wrks/019-20/00018 was screened on 23rd September, 2019 by the Environment Officer and DCDO.

Construction of Kajoga protected spring in Kiziranfumbi sub county KIKU 628/wrks/019-20/00018 was screened on 23rd September, 2019 by the Environment Officer and DCDO.

Drilling deep borehole at Musajamukuru in Buhimbi Sub county was screened on 23rd September, 2019 by the Environment Officer and DCDO.

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 projects implemented did not require ESIA

There was no evidence of social impact assessment carried out at the time of assessment.

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 contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

The contractor got drilling permit Number DP13266/DW2019

MSR Technologies (U) Ltd for the period 1st July 2019 to 30th June 2020 from Ministry of Water Environment Directorate of Water Resource Management issued on 10th July 2019 by Eng. Kavute Dominic

Director of Water Development.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG neither recruited nor wrote to the MOPs for secondment of staff but however, appointed Kwikiriza Magambo Nicholas as the acting District Health Officer on the 2nd/September/2019</p> <p>Under the Ref:CR 156/1 and DSC Minute No.58/2019(v)</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of assessment and had not been advertised</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of assessment and had not been advertised</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of assessment and had not been advertised</p>	0

1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of assessment and had not been advertised</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of assessment and had not been advertised</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position was vacant at the time of assessment and had not been advertised</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Health Educator, score 20 or else 0.</p>
---	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>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)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN There was Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening forms of the projects mentioned below;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of OPD at Kikuube Health Centre IV. Screening was done on 7th February, 2020 by the EO and DCDO and costed ESMP were prepared and signed by the EO and DCDO on 12th February, 2020</p> <p>Construction of 2 stance Ecosam latrine at Bugambe Health Centre III. Screening was done on 7th February, 2020 by the EO and DCDO and costed ESMP were prepared and signed by the EO and DCDO on 12th February, 2020</p> <p>Construction of a gate house at Kikuube HCIV Screening was done on 7th February, 2020 by the EO and DCDO and costed ESMP were prepared and signed by the EO and DCDO on 12th February, 2020</p>	15
2	<p>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)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was no environment and social impact assessment report at the time of assessment.</p> <p>The project implemented did not require environmental and social impact assessment.</p>	15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely: <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The LG appointed Byakagaba Deogratias substantively as the District Education Officer on the 16th/September/2019 under Ref:CR 156 /2 and DSC Minute No.244/2019(ii)	30
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely: <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	- The LG appointed Zondera Amon substantively as the Senior Inspector Of Schools on the 16th/September/2019 under DSC Minute no. 244/2019(ii). The position of the Inspector Of Schools was vacant at the time of assessment and had been advertised in Newvision, Monday, March 9, 2020.	0

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.

All projects implemented by LG under education sector prior to commencement carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment as mentioned below;

15

The Maximum score is 30

Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Muhwiju primary school in Bugambe sub county was screened on 10th February, 2019 by EO and DCDO

Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kirimbi primary school in was screened on 10th February, 2019 by EO and DCDO

Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at St Joseph Wairagaza primary school in was screened on 10th February, 2019 by EO and DCDO

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.

There was no ESIA report availed to assessment at the time of assessment.

All the projects implemented in the financial year 2019/2020 did not require environmental social impact assessment.

15

The Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 neither substantively recruited nor wrote to the MOPs for secondment of the Chief Finance Officer. However the Council appointed Kusiima Jullian as the Acting CFO on 2nd/September/2019 under Ref: CR/156/1 DSC Minute no.58/2019	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The LG neither substantively recruited nor wrote to the MOPs for secondment of District Planner. However the Council appointed Twesigye F.Baguma as the Acting District Planner on 2nd/September/2019 under Ref:CR 156/1 and DSC Minute no.58/2019(iv)	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The LG neither substantively recruited nor wrote to the MOPs for secondment of the District Engineer . However, the Council appointed Arinaitwe Emma as the acting District Engineer on 2nd/September/2019 under Ref: CR/156/1 and DSC Minute no.59/2019(vii)	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 neither substantively recruited nor wrote to the Ministry of Public Service for secondment of the District Natural Resources Officer. However, the CAO assigned duties of DNRO to Nambi Pauline on 18th/May/2020 under Ref: CR 159	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 neither substantively recruited nor wrote to the MOPs for secondment of DPO . However, the Council appointed Ntume Barnabas as the Acting District Production Officer on 2nd/September/2019 under DSC Minute no.58/2019(vi) and Ref CR.156/1	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 neither substantively recruited nor wrote to the Ministry Of Public Service for secondment of DCDO but the CAO assigned duties to Businge Fatuma on 29th/March/2019 under Ref: CR 159/1	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG neither substantively recruited nor wrote to the Ministry Of Public Service for secondment of District Commercial Officer but the CAO assigned duties to Businge Fatuma on 29th/March/2019 under Ref: CR 159/1	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer) score 2 or else 0.	The LG appointed Byarugaba Christopher substantively as the Senior Procurement Officer on the 15th/September/2019 under Ref: CR156/1 and DSC Minute no.90/2018.	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer), score 2 or else 0	The LG appointed Ssewanyana John Herbert substantively as the Procurement Officer on the 10th/January/2020 Ref: CR/156/2 under DSC Minute no.246/2019(ii)	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 neither substantively recruited nor wrote to the MOPs for secondment of Principal Human Resource Officer. However, the Council appointed Kiiza Flavia as the Acting Principal Human Resource Officer on the 2nd/September/ 2019 under DSC Minute no.58/2019(i) and Ref: CR 156/1.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG appointed Nambi Pauline substantively as the Senior Environment Officer on the 10th/January/2020 under Ref:CR 156/2 DSC Minute no.246/2019(viii)	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG appointed Kyakusimire Zainabu substantively as the Senior Land Management Officer 10th/January /2020 under Ref: CR 156/2 and DSC Minute no. 245/2019(ii).	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff 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 appointed Mugabe Emmauel substantively as the Senior Accountant on the 16th/September /2019 under the Ref:CR 156/2 DSC Minute no. 246/2019(iii).	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	The LG appointed Businge Patrick as the Acting PHRO(secretary DSC) on the 2nd/September/2019 under Ref: CR 156/2 and DSC Minute no.245/2019(ii)	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The LG appointed Businge Patrick as the Acting PHRO(secretary DSC) on the 2nd/September/2019 under Ref: CR 156/2 and DSC Minute no.245/2019(ii)	0

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS,

score 5 or else 0

As per the staff structure dated 18th/July/2018, there were five (5) Senior Assistant Secretaries as below;

-Kirungi Denis was substantively appointed as the SAS of Kyangwali sub county on the 21st/April/2008 under Ref:CR 156/5 and DSC Minute no.071/2008(ii).

- Muhanuzi Stuart was substantively appointed as the SAS of Kizifumbi Subcounty on the 22nd/August/2006 under DSC Minute no.79/2006.

- Barungi Patrick was substantively appointed as the SAS of the Bugamba Sub county on the 29th/ September/2005 under and DSC Minute no. 109/2005.

- Mpabaisi Florah was appointed by the CAO to care take the office as the SAS of Buhimba Sub County on the 2nd /July/2019 under Ref:CR.156/2

- Mwanje Nelson was assigned duties to care take as the SAS of Kabwoya Sub County on the 25th/June/2020 under Ref: CR 159/1

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS

score 5 or else 0.

As per the structure dated 18th/July/2018, there were supposed to be 7 CDOs in 2 Town Councils, 5 Sub Counties . The Council had the following:

- The LG appointed Tweyongere Mary substantively as the CDO of Kyangwali Sub County on the 11th/May/ 2020 under Ref:CR.156/2 and DSC Minute no.006/2020(iii)

- Ainebyoona Evelyne was substantively appointed as the CDO of Buhimba Sub County on the 4th/June/2015 under Ref:CR.156 /9 and DSC Minute no. 88/2015.

- Namataka Florence was appointed as CDO of Kizinfumbi Sub County on the 1st/August/2018 under Ref:CR.156/1 and DSC Minute no.88/2018.

- Atumanya Nelson Kikuube was substantively appointed as the CDO of Kikuube Town Council on the 12th/November/2019 under Ref:CR/156/2 and DSC Minute no.249/2019(iii)

- Mpabaisi Florence was substantively appointed as the CDO of Buhimba Sub County on the 18th/December/ 2014 under Ref:CR.156/6 and DSC Minute no.109/2014.

- Mwaje Nelson was appointed substantively as the CDO of Kabwoya Sub County on the 2nd/April/2018 under Ref:CR 156/6 and DSC Minute No.27/2018(i).

- The position of CDO for Buhimba Town Council was vacant at the time of Assessment.

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,

score 5 or else 0.

As per the structure dated 18th/July/2018, there were supposed to be 7 Senior Accounts Assistants in 2 Town Councils and 5 Sub Counties . The LG had the following:

- The LG appointed Moga Ibrahim Substantively as the Senior Accounts Assistant of Buhimba Sub County on the 1st/August/2018. under Ref: CR.156/1 and DSC Minute no.81/2018.

- Kaganzi Ronnet was appointed substantively as the Senior Accounts Assistants of Bugambe Sub County on the 11th/May/2020 under Ref: CR.156/2 and DSC Minute no.006/2020(ii).

- Nanyonga Moreen was appointed substantively as the Senior Accounts Assisrtant of Kikuube Town Council on the 16th/September/2019 under Ref:CR/156/6 and DSC Minute no.249/2019(ii).

- Raymond Isingoma was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant of Kyangwali Sub County on the 7th/September/1995 under Ref:PP/12/37 and DSC Minute no.20/95.

- Mugabi Ilyasi was appointed substantively as the Senior Accounts Assistant of Kiziranfumbi Sub County on the 7th/September/1995 under Ref:CR.PP/M-2/113 and DSC Minute no.20/95.

- Ssenkusu Semanda Godfrey was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assisstant of Kabwoya Sub County on the 11th/May/2020 under Ref:CR 156/2 and DSC Minute No. 006/2020(ii)

- The position of the Senior Accounts Assistant of Buhimba Town Council was vacant at the time of assessment.

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG Spent Shs 151,892,175 (Page not numbered) of Draft Final Accounts FY 2019/20 on Natural Resources department.</p>	2
3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG Spent Shs 235,610,175 (Page not numbered of Draft Final Accounts FY 2019/20) on Community Based Services department</p>	2
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>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG screened all projects under DDEG, Kibuube LG had one (1) project implemented during the FY 2019/2020 as mentioned below</p> <p>Environment and social screening forms (ESSP) for construction and rehabilitation of Munteme Kaigo – Kidoma road 8.0km was screened on 12th February, 2020 by the SCDO and Senior Environmental Officer.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>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),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was no project implemented that required ESIA in FY 2019/2020.</p>	4

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The projects implemented during the FY 2019/20 had no costed ESMP at the time of assessment.</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>Awaits audit report in January 2021</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

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 Local Government had provided information to the PS/ST MOFPED on the Status of implementation of internal auditor General findings for the previous FY</p> <p>2018/2019 on 17h h August 2020 This was beyond the mandatory dead line of end of February.2020</p> <p>Similarly, the Local Government had provided information to the PS/ST MOFPED on the Status of implementation of Auditor General findings on 17th h August 2020</p> <p>This was beyond the mandatory deadline of end of February 2020</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

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 submitted an annual performance contract to PS/ST MOFPED on 2nd June 2020 at 2.57PM which was within the required time frame of by 31st August 2020.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had submitted Annual Performance Report to PS/ST MOFPED on 27th August 2020 which was within the required time frame of by 31st August 2020.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had Submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for all the four quarters to PS/ST MOFPED by 31st August 2020 as required..</p> <p>1st Quarterly Budget Performance Report FY 2019/2020 was Submitted to PS/ST MOFPED on 18th November r 2019..</p> <p>2nd Quarterly Budget Performance Report FY 2019/2020 was Submitted to PS/ST MOFPED on 31st January 2020</p> <p>3rd Quarterly Budget Performance Report FY2019/2020 was Submitted to PS/ST MOFPED on 6th May 2020</p> <p>4th Quarterly Budget Performance Report FY2019/2020 was Submitted to PS/ST MOFPED on 27th August 2020 .</p>	4