



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Namayingo District

(Vote Code: 594)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	48%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	60%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	80%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	29%
Educational Performance Measures	49%
Health Performance Measures	40%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	52%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>• If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>From a sampled list of projects funded by DDEG funds the following projects were completed and in use by the intended beneficiaries</p> <p>Construction of a three-stance lined pit latrine at Buswale Primary School located in Buswale Subcounty, was completed as per Q4 Namayingo LG performance report, page 101 and was being used by the school.</p> <p>Community Learning Center in Banda Sub-County was completed and was in used by the community in Banda Sub-County, Namayingo District.</p>	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The annual performance assessment had not been rolled in LLG.</p>	0

Service Delivery  
Performance

Maximum 6 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

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

There was evidence that DDEG funded investment projects implemented in FY 2019/2020 were completed as per the work plan. Ref: page 101 of the annual performance report. For instance

- Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine
- Purchase of office equipment
- Capacity building
- Construction of water borne toilet
- Supporting PWD groups
- Furniture and fittings for council hall
- Departmental monitoring

There was evidence that DDEG funded investment projects implemented in FY 2019/2020 were completed as per the work plan. For instance

- Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine
- Purchase of office equipment
- Capacity building
- Construction of water borne toilet
- Supporting PWD groups
- Furniture and fittings for council hall
- Departmental monitoring

Percentage of completed projects were calculated by dividing completed (7) total projects over sampled (7) projects multiplied by 100 projects completed as per work plan. This was 100% completion as per page 101 of the LGs Q4 performance report.

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.	There was evidence that the District had budgeted and spent on all DDEG projects for the previous FY on eligible projects.  From the Quarter 4 performance reports dated 22nd August 2020, page 101, the LG had spent on average 100% on all DDEG funded projects as follows;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine worth U.18,000,000</li> <li>• Purchase of office equipment worth Ugx. 5,000,000</li> <li>• Capacity Building worth Ugx.14,000,000</li> <li>• Construction of water borne toilet worth Ugx.22,902,868</li> <li>• Supporting PWD groups worth Ugx.9,220,356</li> <li>• Furniture and fittings for council hall worth Ugx.12,000,000</li> <li>Departmental Monitoring worth Ugx. 5,000,000</li> </ul>	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	The DLG did not have DDEG funded infrastructure projects in the immediate FY.  Therefore, the LG scores the 0 points since we cannot compute the variations based on nonexistent project.	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,  score 2 or else score 0	The PHRO did not avail the list of staff at the LLG to enable the assessor review whether the staffing is in place as per the Minimum standards is accurate. the assessor sampled and visited the LLGs of Buswale, Buyinja and Namayingo T/C with the list of only the production staff in the LLGs.	0
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>There was evidence provided on infrastructure reports constructed using the DDEG funds at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Progress Reports on DDEG-funded projects like Construction of Namugongo Community Learning Centre in Butaija Sub-County and Construction of 3- Stance Lined Latrine at St. Maria Gorett Primary School in Buswale only indicated work in progress not completion.</p>	0
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>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs because assessment had not yet started in LLGs</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>To be assessed when the system has been introduced in LLG.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>To be assessed when the system has been introduced in LLG.</p>	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 LG had not consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY 2021/2022 to MoPS by 30 September 2020.	0
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):  Score 2 or else score 0	The District had conducted a tracking of attendance July and analysis staff attendance for the month of July-September 2020 outside the July-December 2019 required period	0
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:  HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0	Not all the HoDs were appraised were appraised. Only the following were appraised.  1. Oguttu Paul the CFO has been appraised by the Ag. CAO Agum Moses on 14/7/2020 for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020  2. Dr. Batwala Stephen the District Production Officer was appraised by the Ag. CAO Agum Moses on 23/7/2020 for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020	0
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	Administrative Rewards and sanctions had not been implemented as provided for in the guidelines	0
7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.  Score 1 or else 0	The DLG did not have in place a consultative committee (CC) for staff grievance and redress	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.	Some of the staff recruited in 2019/2020 did access the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment while some did not .	0
9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	All the staff that retired in 2019/2020 FY did not access Pension pay roll not later than two months after retirement.  1. Okumu Andrew Peres IPPS 541534 retired on 11/11/2019 and accessed pension payroll on 5/5/2020  2. Ouma Henry IPPS 541784 retired on 16/8/2019 and accessed the pension payroll on 19/2/2020  3. Agola Agnes IPPS 541546 retired on 10/10/2019 and accessed pension payroll on 11/8/2020  4. Opio Charles IPPS 541979 who retired on 15/8/2019 accessed the pension payroll on 28/2/2020  5. Okongo David Ondhoro IPPS 825509 retired on 15/5/2019 and accessed the pension Payroll on 28/2/2020	0

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	The DDEG budget for the District FY 2019/2020 was Ugx. 418,405, 000 of which Ugx290,861,556 was supposed to be remitted to the LLGS. The LG had 9 Sub counties and DDEG funds for all quarters 2019/20 to the LLGs as follows;  Q1 DDEG funds were transferred on 16th November 2020 as follows;  • Banda 16,531,610, EFT 24786587  • Bugana 5,375,263, EFT 247856526  • Buhemba 11,484,691, EFT 24786651  • Buswale 11,219,064, EFT 247865588  • Buyinja 9,831,899, EFT 24786652  • Lolwe 6,555,829, EFT 24786527  • Mutumba 16,206,954, EFT 24786590  • Sigulu 7,913,480, EFT 24786589  • Namayingo TC 11,835,062, EFT 24786653  = 96,953,852	2
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Q2 DDEG funds were transferred on 19th November 2020 as follows;

- Banda 16,531,610, EFT 26342394
- Bugana 5,375,263, EFT 26342392
- Buhemba 11,484,691, EFT 26342403
- Buswale 11,219,064, EFT 26342400
- Buyinja 9,831,899, EFT 26342404
- Lolwe 6,555,829, EFT 26342393
- Mutumba 16,206,954, EFT 26342402
- Sigulu 7,913,480, EFT 26342401
- Namayingo TC 11,835,062, EFT 26342423

=96,953,852

Q3 DDEG funds were transferred on 20th February 2020 as follows;

- Banda 16,531,610, EFT 26342394
- Bugana 5,375,263, EFT 26342392
- Buhemba 11,484,691, EFT 26342403
- Buswale 11,219,064, EFT 26342400
- Buyinja 9,831,899, EFT 26342404
- Lolwe 6,555,829, EFT 26342393
- Mutumba 16,206,954, EFT 26342402
- Sigulu 7,913,480, EFT 26342401
- Namayingo TC 11,835,062, EFT 26342423

=96,953,852

Percentage of funds transferred was  
 $290,861,556/290,861,556 \times 100=100\%$



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

There was evidence indicating that the LG had not provided timely warranting of direct DDEG funds for the FY 2019/2020.

From the IFMIS report, GOU Approved Warrant Report Namayingo District Ref: 01-Jul-2019 to 30-Jun-2020, the District had warranted DDEG funds for FY 2019/2020 as follows;

Q1 DDEG funds cash limits were received on 24th July 2019, warranted on 14th August 2020 and transferred to LLG on 16th November 2020.

Q2 DDEG funds cash limits were received on 07th October 2019, warranted on 22 October 2019 and transferred to LLGs on 19th November 2020.

Q3 DDEG funds grant cash limits were received on 14th January 2020, warranted on 17th January 2020 and transferred to LLGs 20th February 2020.

The LG delayed to warrant DDEG transfers by more than 5 days from the time of receipt of cash limits from MoFPED, thus the LG was not compliant.

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>The LG did not communicate to all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLG within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter. A copy of circulars for the third quarter dated 10th Feb 2020, Second quarter dated 20th Nov 2020 and the first quarter dated 14th/8/2020 were only found at Namayingo T/C out of the three LLG visited. Buswale SAA denied ever receiving such a communication and stated that sometimes it's done by telephone call. There was no evidence of the dates when the DDEG releases to the LG were done and therefore making it impossible to measure the 5 days timeline. The CFO said the system could not retrieve the dates of DDEG releases for the previous FY.</p> <p>However at the DLG, From the IFMIS there was evidence indicating that the LGthe LG had provided timely warranting of direct DDEG funds for the FY 2019/2020 as follows;</p> <p>Q1 funds were released on 14th August 2020 and2020 and transferred to LLG on 16th November 2020.</p> <p>Q2 funds were warranted onwarranted on 22 October 2020 and transferred on 19th November 2020.</p> <p>Q3 funds were warranted on 17on 17th January 2020 and warranted 20th February 2020.</p> <p>However, the LG did not timely warrant the direct DDEG funds within five working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED, thus was non-compliant in this area.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG conducted two supervisory visits to assess the construction of DDEG projects during FY 2019/2020.</p> <p>Ref: LG Multisectoral field report dated, December 5, 2019 Departmental and political monitoring of ongoing &amp; completed development projects implemented at LLGs by Planning Department for the fourth quarter of the FY 2019/2020 was carried out in the sub-counties of Banda &amp; Buyinja where a Community Learning Center was constructed in Banda Sub-County.</p> <p>Ref: Departmental Monitoring Report, dated May 18, 2020, the LG monitored the construction of the three-stance lined pit latrine at Buswale Primary School, constructed using DDEG funds.</p> <p>However, the reports provided at the time of the assessment were monitoring reports and not mentoring reports, thus the LG scored a zero.</p>	0

11	Routine oversight and monitoring  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:  Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence provided that the LG discussed the monitoring and supervision visits reports.	0
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:  Score 2 or else score 0  <b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b>	The DLG maintained an Asset register as per format in the Accounting Manual however it was not updated.  All the Assets acquired during the FY2019/20 were not posted in the Register at the time of assessment. All additions during the year (Page 37 of the Draft financial statements: Summary statement of stores and other assets (physical assets) as at end of the year) detailed below were not included :  Non-Residential Buildings UGX607, 116,708, other structures UGX 155,204,074, Motor Vehicle 1,200,000, all cumulatively totaling UGX 763,520,170 were however not incorporated into the LGs asset register.	0
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:  Score 1 or else 0	The LG had a Board of Survey Report for FY 2018/19 as per section 34 of the PFMA Act 2015.  There were no recommendations made for management.  However, the LG had a Board of Survey Report for FY 2019/20. The report was submitted to Accountant General, MoFPED on 28th August 2020 and received by the Office of the Auditor General and MoFPED on 3rd September 2020.  The report indicated details on the status stores and inventory page 4 to 5, assets register for transport and equipment page 6 to 11, asset register for office equipment page 11 to 30 and list of serviced items recommended for disposal, page 31 to 33.	1
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning	At the time of assessment; the CAO had on 10th July 2018 , under reference No CR/NAMGO/102/01, appointed only 12 Members to the Committee and they included the following;  1. Busagwa Alex designated as Ag. District Natural Resources Officer (Member)	2
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Measure

Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.

2. Discharch Musa designated as District Environment (Member)
3. Hasobo Jolly designated as Town Clerk (Member)
4. Dr. Magoola Patrick designated as District Health Officer (Member)
5. Nandudu Betty designated as District Community Development Officer (Member)
6. Mwondha Christopher designated as District Water Officer (Member)
7. Dembe Daniel designated as Senior Agricultural Officer (Member)
8. Kaawo Kawere Naay designated as District Education Officer (Member)
9. Wanderah Benard Bachecha designated as Surveyor (Member)
10. Kirya Godfrey designated as Engineer (Member)
11. Auma Brenda designated as Physical Planner (Secretary)
12. Agum Moses designated as CAO and Chairperson

The existing Committee was functional, however it was not fully constituted as the Physical Planner in private practice was not appointed.

The following sets were produced during FY 2019/2020 as presented below ;

- Quarter 1 meeting was held on 18th September 2019, Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department on 14th January 2020 and received on 17th January 2020. Ref: CR/NMYGO/102/01
- Quarter 2 meeting was held on 12th December 2019, Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department on 9th March 2020 and received on 11th March 2020. Ref: CR/NMYGO/102/01
- Quarter 3 meeting was held on 10th March 2020, Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department on 18th August 2020 and received on 28th August 2020. Ref: ADMIN/NMGO/213/2
- Quarter 4 meeting was held on 28th May 2020, Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the 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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on desk appraisal reports, the LG participated in monitoring of investment projects as they were part of their annual projects.</p>	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 evidence provided by LG on field appraisal for investment projects in FY 2019/2020.</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>There was evidence that project profiles for all AWP projects for FY 2019/20 were based on the outcomes of the budget conference.</p> <p>The District Technical Planning Committee meeting held on 16th July 2019 discussed and adjusted the Districts Annual Budget. Ref: Min 06/TPC/5/2019</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had screened and put in place mitigation measures before being approved for construction. Screening activities carried out on various projects took place after the construction had started.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The annual consolidated procurement plan of 2020/2021 submitted to PPDA by CAO on 16th September 2020 had two DDEG infrastructure projects viz; (1) Fencing of District Headquarters and (2) Completion of Namayingo Town Council Office Block.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Infrastructure projects for the current FY implemented using the DDEG were not approved by the Contracts Committee virtue of being omitted. Minutes of approval on file are for the Contracts Committee on various projects including those funded under SFG, PHC, DWSG, URF, Uganda Unconditional Grant, and Local Revenue but excluding the DDEG for instance the 04th contracts committee held on 10th /10/2019 under contracts committee no 05/04-10/NDCC/2019.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no copies of letters designating members of PIT on File. However, through a review of supervision reports, I realised there was a team involved but was not fully constituted to include the Environment Officer, DCDO, Labour officer as specified in the sector guideline. I'm, therefore, inclined to maintain the same score of zero.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Community Learning Center at Butajja in Buyinja Sub-county but could not enter inside the facility as it was locked. Assessment of the structure from exterior e.g. the elevations, shape of structure and roof complies with the design drawings of the District Engineer.</p> <p>A 3-Stance Lined Pit Latrine at St. Maria Gorett Buswale Primary School</p> <p>No design drawings were seen for this project. The project was treated as complete yet it had the following shortcomings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No partition wall.</li> <li>• No coping on screen wall to drain off storm water.</li> <li>• There were no protective paint coats on the primer on the steel doors.</li> <li>• No final paint coats on fascia board.</li> </ul>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Various supervision reports were seen and existed in the procurement file for 2019/20202.for instance:</p> <p>Site supervision report for construction of Community learning centre at Namuhololo Village Buyinja Subcounty by the District Engineer to the CAO dated 10th/10/2019, , AWP No, 36.</p> <p>Supervision report of a two classroom block at Bumoli Primary School by the District Engineer to the CAO dated 24th/01/2020, , AWP No, 29.</p> <p>Progress report for the construction of Community Learning Center at Butajja in Buyinja Subcounty by the District Engineer to the CAO dated 28th/06/2020, AWP No, 34.</p> <p>They did not have completion certificates because they were still under defects liability period</p>	2
13	<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>At the time assessment, tThere was no evidence of requisition and payment vouchers on Procurement files as per the procurement files and AWP.</p> <p>I was informed that these documents were with finance office.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	The LG had complete Procurement plan for FY 2020/2021 on file. Procurement files available: For instance:  Supply and Installation of ICT Equipment and Chemical Reagents to Buhemba Seed SSS. The advert in The New Vision dated 11th June 2020. The Evaluation report and Contract Committee approval minute MIN 04/02/08/NDCC/20/21 on 4th August 2020.  Renovation of Rabbachi Health Centre II  With Letter of bid acceptance/award letter dated 31st August 2020.	1
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.  Score: 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence of the designated Grievance Redress Coordinator at the time of the assessment.	0
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.  Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.  If so: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence of a specified system of recording, investigating and responding to grievances. There was no evidence of a centralized complaints log/grievance register.  The LG was supposed to have their own customized system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances. There was no evidence of a centralized complaints log.	0



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 no evidence that the LG had publicized grievance redress mechanisms. The Gender Focal Person presented a poster from MoGLSD for the industrial court sub-registry that handles labor disputes, it did not qualify as a defined complaints referral path for the LG.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 provided on integration of Environmental and climate change interventions of the AWP Ref: page 33 of the AWP as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revitalization of environment clubs in schools and aiding drama groups</li> <li>• Conduct trainings in non-formal environment education</li> <li>• Monitoring and mitigation measures of the development projects</li> <li>• Coordination of LEC and DEC meetings</li> <li>• Community sensitization on wetlands</li> <li>• Community sensitization on land laws</li> <li>• Physical planning committee meetings</li> <li>• Promotion of physical planning awareness</li> <li>• Survey of government land</li> </ul>	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  score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had disseminated guidelines to LLGs. From the sampled LLGs like Namayingo TC, Buyinja Sub-County and Buswale Sub-County, there was no evidence on enhanced DDEG guidelines disseminated to them.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no 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. The assessment noted that the Environment Officer was not involved when it came to the costing of ESMPs for all projects.</p>	0
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 evidence of projects with costings of the additional impact from climate change. The assessment team noted that the Environment Officer was not involved in the screening, costing of ESMPs for all investments financed from DDEG and therefore no evidence obtained from his office</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Among the sampled projects like Lolwe primary school, Namugongo primary school, Mwango primary school, Madowa primary school,, Bulokha primary school, only two in had evidence of letters of agreement for example;</p> <p>Madowa Primary School had an agreement letter dated 24th February 2014, from Madowa Catholic Church signed by the Parish Priest Rev. Fr. Richard OKau permitting the construction and use of part of the church 1 acre piece of land for Madowa Primary school.</p> <p>A Letter of Agreement dated 4th March 2002 where Mr. Bwire Augustine Romans offered 4 acres of his land to Bulokha Primary School.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Monitoring reports were done. However, information gathered from the screening report dated 10th November 2019, signed by the Environment Officer, indicated that screening of projects took place after the construction works had started and there was untimely release of funds to carry out project screenings.</p> <p>Some officers see no value of attaching E.I.A reports consequently not involving the Environment officer and CDO in the project activities.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that E&amp;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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was no evidence of compliance certification forms completed and signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</p>	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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DLG had prepared Bank reconciliations up to June 2020 and they were fully authenticated and on file.</li> <li>• The DLG is on IFMS and had three Bank Accounts: General Fund Account, TSA and Global Fund Account.</li> </ul> <p>However, by the time of the assessment there was no evidence of bank reconciliation for the period ended July to October 2020</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>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 evidence that the LG produced all Internal Audit Quarterly reports as follows :</p> <p>Quarter 1 was produced on 03/01/2020</p> <p>Quarter 2 was produced on 12/06/2020</p> <p>Quarter 3 was produced on 19/06/2020</p> <p>Quarter 4 was produced on 3/09/2020</p>	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Internal Audit reports were submitted and acknowledged by the LG Council/Chairperson and the LG PAC on the following dates</p> <p>Quarter 1 was submitted on 3rd January 2020</p> <p>Quarter 2 was submitted on 30th June 2020</p> <p>Quarter 3 was submitted on 21st August 2020</p> <p>Quarter 4 was submitted on 14th September 2020</p> <p>These reports were submitted to District Speaker and copied to PS Ministry of Finance planning and Economic Development, PS Local Government, Inspector General of Government, Auditor General, Chairman Audit, Resident District Commissioner, District Public Accounts Committee, Chairman, Finance, Planning and Administrative Committee and Chief Finance Officer.</p>	1
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The reports were submitted to the LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC on the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1 on 3rd January 2020</p> <p>Quarter 2 on 30th June 2020</p> <p>Quarter 3 on 21st August 2020</p> <p>Quarter 4 on 14th September 2020</p> <p>The LGPAC had reviewed Q1 and Q2 Audit Reports on 28th September 2020.</p> <p>Quarter 3 and 4 Audit Reports had not been reviewed by the LG PAC thus the LG was non-compliant.</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>From the Draft financial statements 2019/20, page 13 on the Statement of Appropriation of Account, the Original Budget for Local revenue was projected at UGX 304,459,000 and the Actual local revenue collection realized was UGX 172,140,199. This translates into a revenue collection ratio of 56.5% which is 43.5% short of target and outside the range of +/- 10% range. The team in charge of revenue budgeting needs to budget realistically.</p>	0
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2018/2019 was Ugx. 250,239,697 as shown on page 23 of the Draft Final Accounts FY 2018/2019</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2019/2020 was Ugx. 172,140,199 as shown on page 12 of Financial statement ended 30th June 2020.</p> <p>Thus Ugx. 172,140,199 (FY 2019/2020) minus Shs 250,239,697 (FY 2018/2019)</p> <p>= Decrease of 78,099,498</p> <p>This was a decrease in revenue, which translated to 31% decrease.</p>	0

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

• Sec 85 of LGA (2) "In rural areas, revenue shall be collected by the sub county councils, and a sub county council shall retain 65 percent, or any other higher percentage as the district council may approve, of the revenue collected by it and pass the remaining percentage over to the district"

• (4) "A district council may, with the concurrence of a sub county, collect revenue on behalf of the sub county council but shall remit 65 percent of the revenue so collected to the relevant sub county."

• In this regard to (4) above the DLG collected shareable Local Revenue which amounted to Ugx 53,617,300, 65% of this was 34,851,245. The remittance to LLG of Ugx 34,851,245 was made on 17th January 2020 as follows :

- Namayingo TC 9,340,200
- Lolwe Sub county 1,435,558
- Sigulu Sub county 1,460,648
- Banda Sub county 6,885,060
- Buyinja Sub county 6,296,940
- Mutumba Sub county 4,329,878
- Buhemba 2,596,523
- Buswale Sub county 4,368,878
- Bukana Sub county 1,406,630

The LG remitted 100% of the shareable local revenue.

## Transparency and Accountability

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

Whereas there was no evidence on the notice board and website, the information was verified information from the file. Specific reference was also made the Best evaluated bidder notice. For instance: Construction of Mwema Seed Secondary School the notice was on 11th march 2019;

Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Bumoli, Madowa P/S ,Lolwe P/S the notice was on 14th October 2019;

Drilling, installation and casting of 12 deep boreholes lot1 and lot 2- the notice was on 14th/10/2019

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 provided that the LG published information on Namayingo performance results to Citizens Ref. Namayingo Website; <a href="http://www.namayingo.ug">www.namayingo.ug</a></p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on the LG meetings with the public to get their feedback on status of implementation of activities.</p>	0
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>From the notice boards at the LG, there was no evidence on display of information related to tax rates, collection procedures and procedures for appeal to the public.</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 LG prepared a PAC report dated 30th June 2019. The report was fully authenticated and signed by the PAC Secretary, Chairperson for the District.</p> <p>The LG had not prepared an IGG report as they had no issues that needed the IGG intervention in FY 2019/2020.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes:                      The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG PLE pass rate had improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year, for example, in 2018 the total number of candidates for PLE was 3441. Those who passed were as follows:</p> <p>Grade I: 181, Grade II: 1250 and Grade III: 902. The total number of those who passed between Grade 1 and III was 2,333 which gave a % of <math>2333/3441 \times 100 = 67.8\%</math>.</p> <p>In 2019 the candidates who sat for PLE were 3,549 and those who passed in Grade I were 123, grade II were 1,305 and in grade III were 990 which gave a total of 2,418 pupils who passed between Grade 1 and III. The % was <math>2,418/3,549 \times 100 = 68.1\%</math>.</p> <p>Therefore, Increase was <math>68.1 - 67.8 = 0.3\%</math></p> <p>However, the increase was below 1 % .</p> <p>The results is as follows when the absentees are excluded:</p> <p>PLE 2018: Total no. of candidates registered and sat for PLE 3386 [Excluding 55 absentees]. Div. I: 123; Div. II: 1250; Div. III: 990 - Total pass 2333. Pass rate 68.9%.</p> <p>PLE 2019: Total no. of candidates registered and sat for PLE 3509 [Excluding 40 absentees]. Div. I: 123; Div. II: 1305; Div. III: 990 - Total pass 2418. Pass rate 68.9%.</p> <p>There was no increase and no decline. The score is 0.</p>	0



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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

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

The UCE pass rate had improved between the previous school's year but one and the previous year, for example:

In 2018, the number of candidates who sat for UCE was 354.

Division 1: 3

Division 2: 28

Division 3: 41

Total :72

Therefore, the pass rate was  $72/243 \times 100 = 20.3\%$ .

In 2019 the number of candidates was: 322.

Division 1: 0

Division 2: 20

Division 3: 71

Total: 91

Therefore, the pass rate was  $91/322 \times 100 = 28.2\%$

Therefore, the performance improvement was  $:28.2 - 20.3 = 7.9\%$ .

When computed excluding absentees the results are as follows:

UCE 2018: Total no. of candidates registered and sat for UCE 348 [Excluding 06 absentees]. Div. I: 03; Div. II: 28; Div. III: 41 - Total pass - 72. Pass rate 20.7%.

UCE 2019: Total no. of candidates registered and sat UCE 321 [Excluding 02 absentees]. Div. I: 00; Div. II: 20; Div. III: 71 - Total pass 91. Pass rate 28.3%.

Improvement of 7.6% points.

The score is 3.

NA

0

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

Maximum 2 points

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

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

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education development grant had been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines for example, the SGF grant was used to construct five 2- classroom blocks in five schools,5 stance latrines were constructed in five schools and 176 desks were bought and distributed to Namaingo P/S( 40),Banda P/S(36),Mayanja P/S (36),Namayuge(36),Madowa(18)and Namugongo (10).</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Environment Officer and the DEO had not certified education projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district doesn't have MoES CMU engineer's estimate. Therefore, use of LG engineer's estimate for calculating variation is non-compliant with the provisions of the scoring guide for this performance measure.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG scores the 0.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the Procurement Plan of 2019/2020 FY of the district submitted by the CAO on 14th October 2019 to PPDA (received 14th October 2020) Mbale Regional Office:</p> <p>Ten (10) out of 12 projects were complete representing 100% physical completion. In terms of number, this represents 16.66%.</p> <p>One project i.e. Namugongo Primary School (in Sigulu Island in Lake Victoria) was reportedly built, roofed and doors fixed. Pending works are plastering and finishes. This represents physical completion of between 80%-99%. In terms of number, this represents 8.33 %.</p> <p>Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Isindi Primary School was reportedly still at slab level. This represents physical completion of between 80%-99%. This represents physical completion of below 80%-. In terms of number, this represents 8.33%.</p> <p>Therefore, the score is zero.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 – 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had recruited 764 primary school teachers out of the ceiling of 1096 as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines.</p> <p>Therefore the % was <math>764/1096 \times 100 = 69.7\%</math> which was below 70%. The score was 0.</p> <p>LG staff ceiling is 1096 teachers and number of teachers so far recruited 764. Percent in-post : 69.7%. Score 0.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The schools in LG that met the basic requirements and minimum standards were 74 out of 84 schools. Therefore <math>74/84 \times 100 = 88\%</math></p> <p>The percent was above 70.</p> <p>For example, the three sampled schools namely: .Genguluho P/S in Buhemba Sub-county, Kifuyo P/S in Buyinja Sub-county and Namaingo P/S in Namaingo Town Council had the following: National Flag and Flag pole b) A Mission statement c) A Motto d) A Vision e) An Annual Work Plan. f) An Institution Management Structure (displayed) g) Management information and records.</p>	3

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

There was evidence that the LG had not accurately reported on teachers and where they were deployed according to Namayingo District School Master Staff list reference, 20/20 dated 30/1/2020. For example,

Genguluho P/S had 15 teachers, Kifuyo P/S had 16 teachers and Namayingo P/S had 16 teachers.

The numbers did not tally with those at school as shown below:

1. Genguluho P/S in Buhemba Sub-county had a Head teacher and 11 teachers.

2. Kifuyo P/S in Buyinja Sub-county had a Head teacher and 14 teachers.

3. Namaingo P/S in Namaingo Town Council had a Head teacher and 15 teachers

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

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

No school Asset Registers were in place.

0

6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<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"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There were 22 schools out of 84 registered Primary schools that had submitted reports and only one had been endorsed by the chairperson of the SMC chairperson, namely, Bukoha Primary School.</p> <p>Therefore <math>22/84 \times 100 = 26.2\%</math> which was below 80%.</p>	0
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30– 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that UPE schools were supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations, for example, in a meeting held in the education department on 28th November 2019, it was noted that there was laxity in the school management as reflected in the Inspection report in the 2nd quarter dated 13th January 2020. It was therefore decided that the Headteachers were to immediately put the mandatory documents in use. The letter dated 3/2/2020 of Reference No.EDN/NMYG/161/1 was sent to all schools</p> <p>For example, the 3 sampled schools, namely: .Genguluho P/S, Kifuyo P/S and Namaingo P/S had SIPs. Therefore <math>3/3 \times 100 = 100\%</math>.</p>	4
6	School compliance and performance improvement:	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There were 84 performance contracts from 84 registered schools for year 2019/2020.</p> <p>Therefore <math>84/84 \times 100 = 100\%</math>.</p>	4
Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	Maximum 12 points on this performance measure		

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Assessor found evidence that the LG had budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY 2020/2021.</p> <p>The current year budget of UGX 6,936,712,690 catered for 84 Headteachers and 782 teachers. This was in the approved district annual budget of FY 2020/2021.</p>	4
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had deployed 84 Head teachers and 782 teachers. For example:</p> <p>1.Genguluho P/S in Buhemba Sub-county had a Head teacher and 11 teachers.</p> <p>2.Kifuyo P/S in Buyinja Sub-county had a Head teacher and 14 teachers.</p> <p>3.Namaingo P/S in Namaingo Town Council had a Head teacher and 15 teachers</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>It was evident that the teacher deployment data was disseminated and displayed at the district education offices and on schools noticeboards dated 30/1/2020</p>	1

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p>	<p>. There was no evidence to prove that head teachers had been appraised although the PHRO stated that the Head teachers appraisals had been done but he failed to bring them to the assessor.</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>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>The PHRO stated that the six Secondary school H/Ts in the district had were submitted their appraisals to the HRM and that they are usually appraised by Ministry of Education but did not provide evidence to confirm this</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>Only 4Four out of 7 LG Education staff in place were appraised</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kizito James, the Education officer Guidance and Counseling was appraised for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020 by the DEO on 21/7/2020</li> <li>2. Makali Egombe Barasa Vincent , the Senior Education officer was appraised for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020 by the DEO on 3/7/2020</li> <li>3. Ouma Godfrey Hasibate, the Senior Inspector of Schools appraised for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020 by the DEO on 13/7/2020</li> <li>4. Maloba Thomas, the Inspector of Schools was appraised for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020 by the Senior Inspector of Schools on 13/1/2020</li> </ol>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>		

8

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0

The LG had prepared a training plan and budgeted for it in the District Budget for 2020/2021 which was approved on 22/5/2020 under Minute 05/05/NDC/2020

2

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

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

It was noted that the LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually, according to Budget confirmation Circular BCC/2 dated 26/2/2019.

2

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines in a circular referenced, BCC/2, dated 26/2/2019. The total amount allocated was UGX 57,548,000.

2



9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>From the IFMIS report , the LG provided evidence on transfer of UPE capitation grants for the three quarters in FY 2019/20 as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term 1 2020 USE/UPE Capitation grant was transferred to 9 secondary and 84 primary schools on 23 and 24th January 2020</li> <li>• Term II funds were transferred 9 secondary and 84 primary schools on 18th May and 19th May 2020 respectively</li> <li>• Term III calendar year 2019 USE/UPE Capitation grant was transferred to 9 secondary and 84 primary schools on 2nd and 3rd September 2019.</li> </ul> <p>However, the LG did not provide evidence on the PBS time stamp of LG warrant submission thus this indicator was not fully assessed.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>No invoicing had been done but the releases were publicized on the notice boards.</p> <p>For example, In Quarter 1, Namaingo P/S received UGX 5,170,000 on 13/6/2019, in quarter 2, they received 7,992,716 on 10/9/2019 and received 7,989,591 on 18/2/2020 in quarter 3.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Education department had prepared inspection plans for Term 2 dated 15/4/2019 and term 3 dated 10/9/2019. The plan for term 1 was allegedly destroyed by a virus.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>In 2019 ,82 schools out of 84 were inspected. Therefore <math>82/84 \times 100 = 97.6\%</math></p> <p>Term I/2019: Dated 13/05/2019, received by DES on 15/05/2019; 74 schools out of 84 were inspected - 88.1%.</p> <p>Term II/2019: Dated 18/09/2019, received by DES on 15/01/2020, 82 schools out of 84 were inspected - 97.6%.</p> <p>Term III/2019: Dated 15/01/2020, received by DES on 15/01/2020, 82 schools out of 84 were inspected - 97.6%.</p> <p>Average - 94.4%. which is between 80-99 and so the Score is 1</p>	1
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>The inspection reports had been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions were subsequently followed-up. For example ,there was a departmental meeting held on 29/11/2019 to discuss the inspection and monitoring report under Min.NDED/15/11/2019.</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>In one of the sampled schools, an inspection report of Term 3/2019 dated 18/11/2019 recommended that Namaingo P/S should sort out the land problem and fence the school. The school management committee met to follow up the issue in a meeting held on 06/10/2020 under Minute 4/smc/10/2020 and implemented the recommendation.</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</p> <p>The Social Service Committee presented the sector implementation plan for approval. For instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting of 7th May 2019, under Min 5/Nam-SSC/05/2019, presented the budget to council for approval.</li> <li>• Meeting of 20th August 2019, under Min 4/Nam-SSC/08/2019, page 2, the DEO presented the Education Department planned activities for approval</li> <li>• Meeting of 30th April 2020, under Min 3/Nam-SSC/03/2019, approved construction of pit latrines</li> </ul>	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>Evidence showed that the LG Education department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school in a meeting conducted by the DEO office on 17/10/2019 of Headteachers and Directors attended. During the meeting, the Auditor discussed the issues about the files on accountability for UPE funds.</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 was available</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 evidence indicating that the investments projects for education were derived from the development plan and prioritized in the AWP.</p> <p>According to the District Development Plan II 5 Year Development plan, the District had planned to construct classroom blocks, teacher houses, latrine stances desks supplied.</p> <p>From the District Approved Budget Estimate it was indicated that the education sector grant was spent on; rehabilitation and construction of; MwangoP/S at Ugx. 36,000,000 Dohwe Primary School Ugx. 9,500,000, Sigulu Primary School was estimated at Ugx. 6,224,000. Ref page 35 of the approved estimate dated 17/07/2019.</p> <p>The District Technical Planning Committee meeting held on 16th July 2019 discussed and adjusted the District Annual Budget. Ref: Min 06/TPC/5/2019. Thus the LG was compliant in this area.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on field appraisals for investments under education, thus the LG was non -compliant.</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>Whereas it was budgeted for centrally, it has been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan that was approved on 06th minute held on 20th December 2018 under contracts committee min no 05/06-12/NDCC/2018.</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>By the time of assessment, the PDU had prepared all the bid documents before the commencement of construction.</p> <p>Mwema Seed Secondary school was incorporated in 2018/2019 procurement plan. Contracts committee sitting on 11th march 2019 under contracts committee Min No. 04/09-03/NDCC/2019.</p> <p>Letter from the Solicitor General's office seen and on file.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Supervision report of a two classroom block at Bumoli Primary School by the District Engineer to the CAO dated 24th/01/2020, , AWP No, 29.</p> <p>Progress report for the construction of Community Learning Center at Butajja in Buyinja Subcounty by the District Engineer to the CAO dated 28th/06/2020, AWP No, 34.</p>	0
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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard technical designs provided by the MoES were being followed.</li> <li>• Physical checks in sampled schools adhered to the standards.</li> <li>• However, the site instruction book was not availed.</li> <li>• The Site visitor's book was seen.</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Standard technical designs were followed:</p> <p>Site supervision reports indicated that there were monthly progressive site supervision for Mwema Seed Secondary school dated 8th/01/2020 and 12th/09/2020</p> <p>Supervision report of a two classroom block at Bumoli Primary School by the District Engineer to the CAO dated 24th/01/2020, AWP No, 29.</p> <p>Progress report for the construction of Community Learning Center at Butajja in Buyinja Subcounty by the District Engineer to the CAO dated 28th/06/2020, AWP No, 34.</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>Site supervision reports indicated that there were monitoring during the critical stages.</p> <p>Supervision and monitoring report dated 25th June 2020 for various joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs and other key stakeholders for various projects including Construction of Mwema Seed secondary school was seen.</p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

The LG provided evidence which indicated that all suppliers in FY 2019/2020 were initiated and executed as per contract and implementation results.

From the Projects undertaken by the LG, payments were made for stages that were satisfactorily completed and approved by the certificate of works as per the signed contract; For example

- Chirikumiro Investments Ltd was contracted to construct a 5 stance line pit latrine at Mwango Primary school on 18th December 2020, who submitted a payment request worth Ugx. 35,490,150 on 15th May 2020. The payment request was approved by the CAO, CFO, Accounts, and District Internal Auditor on 27th May 2020. Certification was done by the District Engineer, Head of Internal Audit, and District Internal Audit on worth Ugx. 26,395,275. The Superintendent of works developed a facility monitoring report on 19th May 2020. The payment worth Ugx. 29,853,853, VR. 29853853 was made on 10th June 2020. A receipt confirming the payment was issued on 10th June 2020. Receipt No. 009.

- Mumango construction was contracted to construct a 2 classroom block at Buhemba primary school, submitted a payment request worth Ugx. 34,257,193 on 9th March 2020. The payment request was approved by the CAO, CFO, Accounts, and District Internal Auditor on 9th March 2020. Certification was done by the District Engineer, Head of Internal Audit, and District Internal Audit on 10th March 2020 worth Ugx. 36,395,275. The Superintendent of works developed a facility monitoring report on 10th March 2020. The payment worth Ugx. 34,257,193 VR. 2842082 was made on 30th June 2020.

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

The Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30 seen on file.

Contracts committee sitting on 11th March 2019 under contracts committee Min No 04/09-03/NDCC/2019.

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</p> <p><i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>File for Mwema Seed Secondary school were complete and incorporated in the 2018/2019 FY with clear evaluation reports by the contracts committee. A complete file was availed.</p> <p>06th minute held on 20th December 2018 under contracts committee min no 05/06-12/NDCC/2018.</p> <p>Letter of clearance from The Solicitor General for Mwema Seed secondary school for Egiss Engineering contractors date is 05th April 2019.</p>	1
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework,</p> <p><i>score: 3, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there were no grievances recorded with the GRC under the education department</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>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence of dissemination of Education guidelines.</p> <p>The reason given by DEO was that this was a new indicator and had not been implemented.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents,</p> <p><i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was No evidence of costed ESMP incorporated within the BoQs because the Environment Officer was not involved in the project activity.</p>	0

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>In the Education sector, there was proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects for example;</p> <p>A letter of agreement for</p> <p>Madowa Primary School dated 24th February 2014, from Madowa Catholic Church signed by the Parish Priest Rev. Fr. Richard OKau permitting the construction and use of part of the church 1 acre piece of land for Madowa Primary school.</p> <p>A Letter of Agreement dated 4th March 2002 where Mr. Bwire Augustine Romans offered 4 acres of his land to Bulokha Primary School.</p>	1
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>At the time of assessment there was only one supervision report dated 18th May 2020 for Mwema Seed School. The other projects did not have monitoring carried out because the Environment Officer and CDO were left out of the project activities.</p> <p>The Mwema Seed School report was on Environment monitoring and Implementation of Mitigation measures for Mwema seed school. The objectives were;</p> <p>i. To plant trees/fruits on selected school compounds by the Environment Officer.</p> <p>ii. To monitor environmental compliance by the service providers.</p> <p>In the findings it was established that the lockdown and subsequent closure of schools due to Covid-19 interfered with the approach on managing the activity of fruit tree planting, they needed guidance from the school management on where to plant trees. Some of the trees that had been planted around the school compound were poorly managed.</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&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that that the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environment officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments.</p>	0



No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
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"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Sampled 3 Health facilities namely: Buyinja HC IV, Banda HC III and Syanyonja HC III. OPD attendance and Deliveries in FY 2018/2019 were compared with those in FY 2019/2020 to assess increased or decreased utilization of health facilities during FY 2019/2020. Total OPD for the 3 health units for FY 2018/19 was 32,323; while during FY 2019/20 was 35,160. Therefore change in OPD attendance = <math>(35,160 - 32,323) = 2,837</math>; % change = <math>(2,837 / 32,323) \times 100\% = 8.3\%</math></p> <p>On the other hand, total deliveries for the 3 health facilities during FY 2018/19 was 1,547, and during FY 2019/20 was 1,675; Change in deliveries = <math>(1,675 - 1,547) \times 100\% = 8.8\%</math>.</p> <p>There was just slight increase in utilization of health services in the three sampled health facilities.</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"> <li>• Above 70%; score 2</li> <li>• 50 – 69% score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>This was not in the area of assessment.</p>	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

Namayingo LG had just been recently enrolled on the result Based Financing (RBF). Nine Health facilities were on RBF program and scored as follows:

HEALTH FACILITY	SCORE
Buyinja Hc IV	92.7
Banda HC III	87.5
Mutumba HC III	89.3
Bumooli HC III	76.9
Lolwe HC III	65.7
St. Matia HC III (PNFP)	83.9
Busiro HC III (PNFP)	70.6
DHO Facility	80
Sigula HC III	66.4
TOTAL SCORE	713
Average Score	79

The average score is above 70%, therefore Score 2

2

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.

There was evidence which indicated the LG budgeted and spent on eligible activities as per the health grant guidelines;

Namayingo District had budgeted for the following activities in FY 2019/20; Ref page 28 of the approved Namayingo District Budget Estimate dated 17/07/2019

Construction of Buyinja Health Centre, budget was Ugx. 35,999,000

Rehabilitaion of Shanyonja HC II budget was Ugx. 4,450,000

Rehabilitaion of Banda HC III budget was Ugx. 13,403,000

From Q4 performance report Ref, pages 134 and 135, the LG had spent as follows;

Buyinja Health Centre Ugx;35,999,000 ,

Banda HC III Ugx. 13,403 13,402 ,

Shanyonja HC II Ugx 4,450, 000.

2

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From payments made during the financial year, Health department</li> <li>• Payment to Semufuco Ltd for ceiling works, gable ends, facial boards and ring beams at Buyinja Health Centre IV worth UGX. 35, 969,704 VR No. 28314870 dated 12th March 2020, certification of works was done by the District Engineer, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Finance Officer, Internal Auditor and District Health Officer on 12th February 2020.</li> <li>• Payment to Semufuco Ltd for ceiling works, gable ends, facial boards and ring beams at Buyinja Health Centre IV worth UGX 1,690,576 VR No. 2985385 dated 10th June 2020, certification of works was done by the District Engineer, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Finance Officer, Internal Auditor and District Health Officer on 21st May 2020.</li> <li>• These payments were made without certification of works by the Community Development Officer and Environment Officer hence the LG was not compliant in this area.</li> </ul>	0
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>All sampled Health Infrastructure projects under this funding, had their estimates less by 20%. For instance:</p> <p>Upgrading of both Bugana HC II and Syanyonja HC II, MoWT's estimates were UGX650M against the Contractor's price was UGX676M with a variation of Ugx.657,984 equivalent to <math>(657,984/28,000,000)*100 = 2.34\%</math>.</p> <p>Upgrading of Lolwe HC II MoWT's estimates were UGX500M while contractors' estimates were UGX474M with a variation of UGX 26M equivalent to -4%.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG scores the 2 points since all the variations in the contracts were within +/-20%</p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	All sampled Health Projects were not completed on schedule but were due in nearest future.  For both upgrading of both Bugana HC II and Syanyonja HC II, to HCII, at the time of assessment according to the contract agreement these project were expected to be complete by 10th June 2020. However, they are in the final touches including painting.	1
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	The LG Performance contract for FY 2020/2021 had 188 workers and wage bill budget of 2,527,184,186/=. The staff on post in FY 2020/2021 were 188 with a wage bill of 2,527,184,186/=. Using the evidence from sampled health facilities Buyinja HC IV with 46 /49 (95.8%) staffing level, Banda HC III with 15/19 (78.9%) staffing level and Syanyonja HC III with 6/19 (31.6%) staffing level and an overall staffing level of 77% $(46+15+6)/(49+19+19) \times 100\% = (67/87) \times 100\% = 77\%$	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	Two facilities were constructed to upgrade from HC II to HC III status. namely Nagana HC II and Syanyonga HC II. Field visit at the time of assessment showed that construction work had taken place. The steel doors and windows at Syanyonja HCIII under construction followed the MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>		

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The assessment sampled three (3) health facilities namely: Buyinja HC IV, Banda HC III, and Syanyonja HC III. The staffing norms for HC IV was 48, HC III was 19. At the time of assessment Buyinja HC IV had 46 staff, and Banda HC III had 15 staff. The number and listing of staff found at the health facility at the time of assessment were in agreement with the staff on payroll posted to these facilities. The variation of the numbers on the lists found at health facilities included volunteers that were being supported by RHITES-EC. the additional volunteer staff were not part of the government staff on payroll. The LGPA maintain its assessment and score 2.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

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>Two (2) health facilities were upgraded/constructed during FY 2019/2020. These were Bugana HC II upgraded to HC III and Syanyonja HC II upgraded to HC III. Both facilities were included in the PBS budget report of FY 2019/2020, indicating that the information was accurate. Construction works had started in FY 2019/2020 but not completed yet due to delayed release of funds..</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per planning and budgeting guidelines for LGs departments, health facilities are required to prepare and submit their Annual Work plans and Budget to DHO by March 31st of previous year. To assess compliance of Namayingo LG to these guidelines 3 health facilities were sampled namely: Buyinja HC IV, Banda HC III, and Syanyonja HC III. The health facilities submitted their Annual Workplans and Budgets as follows: Syanyonja HC III submitted on 16/04/2020; Banda HC III submitted on 25/07/2020; and Buyinja HC IV submitted on 01/07/2020. These facilities submitted their AWP and Budgets for approval beyond the deadline date of March 31st, 2020.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <p>• Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As a budgetary requirement, health facilities were required to submit their Annual Budget Performance Reports for previous FY by July 15 (of the new FY 2020). The three sampled health facilities submitted their Annual Budget Performance reports on 30/09/2020, well beyond July 15th and the reasons were not clear.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Only Buyinja HC IV had PIP. Buyinja had a PIP for FY 2020/2021 which had reached the CAO's office on 5th August 2020. There were documents provided by Syanyonja dated 16/4/2020 and Banda HC III dated 25/7/2020 but could not qualify to be Performance Improvement Documents (PIPs). Therefore score "0"</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>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The sampled health facilities; Buyinja HC IV, Banda HC III and Syaanyonja HC III had submitted their Monthly HMIS 105 and HMIS 106(a) during FY 2019/2020 irregularly and not timely. For instance for the month July 2019, HMIS reports for Banda HC III were missing and Syaanyonga hC II had submitted HMIS 105 on the 8th August 2019.</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>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>Namayingo district LG had been enrolled on Result Based Financing (RBF) in April 2020. Nine (9) facilities are on the RBF program and they had submitted their invoices as follows: Buyinja HC IV submitted on 03/09/2020, Banda HC III on 28/8/2020, Mutumba on 18/9/2020, Lolwe HC III on 3/9/2020, St Matia HC III (NFPA) on 27/8/2020, Busiro HC III (NFPA) on 3/9/2020, Bumooli HC III on 18/9/2020, Sigulu HC III on 18/9/2020, and DHO office facility submitted on 18/9/2020. All the 9 facilities had submitted their RBF invoices within time, before the 15th of the month following first quarter (October 2020).</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

By the time of assessment Namayingo district LG had submitted RBF invoices of the 9 health facilities to the DHO to the Ministry of Health by 21.09.2020.

1

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the Health Department quarterly performance reports were submitted beyond one month of the next quarter; Ref. acknowledgment forms planning unit as indicated below;

- Quarter 1 was submitted on 04th November 2019
- Quarter 2 was submitted on 07th February 2020
- Quarter 3 was submitted on 18th May 2020
- Quarter 4 was submitted on 20th August 2020

0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was no Performance improvement plan for weakest performing health facilities in Namayingo district</p>	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

**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>The LG performance contract had 188 workers and wage bill budget of 2,527,184,186/=</p> <p>The staff on post in FY 2020/2021 were 188 with a wage bill of 2,527,184,186/=</p> <p>the LG budgeted and deployed health workers as per guidelines</p> <p>Source: PBS budget report and Staff list provided by HRO</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>The Sampled health facilities were Buyinja HC IV, Banda HC III, and Syanyonja HC III.</p> <p>Staffing Norm: Buyinja HC IV, 48; Banda HC III, 19; Syanyonja HC III, 19</p> <p>Staffing levels were: Buyinja HC IV had 93.9% (46/49) ; Banda HC III, 78.9% (15/19); Syanyonja HC III 31.6% (6/19). Only 2 of the sampled health facilities had at least 75% of the required staff, Syanyonga had less (31.6%).</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>The list of health workers found at work, those who had keyed or signed in the attendance book was in agreement with the list of staff on payroll and posting to Buyinja HC IV, Banda HC III and Syanyonja HC III. Scored 3</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>Lists of Health workers as deployed or posted to Buyinja HC IV, Banda HC III, and Syanyonja HC III were posted on the facility noticeboards.</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

All sampled 10 health facility in-charges sample had been appraised for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020

1. Opedun Geoffrey an Enrolled Nurse is the In-charge Dohwe HCII was appraised on 21/7/2020
2. Mwino Alex, a Medical Clinical Officer in-charge Bugali HCII was upraised 26/7/20202
3. Akitui Margret , Enrolled nurse in-charge Mulombi HCII was appraise on 26/7/2020
4. Musumna Moses, a Senior Clinical officer, in-charge Mutumba HCIII was appraised on 5/8/2020
5. Awanya Robert, a Senior Clinical Officer in-charge Syanyonja HCII was appraised on 3/8/2020
6. Namuyingo Zamina, Enrolled Nurse , in-charge Kifuyo HCII was appraised on 30/7/2020
7. Ochan Daniel , a Medical Clinical officer, in-charge Lolwe HCIII was appraised on 13/8/2020
8. Kitundi Aaron a Senior Clinical Officer, in-charge Bumooli HCIII was appraised on 3/8/2020
9. Namulondo Sandra, Enrolled Midwife in-charge Byjwanga HCII was appraised on 27/7/2020
10. SSEWAGUDE Kizito, a Senior Medical Officer, In-charge Buyinja HCIV was appraised on 1/7/2020

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

All sampled 10 health facility in-charges sample had been appraised for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020

1. Opedun Geoffrey an Enrolled Nurse is the In-charge Dohwe HCII was appraised on 21/7/2020
2. Mwino Alex, a Medical Clinical Officer in-charge Bugali HCII was upraised 26/7/20202
3. Akitui Margret , Enrolled nurse in-charge Mulombi HCII was appraise on 26/7/2020
4. Musumna Moses, a Senior Clinical officer, in-charge Mutumba HCIII was appraised on 5/8/2020
5. Awanya Robert, a Senior Clinical Officer in-charge Syanyonja HCII was appraised on 3/8/2020
6. Namuyingo Zamina, Enrolled Nurse , in-charge Kifuyo HCII was appraised on 30/7/2020
7. Ochan Daniel , a Medical Clinical officer, in-charge Lolwe HCIII was appraised on 13/8/2020
8. Kitundi Aaron a Senior Clinical Officer, in-charge Bumooli HCIII was appraised on 3/8/2020

9. Namulondo Sandra, Enrolled Midwife in-charge Byjwanga HCII was appraised on 27/7/2020

10. SSEWAGUDE Kizito, a Senior Medical Officer, In-charge Buyinja HCIV was appraised on 1/7/2020

All the 10 staff files sampled had appraisal reports of Health workers appraised by their In-charges for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020.

1. Wafula Job an Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 27/7/2020

2. Ochan Daniel a Medical Clinic Officer was appraised on 1/7/2020

3. Kakaire Charles an Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 4/7/2020

4. Kisakye Lydia an Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 17/7/2020

5. Bwire James a Senior Clinical Officer was appraised on 5/10/2020

6. Namazi Christine an Assist. Nursing Officer was appraised 10/7/2020

7. Kadondo Sophie an Enrolled Midwife was appraised 30/7/2020

8. Obara Grace a Nursing Assist. was appraised

9. Namulondo Sandra an Enrolled Midwife was appraised on 27/7/2020

9.10. Nabulo Juliet an Enrolled Psychiatric Nurse was appraised on 20/7/2020 All the 10 staff files sampled had appraisal reports of Health workers appraised by their In-charges for the period 1/7/2019 – 30/6/2020.

8

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

There was no record of corrective action taken by the DHO based on the appraisal reports

0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Namayingo district did not have a CPD training plan for FY 2019/2020 and there were no training reports reflecting activities in the plan.</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>Documentation of training in CPD data base was not available.</p>	0
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no budget allocated for Health promotion service delivery. Ref: Page 61 LG Quarterly Performance Report 2019/20 Vote 594.</p>	0
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence provided indicating when warranting/verification of releases to PHC facilities was done. Hence the LG was non-compliant.

Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0

The CAO Namayingo District invoiced and communicated releases for funds to health facilities for all quarters as follows;

- Quarter 1 disbursement Ref: Letter dated 19th August 2019
- Quarter 2 disbursement Ref: Letter dated 19th November 2019
- Quarter 3 disbursement Ref: Letter dated 23rd January 2020
- Quarter 4 disbursement Ref: Letter dated 13th May 2020.

From the 3 sampled health facilities; namely Banda HCIII, Bumooli HCIII, Lolwe HCII, there was no documentation provided indicating when the funds were received by the time of the assessment. The CAO Namayingo District invoiced and communicated releases for funds to health facilities for all quarters as follows;

- Quarter 1 disbursement Ref: Letter dated 19th August 2019
- Quarter 2 disbursement Ref: Letter dated 19th November 2019
- Quarter 3 disbursement Ref: Letter dated 23rd January 2020
- Quarter 4 disbursement Ref: Letter dated 13th May 2020.

However, from the 3 sampled health facilities; namely Banda HCIII, Bumooli HCIII, Lolwe HCII, there was no documentation provided indicating when the funds were received by the time of the assessment.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a display at the sampled health facilities notice boards non-wage current grants indicating quarterly breakdown of releases dated 2nd June 2020</p> <p>Q1 July -Sept 2019 the release was Ugx. 4,500,000</p> <p>Q2 Oct-Dec 2019 the release was Ugx. 3,350,000</p> <p>Q3 Jan-Mar 2020 the release was Ugx. 3,840,000</p> <p>Q4 Apr-June the release was Ugx. 3,350,395.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there were no exact dates of publicizing the quarterly financial releases to help tell whether this was done within the stipulated 5 days .. Hence score "0"</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment minutes of DHMT quarterly Performance Review meetings dated 3rd August 2019, 15th December 2019, 12th March 2020 and 3rd May 2020 were in soft copy, hard copies were not availed.to the LGPA team, This was made clear at the exit meeting.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no hard copy of minutes of DHMT quarterly performance review meetings for FY 2019/2020. Hard copies of attendance lists were not availed to the LGPA team. It was therefore impossible to objectively agree on participants who attended the meetings.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The DHO supervised Buyinja HC IV and other lower health facilities at least once every quarter, in FY 2019/2020. The DHT documented the supervision activities and findings in Quarter 1 report dated 14th August 2019; Quarter 2 report dated 4th November 2019; Quarter 3 report dated 24th February 2020; and Quarter 4 report dated 22nd June 2020.</p> <p>Some of the findings during these supervision included: EPI activities not well coordinated , vaccine books not well balanced and immunization not carried out on daily basis; maternity wards were congested; RED/REC micro plans not available , vaccine coverage poor, Vaccine fridges not in good condition. Remedial solutions had been recommended by the supervising teams.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Buyinja HSD hd conducted support supervision of lower health facilities on quarterly basis in FY 2019/2020 and submitted quarterly reports to the DHO/CAO: Quarter I report dated 19th July 2019; Quarter II report dated 29th November 2019; Quarter IV report dated 12th June 2020.</p> <p>The following were the focus of the supervision: PHC funds accountability, waste management and disposal, Follow up of untimely usage of misoprostol by pregnant mothers in Sigulu Islands</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHO issued some circular letters. For instance at the time of assessment the DHO had issued circular letters to all in-charges and staff regarding professional misconducts, absenteeism, and drug pilferage. These circular letters were prominently pinned on the noticeboard of health facilities. Buyinja HC IV had taken corrective action for absenteeism, improving EPI outreaches.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Namayingo district LG health department had a Medicines Management and Surveillance Focal Person (MMS-FP). The MMS-FP conducted quarterly supervision of Health units, documented and submitted supervision reports to the DHO: Quarter I report dated 25th September 2019, Quarter II report dated 11th December 2019, Quarter III report dated 24th March 2020, and Quarter IV report dated 19th June 2020.</p> <p>During the supervision visits, facilities were advised on opening and updating of drug stock cards; ensuring that the principle of First In First Out (FIFO) is adhered to in order to avoid expiry of medicines; ensuring that facilities have adequate shelves for medicines and supplies, the need to fumigate health facility medicines store and chase bats, labeling medicines dispensing envelopes, irrational use of medicines (Polly pharmacy) among others.</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no budget allocated for Health promotion service delivery. Ref: Page 61 LG Quarterly Performance Report 2019/20 Vote 594.</p>	0



11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health sector mandate has 3 main areas namely: Health Promotion, Disease Prevention and Social mobilization; Provision of Curative Services; and Rehabilitation.</p> <p>The mandate of health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Safe water and Sanitation (WASH)</li> <li>2) Health Education</li> <li>3) Immunization</li> <li>4) Family Planning</li> <li>5) Prevention of Communicable and Non-communicable Diseases</li> <li>6) Promotion of health seeking behavior, early diagnosis and treatment</li> <li>7) Personal and environmental hygiene</li> <li>8) Safe Male Circumcision (SMC), and prevention of FMG Mutilation.</li> <li>9) School health</li> <li>10) And many others.</li> </ol> <p>During FY 2019/2020 Namayingo district LG health sector had implemented health promotion and disease prevention activities covering the above outlined technical areas</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>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHT had addressed Dressing code for health workers, EPI, Open Defecation Free Village (ODF), WASH Community sensitization, Risk Communication and Education, and the need to prioritize Health Promotion and Education agenda. These discussions were well documented in the soft copies of the minutes of Quarter II, Quarter III and Quarter IV review meetings.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

**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>At the time of assessment the LG had a list of medical equipment and supplies but the list was not comprehensive and inclusive. For instance, there were no land titles or agreements for the land on which most health facilities are located. A case at a hand was UNRA road compensation for Buyinja HC IV land which was claimed by an individual. This issue was before court at the time of assessment.</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 evidence that the health investments were prioritized in the LG Workplan and eligible for expenditure as per the sector guidelines; Ref page 28 of the Approved Namayingo District Budget Estimate dated 17/07/2019, the sector had budgeted for Buyinja Health Centre, Ugx. 35,999,000, Shanyonja HC II, Ugx. 4,450,000, Banda HC III budget was Ugx. 13,403,000. These were reflected in the annual performance report pages 134 and 13The District Technical Planning Committee meeting held on 16th July 2019 discussed and adjusted the District Annual Budget. Ref: Min 06/TPC/5/2019</p> <p>Thus the LG was compliant in this area.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on field appraisals for investments under health, thus the LG was non-compliant</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 evidence of screening forms for the Upgrade of Bukana Health Centre II to Health Centre III and Upgrade of Syanyonja Health Centre II to Health Centre III prepared and signed by the Environment officer on 10th June 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>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>Evidence available on file the Department of Health submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU quite late, dated 7th July 2020.</p> <p>However, the COVID-19 lockdown from 20th March 2020 to July 2020 could have had an impact on timely submission by the 30th April 2020 deadline.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Submission letters available on file. There was evidence that the health department submitted a procurement request (PP form 1) to PDU dated 12th July 2019.</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>Letter from the Solicitor General's office seen and on file dated 26th November 2019. The Contracts Committee also approved all the Health Infrastructure Investment Infrastructures including Bugana HCII and Syanyanja HCII. MIN 362/DCC/2019 dated 21st/10/2019.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No copies of letters from the CAO designating members of the PIT on file.</p> <p>PIT composition was available as per the project supervision report, however, it was not fully constituted as per the guidelines.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>following technical designs provided by the MoH. However, construction don't have louvres in them yet the door and window schedules in MoH standard drawings indicate them to have louvres on top. The functional and cost implications of this non-compliance is huge</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>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>Various copies of Clerk of Work's consolidated site report to the DE and DHO were on file. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bukana H/C – 10 reports weekly from June to August 2020.</li> <li>• Syanyonja H/C – 13 reports weekly from June to August 2020</li> </ul>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The reports referred to from the clerk of works (Mr Felix Ojiambo) were weekly reports that were reports to the DE and DHO. They did not necessarily reflect a daily journal of the clerk of works on these utilities.</p>	
			<p>I think, asking for a daily journal for a civil servant who is not resident on site is rather much and not practical.</p>	
			<p>Nevertheless, I agree and score a zero.</p>	

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

There was evidence that monthly meetings were held.

Joint monthly site meeting for Upgrading of Syanyonja H/C II & Bukana H/C II, held at the district Boardroom dated 14th/04/2020,

Joint monthly site meeting for Upgrading of Syanyonja H/C II & Bukana H/C II, held at the district Boardroom dated 2nd/06/2020.

However, the report was not categorical on attendance by Community Development and Environmental officers.

Also the composition was available as per the project supervision report, however, it was not fully constituted as per the guidelines.

Attendees included the CAO, de, Internal Audit, DHO, Supervisor, Clerk to works and "other stakeholders".

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

There was evidence of monthly supervision report, and site visitor's book at Syanyonja HC II however the site Inspection book was missing. At Bugana HCII, all the three were missing.

According to the supervision and monitoring reports these activities were being carried out by the CAO, de, Internal Audit, DHO, Supervisor, Clerk to works and "other stakeholders".

The composition was available as per the project supervision report, however, it was not fully constituted as per the guidelines.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the sampled payments made to the following vendors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semufu Company Ltd worth Ugx. 1,690,576 VR. No. 29853854 for construction of ceiling works, gable ends, facial boards, ring beam at Buyinja Health Centre IV, payment request was submitted on 11th February 2020 and certification was done on 21st May 2020</li> <li>• Semufu Co. Ltd , worth Ugx 35,969,704, VR.No.28314870 for construction of ceiling works, submitted payment request on 11th February 2020, certification of payment was done on 12th February 2020</li> </ul> <p>Whereas these payment requests were made in February, payment request for semufu dated 11th February 2020 was certified beyond 10 working days, thus the LG was not compliant.</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>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Various procurement files for the health infrastructure projects were seen, However, much of the information was either scattered or not available whence making the files incomplete for instance</p> <p>Contract committee minutes: Min 362/DCC/2019 dated 21st/10/2019 and 04th contracts committee held on 10th /10/2019 under contracts committee no 05/04-10/NDCC/2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award letter</li> <li>• Contract document:</li> <li>• BEB: 11th march 2019</li> <li>• Invitation to bid: Not clearly available</li> <li>• Date for Opening and Closing:</li> <li>• PP Form 19th September 2019</li> </ul> <p>Payment approval on 10th March 2020 , Voucher number no;27943887</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount paid was 406,027,745</li> </ul>	0

**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>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence of recorded grievances by the GRC under the health sector.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence on dissemination of guidelines on waste management at the LG. However, Buyinja Health Center IV had some guidelines from WHO on waste management. (Waste disposal in health units and management of medical waste: and safer water, better health).</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the sampled Health Centers, there was evidence of Placenta pits, rubbish pits, segregation waste bin systems at Biyinja Health Centre IV, Banda Health Centre II, and Syanonja Health Centre III respectively.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had conducted trainings and created awareness in healthcare management, no reports adduced.</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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	At the time of assessment no evidence was adduced on costed ESMP incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding documents.	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	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	At the time of assessment, there was no evidence to prove that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership.	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 of monitoring reports, however a general a report dated 24th July 2020 with Education, Health, Water, SFG sensitization meetings conducted by the Environment Officer was presented. The objectives of the report were to monitor and supervise departmental sector activities for Lolwe Health Centre III and Bugana Helath Centre III, Mwema Seed School, Water projects. The challenges noted were that the limited funds affected effective implementation of departmental activities.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Some contractors do not implement the recommended environment mitigation measures by the Environment Officer. Recommendation: Disciplinary action to be taken against staff on irregular attendance on duty.	



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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence of Environment and social certification forms completed and signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS sector data report, it was observed that Namayingo LG had rural water source functionality percentage of 83%</p>	1
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From Water and Sanitation committee 2019/20 MWE, it was observed that Namayingo LG had 377 established Water and Sanitation committees out of which only 336 WSCs were functional translating to <math>(336/377)*100=89.12\%</math></p>	1
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Above 80% score 2</li> <li>b. 60 -80%: 1</li> <li>c. Below 60: 0</li> </ul> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>No performance assessment had been carried out to the LLG by the LG at the time of assessment.</p>	0

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

There was evidence that Namayingo LG had budgeted for water projects during FY 2019/20- Approved budget 2019/20 page 46 and 47 at estimated cost of Ugx.248, 340,000. The average water access during FY 2018/19 was 59% and five (5) out of Nine (9) sub counties were below average which included; Sigulu 57%, Bukana 6%, Banda 44%, Lolwe 32% and Mutumba 53% and four (4) were budgeted except Lwolve.

In the fourth quarter progress report FY 2019/20 page 3 of 3 dated 15th July, 2020 in the budget expenditure page 21 indicated 99% of the development budget had been spent.

Targeted sub county were 4 in number, implemented and completed projects were 4, scoring  $(4/4)*100= 100\%$

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

Drilling, Installation and casting of 06 Boreholes Lot 1; Engineers' estimate was Ugx123,923,600 the contract price was UGX.116,940,360, variation was Ugx.6,983,240 equivalent to  $(6,983,240/123,923,600)*100=5.6\%$

Drilling, Installation and casting of 06 Boreholes Lot 2; Engineers' estimate was Ugx123,923,600 the contract price was UGX.117,017,650, variation was Ugx.6,905,9500 equivalent to  $(6,905,9500/123,923,600)*100=5.57\%$

Construction of a 5-Stance lined latrine at Bumalenge, the engineers' estimate was Ugx.28,000,000, the contract price was Ugx.27,342,016 with a variation of Ugx.657,984 equivalent to  $(657,984/28,000,000)*100 = 2.34\%$ .

Therefore, the LG scores the 2 points since all the variations in the contracts were within +/- 20%

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that all of WSS infrastructure projects were completed as per the annual work plan by the end of the FY as observed from the AWP FY 2019/2020, the district reported;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. drilling 12 boreholes out of 12, one borehole was dry;</li> <li>2. constructed 2 5-stance latrines out of 2 planned for, rehabilitated 23 water sources out of planned 23. Designed piped water supply systems for Banda.</li> </ol> <p>This gives % completion of infrastructure in FY 2019/2020 at 100%</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>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If there is an increase: score 2</li> <li>o If no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>From the MWE MIS data on functionality of water sources, it was observed that during FY 2018/19, Namayingo LG registered water source functionality of 81% and in FY 2019/20, the functionality was 83% leading to <math>(83-81/81)*100 = 3.7\%</math> increase</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 &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If increase is more than 5%: score 2</li> <li>o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1</li> <li>o If there is no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>According to MWE MIS data for FY 2018/19, Namayingo LG had functional WSCs equivalent to 317 and in FY 2019/20 functional WSCs had increased to 336 in number, this gave an increase of 19 functional WSCs leading to <math>(19/317)*100=5.99\%</math> increase.</p> <p>Verified from MIS, in FY 2018/2019, % functional WSC was <math>(317/350)*100 = 90.6\%</math></p> <p>In FY 2019/2020, functional WSC was <math>(336/377)*100 = 89.12\%</math></p> <p>Although the number of WSCs functional increased from 317 to 336, the % WSCs functional decreased.</p>	0

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>There was evidence that DWO had accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities was as reported according to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitoring report on new functioning sources on 1st June,2020,</li> <li>2. MIS data collection report of 25th June,2020 on Muabe water source</li> </ol>	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>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that DWO collected and compiled quarterly information on sanitation facilities as follows;</p> <p>On 15th October,201p quarter one report</p> <p>On 22nd June ,2020 quarter two report</p> <p>On 30th June,2020, quarter three report,</p> <p>On 15th July,2020, quarter four</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 25th June,2020 data on Mugabe source in Bukana Sub county was seen report</li> <li>• On 25th June,2020 data on Sidome and Bulundira source in Mutumba Sub county was seen</li> <li>• On 25th June,2020 data on Buyombo source in Banda Sub county was seen</li> </ul>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG water Office updated MIS data report on new Boreholes on form 1 and 4 and was submitted on 12th August, 2020 to PS MWE and a copy of receipt was on 14th August, 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>The DWO failed this PM as no assessment to LLG in FY 2019/20 had been conducted</p>	0
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; 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 &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO had budgeted for the following Water, a Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer (Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation and hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician</p> <p>In the approved budget for FY 2019/20 on page 43 output 098101 –Operation of the DWO amount equivalent to Ugx.32, 810,000 was allocated</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; 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 &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer had budgeted for the following</p> <p>Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer.</p> <p>In the approved Budget FY 2019/20 page 49 output 098301 – regularization and promotion amount equivalent to</p> <p>Ugx.212, 032 was allocated</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The DWO had only one staff in the name of Namutamba Hellen file no. CR/D/10308 appraised for the period 1st July, 2019 to 30th June, 2020 by Mwandh Christopher a Senior water officer on 30th July, 2020 and counter signed by Kirya Godfrey Senior engineer.</p> <p>The rest like Busagwa Alex file no. CR/D/10041 a senior environmental officer was last updated for the period 1st July, 2017 to 30th June, 2018 and Muganza Emmanuel file no. CR/D/10110, no appraisal information was seen.</p>	3
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District Water Office had identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and no assurance that training activities were conducted in adherence to the training plans at the district level and documented in the training database.</p>	0

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <li>•</li> <li>• If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the MWE Namayingo LG has average water coverage during FY 2019/20 at 61% and in the AWP and budget the following sub counties were planned and budgeted; Buhema sub county with 61%, Mutumba sub county 57%, Banda sub county had 45%, Bukana sub county 15%, Sigulu sub county 64%, with a total development budget of Ugx.456,334,000 (new water sources development) of which Ugx.66,790,000 was for Buhema ,Mutumba sub county had Ugx.108,990,000,Banda sub county had 189,500,000,Bukana sub county had Ugx.44,527,000 giving a total of Ugx.343,017,000 for sub counties below the district average of 61% leading to <math>(343,017,000/456,334,000)*100 = 75.2\%</math> budget</p>	1
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>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 availed to the Assessment team to verify that the DWO had communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</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>	<p>There was no evidence that the district Water Office had monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> </ul>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> </ul>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>		
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings this was observed in the following reports;</p>	2
	<p>Quarterly DWSCC report were verified, dated; 5/2/2020 for second quarter, 10/4/2020 for third quarter and 8/7/2020 for forth quarter. The report discusses issues on functionality, mobilization and development plan.</p>			
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessment team to verify that 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 neither was there any notice board to check and verify</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>			



10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO allocated budget to the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities , in approved budget FY 2019/20 page 43 and 44 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NWR was equivalent to Ugx.38,320,000 page 44 in the budget for Mobilization activities budget was equivalentto Ugx.11,369,000 page 43 in the budget</li> <li>2. Coordination meeting had Ugx.3,087,000 page 1 of 3 LG work plan,</li> <li>3. Extension staff meetings had Ugx.2, 300,000 page 1 of 3 AWP.</li> </ol> <p>Total Ugx.16,747,000 leading to  <math>(16,747,000/38,320,000)*100</math>  = 43.7%</p>	3
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on OEM of WSS facilities during FY2019/20 as was observed from the following training reports;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On 28th May, 2020 in Banda,Mutumba and Bukama Sub counties indicated training and formation of WSCs.</li> <li>2. On 19th March, 2020 in Banda, Mutumba and Bukama Sub counties indicated training and formation of WSCs.</li> <li>3. On 23rd December, 2019 in Banda,SIAMBA and Shaholi Sub counties indicated training and formation of 2 WSCs.</li> <li>4. On 22nd December, 2019 in Bukama Sub county indicated training and formation of 3 WUCs.</li> </ol>	3
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Investment Management**

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no information availed to the Assessment team to verify the existence of an up—to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG</p>	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible for expenditure.</p> <p>In the second Namayingo development plan (DDP11) 2015/16 to 2019/20 prepared June 2015 on page 191 number 3.7.2 ; the construction of hand pump Boreholes Drilling for communities 50 in number and source of funding was indicated as DWSCG amounting Ugx.1.25Bn and shown in the LG annual work plan page 2of 3.</p> <p>The District Technical Planning Committee meeting held on 16th July 2019 discussed and adjusted the District Annual Budget. Ref: Min 06/TPC/5/2019.</p>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that all budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities as seen below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Application dated 13th May,2019 for Lubango A in Mutumba sub county,</li> <li>2. Application dated 20th August,2019 for Siaholi in Banda sub county,</li> <li>3. Application dated 14th March,2020 for Mugabe in Bukana sub county,</li> </ol>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to prove that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for:</p> <p>(i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY by the time of assessment as no any field appraisal report was seen by the assessment team.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no information availed to the Assessment team to verify that the sampled water project for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPS prepared before being approved for construction</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water infrastructure investments for FY 2019/20 were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan page 64 under the subject: Construction of other structures works 405 estimated at Ugx.248,340,000</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 the commencement of construction as verified from the following Contracts Committee minutes;</p> <p>Contract committee minutes number, NIM05F/06-11/NDCC/2019 approving the evaluation report for Lot 1 project held on 19th November 2019,</p> <p>Contract committee minutes number, NIM04d/08-12/NDCC/2019 approving the evaluation report for Lot 2 project held on 19th November 2019</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>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines. There were however project management plan schedule on form 49 for all water projects</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled at Mugabi village in Bukan Sub county had two ramps iteme 6.6 and 29m2 screen wall item 6.3 were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO.</p> <p>And for the Boreholes at Bulundira in Mutumba sub county,Buyombo in Banda sub county and at Mugabe in Bukana sub county, hand pump platform including installation of pedestal were seen as clearly spelt in the Bills of quantities</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects as observed from the following site reports;</p> <p>The contract management plans for all the water and sanitation projects were seen prepared on;12th December,2019-Drilling ,installation and casting of 06 Boreholes by MAMA Boreholes Ltd</p> <p>Platform casting report for Boreholes dated 4th June, 2020 carried out in Bukana, Banda, Mutumba, Buyinja, Sigulu and Buhemba sub counties by the Borehole maintenance supervisor.</p> <p>Monitoring report on new water sources and Sanitation facilities dated, 1st June,2020 by the</p> <p>Borehole maintenance supervisor.</p> <p>However site meeting minutes were not availed to the Assessment team for verification.</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>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated 100% payments of contractors on time as follows ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For lot 1 contract constructed by MAMA (U) Ltd, the requisition was raised on 10th June,2020 certified by the DWO on 11th June,2020 taking only one day,</li> <li>• For Lot2 contract constructed by KLR (U) Ltd , a requisition was raised on 10th June,2020 by the contractor and certified by the DWO on 11th June,2020, taking on one day,</li> <li>• The contract for the construction of 5-Stance latrine constructed by JAS investments Enterprises Ltd, the requisition was raised on 5th June, 2020 and certified by the DWO on 8th June, 2020 taking only 3 days.</li> </ul> <p>All payments were executed within the required timeframe of thirty (30) days.</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The assessment team was able to find that there was a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law as indicated below;</p> <p>For lot 1 contract; Drilling, casting and installation of 06 Boreholes, date of advert was 16th August, 2019 in the New vision newspaper, bid issue on 22nd August, 2019 bid receipt date was 13th September, 2019, bid opening was 13th September, 2029, Evaluation report on the bid was 7th October,2019, Contract committee minutes was on 19th November,2019 and best evaluated bidder notice was done on 14th October,2019.</p>	2
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the environment Officer and DWO had disseminated guidelines on water source and catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There were no evidence of water source protection plans for WSS infrastructure projects constructed during the previous FY were prepared and implemented</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence provided to prove that all WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of E&amp;S Certification forms completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor.</p>	0

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

There was evidence of a monitoring report dated 20th June 2020 signed by the Environment Officer. The Report was on Environment compliance monitoring/Environment Audit Report on the implementation of mitigation measures under water sector. The project site monitored was the Construction of Water Office Block and Water sources. In the report the Environment officer noted that contractors had implemented most of the recommended mitigation measures during and after completion of the projects. Some projects were not yet complete although the contractors promised they would address the environment concerns during the rainy season and that they would clear sites of construction materials.

The report also noted that although costed environment details were supposed to be prepared by the Environment Officer for inclusion in the BoQs, the Engineer who prepares the BoQs for projects had done so on his own without involvement of the Environment Officer.

Whereas the LG availed a Monitoring report, there were no other monthly monitoring reports availed by the time of the assessment.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	N/A	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"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	N/A	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. 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"> <li>• Above 70%; score 4</li> <li>• 60 – 69%; score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%; score 0</li> </ul> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	N/A	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>	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	N/A	0
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	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	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	N/A	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	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	N/A	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	c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	N/A	0
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	N/A	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 score 10</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p>	N/A	0
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	N/A	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>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	N/A	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>	N/A	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>	N/A	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> </ul> <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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>	N/A	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	N/A	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	N/A	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	N/A	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	N/A	0



13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	0

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:  iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.  i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	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  Maximum score is 70	If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.	Osinya Fredrick was appointed the Senior Agricultural Engineer on 8/10/2019 under Min. No. NDSC/12/2019/6(l)	70
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	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.  Maximum score is 30	If the LG:  a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.	Not applicable.	0
2	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.  Maximum score is 30	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.	Not applicable.	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
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 structure provides for Civil Engineer (water) and this was filled by Mr. Mwandha Christopher.  He was appointed under Minute No. NDSC/268/2015 (1), dated 1st June 2015.	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 PHRO stated that this position is not filled because it was is not in the staffing structure of the LG approved by the MoPS on 14/9/2016.	10
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 substantively appointed Namutamba Hellen on 1/4/2015 under Min. No.NDSC 233/2015(l) as Borehole Maintenance Technician	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.	No substantive appointment for this post was seen for this position. The PHRO said it was not in the District staffing structure	15
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 substantively appointed Discharch Musa on 13/8/2019 under Min. No. NDSC/88/2019 as EO	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.	LG substantively appointed Muganza Emmanuel on 21/1/2014 under Min. No. NDSC/117/2013(10)	10

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence of screening forms for Boreholes in; Musoma village, Mutunda sub-county. Mawa village in Mutunda Sub-county  Buyonmbo village in Banda Sub-county, all prepared and signed by the Environment Officer on 6th October 2019. However the CDO had not endorsed on the screening forms, therefore the LG scored zero.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	At the time of assessment, there was no evidence of Environment Social Impact Assessments reports adduced to the team. The Team noted that in Namayingo DLG ESIA assessments were assigned to the CDO, The Environment Officer carried out the Environmental screenings which were not endorsed by the CDO. Therefore the LG scored zero.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	There was evidence to prove that contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM.  The contractor – KLR Uganda Limited was issued with a Drilling Permit by Directorate of Water Development (DWD) under Permit Number: DP 10662DW 2019 issued on 1st July, 2019 valid for 1 year.	10

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
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 substantively appointed Dr. Magoola Patrick as DHO on 23/3/2018 under Min. No. NDSC/62/2018 on promotion from Senior Medical Officer</p>	10
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>LG substantively appointed Kasoga Ida Mary for ADHO-MCH on 8/3/2019 under Min. No. NDSC/120/2019/4(IV) (3)</p>	10
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>LG substantively appointed recruited Mangeni Marthius Namuhaywa as ADHO-Env't on 1/4/2015 under Min.No. NDSC 242/2015(1)</p>	10
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>LG substantively appointed Oundo Humphrey Makokha as PHI on 20/12/2019 under Min.No. NDSC/132/2019/4(II)(16)</p>	10



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>No staff was substantively recruited for the post of the Senior Health Educator</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>LG substantively appointed recruited Kizito Ali on 27/12/2016 as Biostatistician under Min. No.NDSC04/2016(6)4</p>	10
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>Ouma Silfano was substantively appointed DCCT on 30/6/2017 under Min. No. NDSC/40.16/2017</p>	10
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 Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

j. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Health Educator, score 20 or else 0.

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

There was evidence that the sampled Health sector projects carried out screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments under UgIFT for example;

Filled Screening forms for the Upgrade of Bukana HC II to HC III endorsed 10th June 2020 by the Environment Officer.

Filled Screening forms for Upgrade of Syanyonja HC II to HC III endorsed 10th June 2020 by the Environment Officer.

However the CDO had not endorsed on the screened forms therefore the LG scored zero.

0

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

Maximum score is 30

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

There was no evidence of Environment Social Impact Assessments because the Environment Officer and CDO were not facilitated to carry out the assessment yet they required ESIA. Therefore the LG scored zero

0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
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.	LG had a substantive DEO, Kawo Kawere Naaty appointed on promotion from Senior Inspector of Schools 30/6/2011 by the DSC of Bugiri acting on request by the DSC of Namayingo at its 154th meeting held on 23/6/2011 under Min.No. BDSC 152/2011	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.	1. Ouma Godfrey Hasibate was substantively appointed the Senior Inspector of Schools on 28/6/2017 under Min. No. NDSC 40.9/2017  2. Maloba Thomas was substantively appointed the Inspector of Schools on 28/6/2017 under Min.No. NDSC 40.10/2017	40
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
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)  The Maximum score is 30	If the LG carried out:  a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence of Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening forms for;  Construction of 2 Classroom Blocks at Madowa Primary School.  Construction of 2 Classroom Blocks at Namugongo Primary School in Sigulu  Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Bulokha Sub-county.  However the screening forms were not endorsed by the CDO therefore the LG scored zero.	0

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.

At the time of assessment, there was no evidence of ESIA reports of civil works for all Education projects. The assessment team also noted that at Namyingo DLG, issues concerning social impact assessments are assigned to the CDO. The assessment team noted that, the CDO was not facilitated to carry out the ESIA assessments yet it was a requirement for the construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Bulokha Sub-county. . Therefore the LG scored zero

The Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
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	Oguttu Paul was appointed the Chief Finance Officer on promotion from Principal Internal Auditor on 28th/6/2017 under Min. No. NDSC 40.1/2017	3
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	Nasinyama Moses Makhoha was appointed as a Senior planner by Namayingo District Service Commission ((NDSC) on 21/8/2017 at its 6th meeting held on 29th/6/2017 Under Min. No. NDSC 40.13/2017	3
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	No substantive personnel was appointed at the time of the assessment.	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	No substantive appointment was available.tcarried out. Busagwa Alex was appointed in acting capacity under Min. No. NDSC/109/2019(5)(XI)(XXI)	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	Dr. Batwala Stephen was appointed on promotion on 1/4/2015 by NDSC under Min. No. NDSC98/2019(4)	3

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	Nandudu Betty was appointed the District Community Development Officer on promotion dated 1/4/2015 under Min.No. NDSC 246/2015(l)	3
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	No Substantive appointment was seen but place was seen in a recent there was an advert no. 2/2020 by NDSC for the position of District Commercial Officer	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.	Harriet Kakai was appointed the Senior Procurement Officer on 3/8/20152 under Min. No. NDSC 305/2015(III) on promotion from Procurement Officer Manafwa DLG	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	OJiambo Foustine was appointed the Procurement Officer on 3/8/2020 under Min. No. NDSC 04/2020/001. However, Tthis is after the previous FY.	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	Barasa Alexander was substantively appointed the Principal Human Resource Officer on 1/7/22015 under Min. No. NDSC 313/2015	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.	j. A Senior Environment Officer,  score 2 or else 0	Busagwa Alex was substantively appointed Senior Enviroment Officer on 28/6/2017 under Min. No. NDSC 40.20/2017	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.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	Mutesi Minsa, was substantively Appointed the Senior Land Management Officer on 27/6/2018 under Min. No. NDSC 73/2018(l)	2
Maximum score is 37.				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	Lumala Stephen was substantively appointed the Senior Accountant on 13/3/2019 under Min. No. NDSC/842/2019(l)	2
Maximum score is 37.				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs,	Okello James Andrew Onyango was substantively appointed on 27/6/2018 under Min. No. NDSC 74/2018(l)	2
Maximum score is 37.		score 2 or else 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.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Ouma Leudy appointed in acting capacity on 28/2/2020. However, the Position was advertised in external advert no. 02/2020	0
Maximum score is 37.				

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

The assessor was informed that all the 9 LLGs had SAS appointed. However, Letters of appointment for two SAS were not seen as indicated below;

1. Mukyala Constance – SAS Banda S/C was appointed on 9/11/2012 under Min. No. NDSC 24/2012(I)

2. Hasoho Jolly - PTO Namayingo T/C was appointed on 28/6/2017 under Min. No. 20.2/2017

3. Onyango Sam – SAS Mutumba S/C was appointed on 8/12/2004 under Min. No. BDSC 199/2004

4. Wandera Fred Mango - SAS Buswale S/C was appointed on 24/3/2020 under Min. No. NDSC 009/4(IV)

5. Onyango Edgar Omali – SAS Buhemba S/C was appointed on 1/4/2015 under Min. No. NDSC 256/2015(I)

6. Wasige Yakub – SAS Lolwe S/C was appointed on 1/4/2015 under Min. No. NDSC 228/2015(I)

7. Ojiambo Fred- SAS Bukana S/C was appointed on 23/6/2006 under Min. No. BDSC 37/2006

8. The appointment letter for Oundo Charles, was not seen

9. The appointment letter for Batambuze Isma was not seen.



Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:	Only six out of nine CDO's appointment letters were availed by the PHRO to the assessment team.
Maximum score is 15	<p>b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS</p> <p>score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>1. Oguttu William CDO Buswale S/C was appointed on 21/3/2018 under Min. NDSC /58/2018</p> <p>2. Nabwire Josephine was appointed CDO on 9/4/2019 under Min.No. NDSC/102/2019(I)</p> <p>3. Balyedhusa Thomas CDO Buyinja S/C, was appointed on 1/4/2015 under Min. No. NDSC257/2015(2)</p> <p>4. Wakateta Robert was appointed on 1/4/2015 under Min. No. NDSC 257/2015(1)</p> <p>5. Adundo Mildred Nyanja CDO Mutumba S/C was appointed on 31/3/2017 under Min. No. NDSC/29/2017/13</p> <p>6. AumaSylvia was appointed CDO on 9/4/2019 under Min. No. NDSC102/2019(III)</p>

Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:	8 out of 9 Senior Accounts Assistants/Accounts Assistants were recruited in each of the 9 LLG as follows.;
Maximum score is 15	c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,  score 5 or else 0.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Badagalsma SAA at Banda S/C was appointed 9/4/2019 under Min. No. NDSC/103/2019</li> <li>2. Sekandi Muhammad, SAA at Buswale S/C was appointed on 17/10/2013 under Min. No. NDSC/95/2013</li> <li>3. NabwireMwajumaShimesha SAA at Namayingo T/C was appointed on 29/6/2018 under Min.No. NDSC 75/2018(l)</li> <li>4. AumaEverline SAA at Mutumba S/C was appointed on 30/6/2011 under Min. No. BDSC 137/2011</li> <li>5. OmaliWekesa SAA at Sigulu S/C was appointed on 19/3/2018 under Min. No. NDSC/50/2017(2)</li> <li>6. Ojiambo Leonard SAA at Lolwe Island S/C was appointed on 19/3/2018 under Min. No. NDSC/50/2017(3)</li> <li>7. Wasike Charles Accounts Asst, at Buyinja S/C was appointed on 27/10/2005 under Min. No. BDSC136(2005)</li> <li>8. Mwoga Patrick Accounts Asst. at Bukana S/C was appointed on 30/6/2011 under Min. No. 147/2011</li> <li>9. The appointment letter for KidubuleYosam SAA at Buhemba S/C was not seen by the assessor. The PHRO Mr. Barasa Alex openly stated that he could not find the 9th staff's file.</li> </ol>

## Environment and Social Requirements

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>From the LGs Approved budget for FY 2019/20. Summary: Overview of Revenue and Expenditure. Page 2, the budgeted funds for Natural Resources was Ugx.275, 402,000.</p> <p>The total releases to Natural Resources was Ugx. 245,123,000</p> <p>Which is <math>245,123,000 \times 100</math></p> <p style="text-align: center;">275,402,000</p> <p>= 89%</p> <p>Thus the LG was non-compliant with the performance measure..</p>	0
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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>From the LGs Approved budget for FY 2019/20. Summary: Overview of Revenue and Expenditure, page 2, the budgeted funds for Community Services was Ugx. 509,566,000.</p> <p>The total Releases to Community services was Ugx. 371,464,000</p> <p>Which is <math>371,464,000 \times 100</math></p> <p style="text-align: center;">509,566,000</p> <p>= 73%</p> <p>Thus the LG was non-compliant to the performance measure.</p>	0
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

Maximum score is 12

a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0

Namayingo DLG conducted Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening for the listed projects.

1. Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Madowa Primary School, on 20/08/2019;
2. Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Namugongo Primary School, on 27/08/2019;
3. Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Lolwe Primary School, on 29/08/2019;
4. Upgrading of Syangonja HCII to HCIII, on 18/05/2020;
5. Upgrading of Bukana HCII to HCIII on 16/10/2020;
6. Construction of Borehole at Buhobi Primary school on 16/10/2019;
7. Construction of a borehole at Buyombo South on 16/10/2019;
8. Construction of a borehole at Buchimbo South on 16/10/2019; and
9. Construction of a borehole at Buduma on 16/10/2019.

These screening forms were only signed by the District Environment Officer.

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or 0

At the time of assessment, there was no evidence of ESIA reports. The Environment officer and CDO stated that they were not involved in the projects implemented using DDEG for example: The completion of Two community centres in Buyinja Sub-County and Banda Sub-County.

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;	There was no evidence of costed ESMPs from the Environment Officer and CDO as stated above. The following projects had costed ESMP:	0
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0	(i) Upgrading of Bukana HCII to HCIII (500,000/= for greening and landscaping and 500,000/= for health and safety at the construction site.	
			The other project did not have costed ESMPs	
			(i) Upgrading of Syangonja HCII to HCIII.	

**Financial management and reporting**

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;	Not applicable.	0
	Maximum score is 10	If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5		
		If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0		
6	Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).	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),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG submitted the responses on the Internal Auditor General's report for the FY2018/19 on 12 December 2019, Ref: ADM/NMGO/109/1. The responses were received on 16th December 2019 by MOFPED, Accountant General, IGG, MOLG and Auditor General.</li> <li>• Ten queries were raised and all were responded too and their status clarified as detailed below:</li> </ul>	10
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Diversion of a construction block Buswale sub-county. Cleared.</li> <li>2. Unaccounted for funds. Done</li> <li>3. Understaffing at Health Centres. Done.</li> <li>4. Doubtful Expenditure. Done</li> <li>5. Incomplete books of accounts at Sub-county. Done.</li> <li>6. Unbanked Revenue. Cleared.</li> <li>7. Misappropriation of Drugs. Done.</li> </ol>	

8. Irregular procurement of 3 used vehicles. Done.

9. Unaccounted for funds under Health. Done.

10. Unaccounted for funds under Works. Done.

• The LG submitted responses on the Auditor General report for 2018/19 on 20th February 2020 which was received on 25th February 2020 by MOFPED, Auditor General and Parliamentary LGAC. The number of queries raised were seven and they were cleared, as detailed below:

1. Shortfall in releases representing the budgeted revenue. Cleared.

2. Unspent warrants- cleared

3. Partially implemented outputs i.e. upgrade of Lolwe HC III, provision of water sources, construction of community learning centers, procurement of vehicles-cleared

4. Accumulated payables in the financial statements-on-going

5. Vacant positions approved in the staff structure-on-going

6. Low absorption of UgiFT funds-cleared

7. Deteriorated roads-done

7

Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY

Maximum Score 4

If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY, score 4 or else 0.

The LG had submitted the Annual performance contract for the FY 2020/2021 on 18th June 2020, which was acknowledged by MoFPED, Head of Public Service and Secretary to Cabinet, Ministry of Local Government, Office of the Auditor General and Parliament on 19th June 2020. This was within the acceptable time frame of 31st August 2020 hence the LG is compliant.

Ref: PBS Reports

4

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The annual performance report for FY 2019/20 was submitted on 20th August 2020 and received on 24th August 2020 and this was within the adjusted submission date of 31st August 2020.</p> <p>Ref: PBS Reports</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>Budget performance reports for the 4 quarters were submitted within the deadline of 31st August 2020 as per PFMA Act 2015 as shown in the table below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 was submitted on 04th November 2019</li> <li>• Quarter 2 was submitted on 07th February 2020</li> <li>• Quarter 3 was submitted on 18th May 2020</li> <li>• Quarter 4 was submitted on 20th August 2020.</li> </ul> <p>All reports were submitted via PBS.</p>	4