



LGMSD 2021/22

Rukungiri District

(Vote Code: 550)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	83%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	80%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	74%
Educational Performance Measures	65%
Health Performance Measures	64%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	72%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	77%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The LG provided evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding is functional and utilized as per purpose of the projects.</p> <p>The projects were.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1. Installation of water-harvesting tanks at HQRs, UGX. 15,000,000 (ABPR, page, 20). 2. Construction of 2-classroom block at at Rutooma, Kihanga, P/S, UGX. 68,757,000 (ABPR-page, 18). 3. Remodeling of former Administration block to staff house, UGX.55, 000,000 (ABPR-page,64). 4. Fencing of Bugangangari staff house at Bugangangari S/C., UGX.50, 000,000, (ABPR-page,65). 	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	<p>LLGs were not assessed in 2021/2022.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>Evidence provided showed the DDEG funded investment projects implemented were completed as per performance contract end of the FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>The projects were.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation of water-harvesting tanks at HQRs-100% complete, UGX. 15,000,000 (ABPR, page, 20). 2. Construction of 2-classroom block at at Rutooma-Kihanga, P/S, 100% complete, UGX. 68,757,000 (ABPR-page,18). 3. Remodeling of former Administration block to staff house,100% complete, UGX.55,000,000 (ABPR-page,64). 4. Fencing of Bugangangari staff house at Bugangangari S/C.100% complete, UGX.50,000,000 (ABPR-page,65). 	3

Investment
Performance

Maximum 4 points on
this performance
measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0.

The LG budgeted for DDEG, UGX. 832,162,000 (ABPR, page, 4).

The release was as below.

HLG was UGX. 355,809,035.

LLGs. UGX. 476,352,607

HLG spent the on DDEG projects and activities of UGX.355,809,035 as below.

1. Installation of water-harvesting tanks at HQRs UGX. 15,000,000 (ABPR, page, 20).

2. Construction of 2-classroom block at at Rutooma-Kihanga, P/S, UGX. 68,757,000 (ABPR-page,18)

3. Supply of furniture at Rutooma- Kihanga, P/S- UGX.15,628,000 –ABPR-page-18

4. Remodeling of former Administration block to staff house, UGX.55,000,000 (ABPR-page,64).

5. Fencing of Bugangangari staff house at Bugangangari S/C., UGX.50,000,000 (ABPR-page,65).

6. Land titling at Headquarters, UGX 10,000,000 (ABPR, page , 94).

7. Supply of furniture at DLG Hdqrs for HODs, UGX.64,000,000 (ABPR-page,107).

8. Supply of laptops for office staff at DLG Hdqrs- Planning Unit, UGX.13,050,000 (ABPR, page, 107).

9. Capacity building-10%, UGX. 35,712,000 (ABPR, Page, 8).

10. Supervision and monitoring, UGX.28,662,000 (ABPR-page,28)

Total, UGX.355, 809,000.

3

Investment
PerformanceMaximum 4 points on
this performance
measureb. If the variations in the
contract price for sample
of DDEG funded
infrastructure investments
for the previous FY are
within +/-20% of the LG
Engineers estimates,

score 2 or else score 0

From Rukungiri District LG Procurement and Disposal Plan for FY 2021/2022 dated 12/07/2021 Ref.CR/105/05 the LG implemented the following projects using DDEG funds.

Construction of classroom block at Rutooma Primary School. According to Annual Budget, the cost was 70,309,000/= The Engineer's Estimates from the costed Bills of Quantity was UGX 82,789,830/= and the contract price according to agreement signed between the LG and M/S Ruhinda Technical Services Ltd dated 13th/10/2021 was UGX 81,760,900/=. Price variation was therefore 1.2%

The remodeling of Sub- County Hall into staff house at Buhunga HC IV was another DDEG project that had a budget of UGX 55,000,000/=. The Engineer's Estimates according to costed Bills of Quantity was UGX 49,928,120/= and contract price according to signed agreement dated 2nd/11/2021 between the LG and Talented Engineering and Supplies Ltd was UGX 49,845,520/= This implied that the project had a price variation of 0.2%

Completion of fencing of Bugangari HCIV that had a budget of UGX 50,000,000/=. The Engineer's Estimates according to costed Bills of Quantities was UGX 50,000,000/= and contract price was UGX 49,498,740/= from the signed contract agreement between Rukungiri District LG and OWIT Technical Services dated 13th/10/2021.%. It was established that all DDEG funded projects had variation within acceptable margins of +/-20%

2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4

Accuracy of reported
informationMaximum 4 points on
this Performance
Measurea. Evidence that
information on the
positions filled in LLGs as
per minimum staffing
standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate.

Three LLGs were visited, and the staff were in place as follows:

1. Buyanja TC had a staff list of 26 staff according to HRM division's list, and the staff list at the Sub county indicated 26 staff, as well

2. Buyanja Sub County had a total of 17 staff according to HRM division's list and the staff list at the Town Council indicated 17 staff as well

3. Kebisoni Sub County had a staff list of 14 staff according to HRM division's list and the staff list at the Sub County, indicated 14 staff as well.

2

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>Evidence availed showed that the infrastructure constructed using the DDEG FY 2021/2022, were completed as per completion reports.</p> <p>The sampled projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation of water-harvesting tanks at HQRs-100% complete,, UGX. 15,000,000 (ABPR, page, 20). 2. Construction of 2-classroom block at Rutooma- Kihanga, P/S,-100% complete, UGX. 68,757,000 (ABPR-page,18) 3. Remodeling of former Administration block to staff house, 100% complete, UGX.55,000,000 (ABPR-page,64). 4. Fencing of Bugangangari staff house at Bugangangari S/C., UGX.50,000,000-100% complete, (ABPR-page,65) 	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to MoPS in a letter dated 23/9/2022 and was received on 23/9/2022, Ref. CR/160/1</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence produced of tracking and analysis of staff attendance as per guidelines provided by MoPS CSI. The LG receives attendance analysis from the sub counties on a monthly basis but did not have evidence to show tracking and analysis as for the staff attendance as per guidelines</p>	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

There was evidence to show that Heads of Departments were appraised for the previous FY against their performance agreements.

1. The Chief Finance Officer- Joram Asimwe was appraised on 30/7/2022
2. The District Engineer – Tukamushaba Kajuba Innocent was appraised on 30/7/2022
3. The District Natural Resource Officer – Rukwago Severino was appraised on 1/9/2022
4. The District Community Development Officer Agaba Posias Nemesus was appraised on 15/7/2022
5. The District Commercial Officer Turyahumura Jackson was appraised on 4/8/2022
6. The District Education Officer Turyahumura Jackson was appraised on 4/8/2022
7. The District Health Officer Akasiima Mucunguzi was appraised on 30/7/2022
8. The DPO Karyaija Zepha Byarugaba was appraised on 1/7/2022
9. The Principal Auditor Arinaitwe Florence was appraised on 4/8/2022

1

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

There was evidence that administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented.

The Rewards and Sanctions committee met on 31/3/2022 and handled several cases including a case of Tumuranye Ivan an Education Assistant II who failed to formalize hand over. The committee recommended that he should hand over by 15th April 2022. A letter was seen from CAO dated 13/4/2022 warning the said officer and instructing him to hand over (ref. CR/157/1)

1

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	There was evidence that the LG established a Consultative Committee for staff grievances which was functional. The committee is composed of; 1. Wasswa Masokoyi 2. Tumwebaze Ivan 3. Twesime Charlene 4. Kahenge Denis 5. Ganshanga Anxious 6. Kamanzi Fatuma 7. Tumusime Jenifer 8. Biriho Lovence 9. Akanyijuka John Andrew 10. Tukundane Geofry 11. Katwre Aphophia and 12. Tumuboneine Kenneth 13. The committee was appointed on 29/5/2022 and inducted on 1/6/2022. No cases have been handled so far.	1
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	There was no evidence to show that all the 21 new staff recruited in the previous financial year accessed the salary payroll within 2 months after recruitment.	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.	There was no evidence that all the 28 staff who retired in the previous FY accessed the pension payroll within the two months after Retirement.	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 LG budgeted and received for DDEG, was UGX. 832,162,000 (ABPR, page, 4).

The amount for HLG, UGX. 355,809,035 (ABPR, page, 4) and LLGs was UGX. 476,352,607 (ABPR, page, 4).

The transfers to LLGs of UGX.476,352,606 (Annual Approved Budget Estimates page 4, AWP-page- 4).

Sub-county	UGX.
1. Bugangari	55,700,304
2. Buhunga	44,552,379
3. Buyanja	57,425,577
4. Bwambara	47,339,358
5. Kebisoni	29,953,905
6. Nyakagyeme	52,780,608
7. Nyakishenyi	61,672,404
8. Nyarusanje	77,067,159
9. Ruhinda	49,860,912
Total	476,352,606

The DDEG for Town Councils budgeted and transferred was UGX.42,723,255 (ABPR, page4).

Town Council	UGX.
a. Buyaja	8,837,031
b. Kebisoni	19,014,696
c. Rwerere	7,171,809
d. Bikurungu	8,158,719
Total	42,723,255

10

Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: (within 5 working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MoFPED):

Score: 2 or else score 0

The LG did not timely warrant DDEG transfers to LLGs FY 2021/2022.

Time taken;

- Q 1-9 days;
- Q 2-12 days
- Q 3-21 days.

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

0

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 receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence shows that the LG did not invoice and communicate all DDEG transfers to the LLGs within 5 working days within from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter.</p> <p>Time taken;</p> <p>Q 1-20 days</p> <p>Q 2- 12 days</p> <p>Q 3- 15 days</p> <p>The communication and invoicing were on the following dates below;</p> <p>Notification of Cash release from MOFPED Invoiced</p> <p>Q 1- 06/07/2021 23/08/2021</p> <p>Q 2 -30/09/2021 18/10/2021</p> <p>Q 3 -22/12/2021 21/01/2021</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 provided evidence on supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District on quarterly basis as per reports below;</p> <p>Q 1 dated 15th November 2021 (Nyakishenyi, Nyarushanje and Kebisoni SC & TC)</p> <p>Q 2 dated 24th January 2022 (Buhunga and Ruhinda)</p> <p>Q 3 dated 12th March 2022 (Nyarushanje SC, Nyakishenyi SC, Buyanja SC & TC and Kebisoni SC & TC)</p> <p>Q 4 dated 20th May 2022 (Bwambara SC, Bugangari SC, Nyakagyeme SC, Rwerere TC and Bikurungu TC)</p>	2
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG availed reports which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow up.</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <p>Q 1-15/11/2021- MIN. 33/DTPC/2021/22</p> <p>Q 2-28/02/2022- MIN. 42/DTPC/2021/22</p> <p>Q 3-25/03/2022- MIN. 47/DTPC/2021/22</p> <p>Q 4-01/06/2022- MIN. 70/DTPC/2021/22</p>	2

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided the assets register which was maintained by the District up to-date by the time of assessment on 24th November 2022. The assets register was maintained according the Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007 and was printed from IFMIS system. The assets registers included; land and buildings at headquarters and at LLGs; transport equipment and the location of each; furniture and fittings and location; ICT equipment machinery; office equipment and their locations.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The District provided the Board of Survey (BOS) dated 30/08/2022 signed by the committee chairperson, Twijukye D. Kirenzi with five other members. The BOS report included the following items; Cash balances and bank reconciliations; District land and buildings at headquarters and at LLGs; transport equipment; ICT equipment, office equipment; medical equipment, machinery. BOS as well showed Assets Management decisions on recommending disposal of existing assets (page,49).</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The evidence provided indicate the District had functional physical planning committee and all fully appointed of 15 members. The Physical planner Mr. Majanga Tom availed the following documents:</p> <p>a. Plans submission register with the last transaction on 15/09/2022, 04/10/22-Kyabugashe C.O.U.</p> <p>b. Annual work-plan.</p> <p>c. Appointments letters dated 07/12/2016 members.</p> <p>d. The minutes were stamped and received by MoLHUD dated on the falling dates;</p> <p>Q -16/08/2022</p> <p>Q -2 16/08/2022</p> <p>Q -3 16/08/2022</p> <p>Q -4 16/08/2022</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence that the District conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget and the prioritized investments were derived from the LG Development Plan eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source. The desk appraisal was carried out on 16/11/2020 by the following; District Planner, Senior Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer and HODs.</p>	2

investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:

Score 2 or else score 0

The projects were.

Rehabilitation of four boreholes and shallow wells in Kebisoni town council.

Construction of waterborne toilet at Nyakanyinya-Ruhinda S/C.

Construction of spring in Nyakishenyi- S/C.

Construction of Kateramo phase two, in Bwambara sub county.

Sealing of leakages in rain water, gutter, and cleaning of external cladding/glass and window in Northern ward, Rukungiri municipality.

Construction of a water borne toilet at ibanda p/school in Ibanda Nyarushaje.

Spring protection in Rushinya Burama Bugangari.

Spring protection in Nyamitooma western ward, Bikurungu town council.

Supply and installation of tanks at Karuhembe HC 111 in Ruyedwa Karuhembe, Kebisoni.

Spring protection in Rwesigiro kikarara Bwambara.

Construction of Kateramo water supply in Kikongi Bwambara.

Spring protection in Kihengamo , Rubanga , Buyanja.

Partial renovation of 2- OPDS at Rushasha and Nyarwimuka in Nyakagyeme and Ruhinda respectively.

Renovation of laboratory and OPDS at Ruhinda and Kikarara in Ruhinda and Bwambara respectively.

Partial renovation of DHO'S office, drug store and construction of main entrance gate at Rwamahwa, Northern ward, Rukungiri municipality.

Construction of a 3-roomed kitchen for staff members, 3-stance bathroom and renovation of 3-roomed staff houses at Kisiizi, Nyarushanje.

Upgrade of Kasheshe HC11 to HC111 in Kasheshe, Nyakabungo, Buyanja.

Renovation of 2 NO staff houses at Kisiizi Nyarushaje.

Renovation of maternity wards and OPD blocks at Kisiizi, Nyarushaje.

Remodeling of former Buhunga S/C council hall into staff units at Buhunga .

Partial renovation of OPD and completion of staff house at Katonya and Ngoma respectively in Nyakishenyi subcounty.

Partial renovation of OPD and G/ward and construction of a lined 5-stance VIP latrine at Buyanja TC and Nyabitete respectively in Buyanja.

Construction of a chain link fence in Bugangari Rukungiri.

Construction of a staff houses in Karuhembe, Kebisoni.

Construction of a twin staff house at Karuhembe Health centre III in Kebisoni sub county.

Remodeling of former Buhunga SC Office block into staff quarters for Buhunga HC IV.

Construction of chain link fence at Bugangari HC IV

Construction of chain link fence and gate keepers house at Kebisoni HC IV.

Construction of chain link fence and gate keeper's house phase 1 at Bugangari HC IV.

Construction of a Lined 4 stance VIP latrine at Buyanja Health centre III in Buyanja Town Council

Upgrade of Kasheshe HC II to HC III in Kasheshe in Buyanja sub county.

Construction of Nyakishenyi SEED secondary school in Nyakishenyi Sub county.

Construction of a 5-stance latrine at Rwetuha primary school in Buyanja sub county.

Construction of three classroom block at Kakindo primary school in Bugangari sub county.

Construction of two classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga primary school.

Supply of classroom furniture (3 seater twin desks) at Rusheshe PS in Buhunga

Construction of Kebisoni Seed Secondary school at Magoma in Kebisoni sub county.

Construction of a Lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kafunjo primary school in Nyakishenyi

Construction of a Lined 5 Stance VIP latrine at Katerampungu in Bugangari .

Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Mashongora S/C in Nyakagyeme.

Rehabilitation of a 2 classroom block and costruction of a latrine at Kasheshe primary school in Buyanja.

Construction of 4 classrooms and a 2 stance latrine at Katungu primary school in Buyanja.

Construction of 3 classrooms at Karire primary school in Kebisoni sub county.

Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kiborogota primary school in Kebisoni T/C.

Construction of a 4 classroom block and 5 stance latrine at Rumbugu primary school in Kebisoni Town Council.

Construction of 4 classrooms and 2 stance latrine at Mitooma primary school in Nyakagyeme .

Construction of a multi-purpose hall at Kashenyi primary school in Ruhinda.

Renovation of 4 classrooms and office at Rusheshe primary school in Nyakishenyi sub county.

Completion of hall and classroom block at Ihimbo primary

school in Bwambara sub county.

Completion of a 4 classroom block at Karire in Kebisoni.

Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at bugarama in Nyakishenyi.

Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Rwerere In Nyakagyeme .

Renovation of laboratory , art building and OPD in Ruhinda and Kikara.

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

For DDEG financed projects:

e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:

Score 2 or else score 0

The LG provided evidence that showed it conducted field appraisals as per report dated 20/11/2021 to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects. They were appraised by, the, District Planner, Senior Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer and HODs.

The projects were;

Rehabilitation of four boreholes and shallow wells in Kebisoni town council.

Construction of waterborne toilet at Nyakanyinya-Ruhinda S/C.

Construction of spring in Nyakishenyi- S/C.

Construction of Kateramo phase two,in Bwambara sub county.

Sealing of leakages in rain water, gutter, and cleaning of external cladding/glass and window in Northern ward, Rukungiri municipality.

Construction of a water borne toilet at ibanda p/school in Ibanda Nyarushaje.

Spring protection in Rushinya Burama Bugangari.

Spring protection in Nyamitooma western ward, Bikurungu town council.

Supply and installation of tanks at Karuhembe HC 111 in Rugyedwa Karuhembe, Kebisoni.

Spring protection in Rwesigiro kikarara Bwambara.

Construction of Kateramo water supply in Kikongi Bwambara.

Spring protection in Kihengamo , Rubanga , Buyanja.

Partial renovation of 2- OPDS at Rushasha and Nyarwimuka in Nyakagyeme and Ruhinda respectively.

Renovation of laboratory and OPDS at Ruhinda and Kikarara in Ruhinda and Bwambara respectively.

Partial renovation of DHO'S office, drug store and construction of main entrance gate at Rwamahwa, Northern ward, Rukungiri municipality.

Construction of a 3-roomed kitchen for staff members, 3-stance bathroom and renovation of 3-roomed staff houses at Kisiizi, Nyarushanje.

Upgrade of Kasheshe HC11 to HC111 in Kasheshe, Nyakabungo, Buyanja.

2

Renovation of 2 NO staff houses at Kisiizi Nyarushaje.

Renovation of maternity wards and OPD blocks at Kisiizi, Nyarushaje.

Remodeling of former Buhunga S/C council hall into staff units at Buhunga .

Partial renovation of OPD and completion of staff house at Katonya and Ngoma respectively in Nyakishenyi subcounty.

Partial renovation of OPD and G/ward and construction of a lined 5-stance VIP latrine at Buyanja TC and Nyabitete respectively in Buyanja.

Construction of a chain link fence in Bugangari Rukungiri.

Construction of a staff houses in Karuhembe, Kebisoni.

Construction of a twin staff house at Karuhembe Health centre III in Kebisoni sub county.

Remodeling of former Buhunga SC Office block into staff quarters for Buhunga HC IV.

Construction of chain link fence at Bugangari HC IV

Construction of chain link fence and gate keepers' house at Kebisoni HC IV.

Construction of chain link fence and gate keeper's house phase 1 at Bugangari HC IV.

Construction of a Lined 4 stance VIP latrine at Buyanja Health centre III in Buyanja Town Council

Upgrade of Kasheshe HC II to HC III in Kasheshe in Buyanja sub county.

Construction of Nyakishenyi SEED secondary school in Nyakishenyi sub county.

Construction of a 5-stance latrine at Rwetuha primary school in Buyanja sub county.

Construction of three classroom block at Kakindo primary school in Bugangari sub county.

Construction of two classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga primary school.

Supply of classroom furniture (3 seater twin desks) at Rusheshe PS in Buhunga

Construction of Kebisoni Seed Secondary school at Magoma in Kebisoni sub county.

Construction of a Lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kafunjo primary school in Nyakishenyi

Construction of a Lined 5 Stance VIP latrine at Katerampungu in Bugangari .

Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Mashongora S/C in Nyakagyeme.

Rehabilitation of a 2 classroom block and costruction of a latrine at Kasheshe primary school in Buyanja.

Construction of 4 classrooms and a 2 stance latrine at Katungu primary school in Buyanja.

Construction of 3 classrooms at Karire primary school in Kebisoni sub county.

Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kiborogota primary school in Kebisoni T/C.

Construction of a 4 classroom block and 5 stance latrine at Rumbugu primary school in Kebisoni Town Council.

Construction of 4 classrooms and 2 stance latrine at Mitooma primary school in Nyakagyeme .

Construction of a multi-purpose hall at Kashenyi primary school in Ruhinda.

Renovation of 4 classrooms and office at Rusheshe primary school in Nyakishenyi sub county.

Completion of hall and classroom block at Ihimbo primary school in Bwambara sub County.

Completion of a 4 classroom block at Karire in Kebisoni.

Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at bugarama in Nayakishenyi.

Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Rwerere In Nyakagyeme .

Renovation of laboratory , art building and OPD in Ruhinda and Kikara.

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:

Score 1 or else score 0.

Evidence that project profiles with costing were developed by HODs from different departments and discussed on 25/04/2022 under TPC MIN 48/DTPC/2021/22 with presentation developed from Annual Work plans and Approved Budget Estimates for the FY 2022/23.

1. Water Extensions for Kabuga and Nyakabingo Water Systems by South western Umbrella of Water and Sanitation at Nyarushanje Sub-county.
2. Bwanga Stock Farm at Nyarushanje S/C.
3. Construct of a water borne toilet at Ibanda primary school at Nyarushanje SC.
4. Construction of three class classroom block by Parents at Ibanda Primary school at Nyarushanje SC.
5. Construction of a 5stance latrine at Nyabushenyi lower P/S at Nyarushanje SC.
6. Chain Link fencing of Kebisoni HC IV Phase 4 and construction of Gate Keeper's House at Kebisoni TC.
7. Construction of staff house at Karuhembe HC III at Kebisoni SC.
8. Renovation of Buyanja HC III Outpatient department at Buyanja TC.

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>Rukungiri DLG had not prepared mitigation measures for DDEG projects before being approved for construction using checklists. The DDEG projects for the current financial year 2022/2023 had only been screened with no mitigation measures developed. The two projects included; construction of 2 classroom block at Kakindo primary school and construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Rwentula primary school.</p>	0
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		
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>Review of Rukungiri District LG Procurement consolidated plan FY 2022/2023, Ref.CR/105/05 dated 15th/07/2022 DDEG funded projects incorporated included; renovation works at Bugarama and Kakoni Primary School at budgeted cost of UGX 200,000,000/=</p> <p>Construction of 5-stance VIP latrine at Rwentula Primary School at UGX 30,000,000/= (Page 6)</p>	1
		<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>		
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>Reviewed was contracts committee decision on submission under MIN: DCC/2022/2023 where selective method of bidding, UGX 30,000/= cost of bidding documents, bid notice/advert, evaluation methodology and technical evaluation committee, shortlisted bidders were approved for construction renovation works at Kakoni Primary School.</p> <p>For construction of 5-stance lined VIP pit latrine with changing rooms for girls at Rwentula P/S in Buyanja Sub-County. The contracts committee in the sitting of 27th/10/2022 under minute number MIN DCC/2022/2023 approved selective National bidding, letter of invitation, technical evaluation committee and shortlisted bidders.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had established the Project Implementation Team however, the established team did not meet the requirements under Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines for FY 2021/22. Review of a memo dated 2nd/07/2021 Ref.105/5 from Management Support Services the team comprised of Project Manager, Project Supervisor, Environment Officer, District Community Development Officer, District Health Officer and Labour Officer. Composition lacked Clerk of Works.</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:

Score 1 or else score 0

The 3 sampled projects were the remodeling of sub-county hall into staff houses at Buhunga HC IV, the construction of classroom block at Rutooma Primary School and completion of fencing at Bugangari HC IV. Review of Bills of Quantities and field visits to these projects unearthed the following.

The phased completion of fencing at the health centre where according to BoQs involved construction and installation of chain link fence 2.40metres high comprising of chain link G.10x50x7x18m housed in a concrete footing (1:3:6) at bottom and concrete posts of size 100x100mm bent 510mm at top to 60degrees housed in 300mmx300mmx400mm concrete pad footings (1:3:6) spaced at 250mm centre and complete with triangular reinforcement cage of 12mm diameter steel bar. There was equally provision of general cleaning of debris from site and fabrication of signpost for the project. This was all done to conformity as verified from field visit.

The construction of 2-classroom block at Rutooma-Kihanga Primary School in Kibirizi Parish, Buhunga Sub-County. From the technical specifications, works involved excavations and earthworks, hardcore filling, anti-termite treatment, walling, roofing with 28-guage pre-painted galvanized corrugated iron sheet covering laid 150mm head laps and 2.5 corrugation side laps. Installation of electrical and lightening protection. Solid steel doors and casement glazed steel windows. Installation of 4mm clear sheet glass. Finishes including 32mm paving troweled finished smooth, 19mm skirting 120mm high. Two coats of rough cast to rendered walls 1200mm high. Final painting with one coat of under coat paint on plastered wall and silk vinyl paint. Construction works adhered to the technical specifications in the Bills of Quantities.

The remodeling of former Buhunga Sub-County administration office block into staff quarters for Buhunga HC IV staff houses. Works involved careful demolitions to pave way for new partition walls, windows, openings and door allocations. Works on leakages on iron sheets, work on ceiling structure and Rainwater disposal. Installation of windows size 1200 x1500mm high with 4mm ordinary quality clear sheet glass and glazing. This project was implemented as per set technical designs.

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>Presented was supervision report on construction of a 2-classroom block at Rutooma-Kihanga P/S in Buhunga Sub-County dated 23rd/02/2022 where sub-structure, walling and floor slab reported complete, super structure including walling, beam ring, splash apron and verandah reported complete. Lightening protection installed and doors & widow shutters fixed. The report equally pointed out that tree planting was done, and project sign board installed. Overall works were reported at 100% completion and perfect workmanship. Reviewed was a report dated 8th/06/2022 supervision of Environment and Social mitigation measures raised in BoQs. The report confirmed compliance during construction. Signed by Senior Environment Officer and Senior Community Development Officer.</p> <p>Inspection report dated 21st/02/2022 for the completion of remodeling of former Buhunga Sub-County Administration Block into Staff houses for Buhunga Health Centre IV. Civil works were reported satisfactory by the project supervisor. For the same project key technical officers including CDO and Environment officer supervised the construction as evidenced by a social and environmental mitigation report dated 8th/06/2022 signed by CDO and Senior Environment Officer confirming compliance.</p> <p>For fencing of Bugangari HC IV using chain link the project supervisor reported partial completion equivalent to 54metres coverage with perfect materials used as stipulated in BoQs. The environment and social supervision was conducted as evidenced by report dated 8th/06/2022 confirming compliance.</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>Construction of 2-classroom block at Rutooma-Kihanga Primary School the contractor M/s Ruhinda Technical Services Ltd submitted request for payment of UGX 30,153,073/= Certificate of completion signed by project supervisor, Environment Officer, CDO and CAO verifying completion up to standards on 22/11/2021. Payment of UGX 28,787,123/= (net pay after deductions) was initiated on 24th/12/2021 as per reviewed payment voucher No.40951634 EFT No.40951634</p> <p>Construction of chain link at Bugangari HC IV the contractor M/S OWIT Technical Services Ltd submitted claim on 24th/11/2021 of UGX 49,498,940/=. Implemented works were verified by relevant technical officers as per signed completion certificates dated 24th/11/2021 (UGX 42,443,986/= with deductions) Payment was initiated on 1st/12/2021 as per voucher No.40310967.</p> <p>Remodeling of Buhunga Sub-County Administration Block into Buhunga HC IV staff units. The contractor M/S Talented Engineering and supplies Ltd submitted a claim of UGX 35,790,000/= on 10th/12/2021/=. Verification and certification was done by technical officers including District Engineer, Environment Officer, CDO and CAO on 15th/12/2021 and payment initiated on 23rd/12/2021 as per payment voucher 40944732</p>	1

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:

Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence of complete procurement files for DDEG projects. Procurement requisition was submitted on 23rd/08/2021 duly signed by originating officer, authorizing officer and confirmation of funds. Using standard form 20 contracts committee decision on submission was made under minute number MIN19/07/DCC/2021-22 on 23rd/08/2021. Bid documents, Technical Evaluation Committee, Open National bidding method and Non-refundable fee of UGX 100,000/= was approved.

On file was evidence of Evaluation report dated 24th/09/2021 which was approved by contracts committee on 27th/09/2021 under minute number MIN:26/DCC/2021/2022. Contract awarded to M/S Ruhinda Technical Services Ltd at UGX 81,760,900/=. On file was contract agreement signed between the LG and M/S Ruhinda Technical Services Ltd dated 13th/08/2021

The construction of chain link had procurement requisition signed on 13th/08/2021 by relevant officers. Approving procurement method, Technical Evaluation Committee and evaluation methodology was done on 22nd/09/2021 under minute number MIN:27/02/DCC/2021/2022 and contract awarded to M/S OWIT Technical Services Ltd. Contract agreement was on file signed on 13th/10/2021.

Remodeling of Sub-County Administration block into Health Centre staff houses had procurement requisition signed by relevant officers on 2nd/09/2021. The method of procurement was approved on 27th/09/2021 under minute 26/02/DCC/2021-22. Evaluation report dated 15th/10/2021 was on file approved under minute 34/01/DCC/2021-22. Contract agreement was signed on 2nd/11/2021 between Rukungiri District LG and M/S Talented Engineering and Supplies Ltd.

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 provided to show that Rukungiri DLG designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC).

0

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri DLG had no specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances.</p>	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>Rukungiri DLG didnot have evidence that it had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</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>The evidence indicates, environment, social and climate change interventions were integrated into, LG development plans, AWP and budgets. LG DP III developed from ; environment interventions, sections,2.5, 2.6- pages, 54-59); Social interventions-pages, section section-2.4.4, pages, 45-51; climate change intervetions-section-2.5-2.6, pages-54-59. AWP-environment interventions- pages-102-113;social intervetions-pages-114-124; climate interventions- pages-102-113. Approved Annual Budget Estimates; environment interventions-pages- 54-55; social interventions-pages-56-59; climate interventions-pages-54-55.</p> <p>1. Construction of Omukatooma GFS, phase II and Burama GFS, Katenga GFS, in Nyakishenyi S/C, Nyakagyeme S/C , Rwampara S/C, respectively (AWP, page,101).</p> <p>2. Sensitization of community and gender mainstreaming, environmental issues, HIV and COVID-19 (AWP, page, 114).</p> <p>3. Tree planting of 10 acres at 9 S/Cs and 4 T/Cs and 1 Municipality (AWP, page, 104).</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0	The LG disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines that strengthened and included, environment, climate change mitigation and adaptation and social risk management. This is in reference to the mentoring report dated 08/02/2022 which was discussed under minute, MIN.54/DTPC/2021-2022, regarding the dissemination of the DDEG guidelines to LLGs. Those involved were, CAO All HODs, Town Clerks of Town Councils and Sub-County Chiefs. The activities included; Objectives; • To disseminate new guidelines on DDEG and unconditional Grant Guidelines. • Changes in internal assessment guidelines on DDEG. • Planning for Parish Model at LLGs using DDEG. • To guide LLGs on project DDEG selection for projects for FY 2021/22. • To have all LLGs plans/budgets for 2021/22 to follow DDEG guidelines. DDEG guidelines were disseminated to LLGs through an extended TPC on 15/10/2020 to 18/10/2020, as per distribution sheet which was seen during the assessment. The guidelines were signed for by the recipients who included S/C chiefs and Town Clerks.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	Rukungiri DLG had one investment financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation, however there were no costed ESMPs incorporated into the BOQs. The one project was remodeling of the former subcounty administration into staff house.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	For the previous financial year, Rukungiri DLG had no projects that required additional costs of addressing climate change adaptation.	3

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that all DDEG projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provide monthly reports; Remodeling of the former subcounty administration block had monthly monitoring reports dated; 28/03/2022, 28/04/2022 and 08/06/2022. Construction of 2 classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga primary school had monthly monitoring reports dated 24/02/2022, 16/05/2022 and 07/06/2022. Completion of fencing at Bugangari HC IV had monthly monitoring reports dated, 28/03/2022 and 08/06/2022.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of project as thus; Remodeling of the former subcounty administration block had had a prepared E&S certification form dated 07/03/2022. Construction of 2 classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga primary school had a prepared E&S certification form dated 27/03/2022 Completion of fencing at Bugangari HC IV had a prepared E&S certification form dated 14/06/2022.	1

Financial management

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0	The LG monthly bank reconciliations were to-date at time of the assessment on 24th November 2022. The bank reconciliations were as at 31st October 2022. The 3 sampled banks were as follows; 1. RUK District LG, UWEP Recoveries, Centenary Bank a/c. no. 9030013133106, -UGX. 9,501,600. 2. RUK DLG General Fund, Stanbic Bank a/c. 903005722631, UGX. 34,587,952. 3. Rukungiri District YLP, Centenary Bank, a/c. no. 51105000016, UGX.94,214,480.	2
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the internal audit reports were submitted to CAO, LGPAC, and RDC/LCV Chair through dated receipt stamps. The LG Internal Auditor Aranaitwe Florence provided to the assessor all four quarterly internal audits (IA) reports. The reports were submitted to the CAO on observations, recommendations and action to be taken.</p> <p>Submissions dates were as follows:</p> <p>Q 1-25/11/2021</p> <p>Q 2 -22/02/2021</p> <p>Q 3- 05/05/2021</p> <p>Q 4 -29/07/2021</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 LG provided information to the Council, chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY 2021/2022, i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports. There was evidence that the internal audit reports were also submitted to CAO, LGPAC, and RDC/LCV Chair through dated receipt stamps for follow-up on the four quarterly reports for FY 2021/2022.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="746 958 1318 1216"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date of Report</th> <th>Date received by LG PAC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q 1- 25/11/2021</td> <td>26/11/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 2 -22/02/2022</td> <td>26/05/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 3- 05/05/2022</td> <td>26/05/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 4 -29/07/2022</td> <td>10/08/2022</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date of Report	Date received by LG PAC	Q 1- 25/11/2021	26/11/2021	Q 2 -22/02/2022	26/05/2022	Q 3- 05/05/2022	26/05/2022	Q 4 -29/07/2022	10/08/2022	1
Date of Report	Date received by LG PAC													
Q 1- 25/11/2021	26/11/2021													
Q 2 -22/02/2022	26/05/2022													
Q 3- 05/05/2022	26/05/2022													
Q 4 -29/07/2022	10/08/2022													
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the internal audit reports for FY2020/21 were submitted to CAO, LGPAC and RDC/LCV Chair through the Registry on the following dates.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report dated 25/09/2021, submitted on 25/09/2021 was discussed on 09/12/2021, under MIN. 05/PAC/2021/2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 dated 22/02/2022, submitted on 22/02/2022, discussed on 09/12/2021, under MIN. 05/PAC/2021/2022.</p> <p>Quarter 3 dated 05/05/2022 submitted on 05/02/2022, discussed on 09/12/2021, under MIN. 05/PAC/2021/2022</p> <p>Quarter 4 dated 29/07/2022, submitted on 29/07/2022 had not been discussed by the time of assessment on 24th November, 2022.</p> <p>There was however for FY 2021/2022, Q 1, Q 2 and Q 3 were discussed, but Q 4 was not discussed by LG PAC.</p>	0										

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Actual Revenue collected in FY 2021/22 was UGX. 849,092,600 against the planned of UGX. 810,772,129. The LG collected more than planned by UGX. 38,320,471. This was 4.7% which fell within the range of 10%.</p>	2																																
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The actual OSR for the FY 2021/22 was UGX. 849,092,600 and actual for 2020/2021 was UGX. 599,318,740. There was an increase of UGX. 249,773,860, which was 41.7% more than +10% (Final accounts 2020/21, page 12).</p>	2																																
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to Rukungiri DLG financial records, for FY 2021/22 the total local revenue collected was UGX. 566,536,635 of this LST and remitted to LLGs, was UGX. 368,251,988. which was the mandatory 65%.</p>	2																																
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ENTITY</th> <th>AMOUNT-UGX.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1. Bikurungu T/C</td><td>69,541,334</td></tr> <tr><td>2. Bugangari S/C</td><td>16,875,732</td></tr> <tr><td>3. Buhunga S/C</td><td>12,181,700</td></tr> <tr><td>4. Buyanja S/C</td><td>12,282,000</td></tr> <tr><td>5. Bwambara S/C</td><td>23,080,450</td></tr> <tr><td>6. Rwerere T/C</td><td>4,964,000</td></tr> <tr><td>7. Ruhinda S/C</td><td>16,875,732</td></tr> <tr><td>8. Nyarushanje S/C</td><td>50,304,549</td></tr> <tr><td>9. Nyakishenyi S/C</td><td>12,138,471</td></tr> <tr><td>10. Nyakagyeme S/C</td><td>15,949,283</td></tr> <tr><td>11. Kebisoni T/C</td><td>49,897,397</td></tr> <tr><td>12. Kebisoni S/C</td><td>6,051,750</td></tr> <tr><td>13. Rukungiri M/C</td><td>11,536,200</td></tr> <tr><td>14. Buyanja T/C</td><td>66,573,390</td></tr> <tr><td>Total, UGX.</td><td>368,251,988</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	ENTITY	AMOUNT-UGX.	1. Bikurungu T/C	69,541,334	2. Bugangari S/C	16,875,732	3. Buhunga S/C	12,181,700	4. Buyanja S/C	12,282,000	5. Bwambara S/C	23,080,450	6. Rwerere T/C	4,964,000	7. Ruhinda S/C	16,875,732	8. Nyarushanje S/C	50,304,549	9. Nyakishenyi S/C	12,138,471	10. Nyakagyeme S/C	15,949,283	11. Kebisoni T/C	49,897,397	12. Kebisoni S/C	6,051,750	13. Rukungiri M/C	11,536,200	14. Buyanja T/C	66,573,390	Total, UGX.	368,251,988	
ENTITY	AMOUNT-UGX.																																			
1. Bikurungu T/C	69,541,334																																			
2. Bugangari S/C	16,875,732																																			
3. Buhunga S/C	12,181,700																																			
4. Buyanja S/C	12,282,000																																			
5. Bwambara S/C	23,080,450																																			
6. Rwerere T/C	4,964,000																																			
7. Ruhinda S/C	16,875,732																																			
8. Nyarushanje S/C	50,304,549																																			
9. Nyakishenyi S/C	12,138,471																																			
10. Nyakagyeme S/C	15,949,283																																			
11. Kebisoni T/C	49,897,397																																			
12. Kebisoni S/C	6,051,750																																			
13. Rukungiri M/C	11,536,200																																			
14. Buyanja T/C	66,573,390																																			
Total, UGX.	368,251,988																																			

21 LG shares information with citizens
 Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence of transparency by the PDU. The LG consolidated plan was observed well displayed on the District Notice board. All planned projects indicated. Also found displayed was the awarded contracts, successful bidders and runners up indicating reasons for failure of their respective bids.

2

21 LG shares information with citizens
 Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0

The LG was number 112 with a score of 37% FY 2020/2021. The results were discussed as per TPC minutes dated 01/06/2022, under MIN.68/DTPC/2021-2022.

2

	Score
Cross-cutting	51
Education	20
Health	52
Water	25

The results were also displayed on the notice-board as seen on the date of assessment on 24th November 2022.

LG shares information with citizens

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0

The LG conducted discussions with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation. The talk shows were held on Rukingiri Radio and Radio Boona . The programme was conducted by District Chairperson, RDC, CAO, Planner, HODs with participation of the community on 30/06/2022. The consultative and talk shows are are being held every Monday, 9 am -10 am.

The feed-back are on the following projects;

- Discussed challenges in sectors of water, education, production, commerce & industry, community-based services, health, natural resources and administration.- COVID-19 Pandemic effect

-Effect of Eboola

-Immunization of corona virus and six killer diseases.

-Feedback on PDM Projects.

-Mindset change

-Operation Wealth Creation.

-Outbreak of foot and mouth disease and Rift valley fever.

-Sources of water construction and environmental management

-Road construction and maintenance of roads.

-Progress of the LG DP III

-Project implementation for FY 2021/2022

-Encroachment on wetlands and water public dams.

The radio clips were also availed to the assessor

LG shares information with citizens

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0

The LG publicly avail information on, tax rates, collection procedures, and procedures for appeal as per evidence of circulars signed by the CAO, on 12/08/2021. These were on livestock market charges, animal movement permit loading fees, trading licenses, ground rent, English beer licenses, liquor licenses, building plan inspection fees, charcoal loading, slaughter fees, loitering fees, milling machine fees, operational license, industry license, rental tax for commercial buildings and local service tax. It was also seen on the noticeboard by The assessor on 24th November 2022.

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

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

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

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.	a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year	The assessor got and reviewed the PLE results for 2019 and 2020 and calculated the percentage change in performance. It was noted that the PLE performance declined by (-1.2%) as evidenced below:	0
	Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>- 5,318 out of 6,234 (85.3%) pupils who sat PLE in 2019 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (74)</p> <p>- 5,370 out 6,384 (84.1%) pupils who sat PLE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (141) Thus a percentage decrease of(- 1.2%) and the score is 0</p>	
1	Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.	b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year	The assessor got and reviewed the UCE results for 2019 and 2020 and calculated the percentage change in performance. We noted that the UCE performance declined by (0.5%) as evidenced below:	0
	Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>- 1987 out of 3352(59.3%) pupils who sat UCE in 2019 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees(19)</p> <p>- 1943 out of 3,251 (59.8%) pupils who sat UCE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3. This excludes absentees (25) Thus a percentage decrease of (0.5%) and the score is 0</p>	
2	Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.	a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year	To be scored Zero for all LGs in Y1 & Y2	0
	Maximum 2 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 		

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the education development grant was used on eligible activities as per sector guidelines. The review of the LG quarterly performance report (Q4) FY 2021/22 revealed the sector development grant of Ush. 2,079,187,000 /= was released in FY 2021/22 and spent on capital investments representing 174% of the approved budget of Ush. 1,193,165,000/=. Specific details show that the funds were spent as below:

- Under output(078181): VIP latrines constructed at 6 primary schools worth at Ush. 226,597,000/=. e.g., Nyabushenyi Lower PS , Kichumba PS, Mabanga PS, Rwere PS , Rwenkureinjo PS, Nyakariro PS, Bugarama PS and payment of retention for contracts after defect period , at the cost of Ush. 165,597, 000/=

- Under output(078183): Provision of furniture(83 twin desks) to Katonya PS at Ush. 15,628,000/=

- Under output(078180): Construction of Kasheshe PS , Katungu PS , Rubanga Parents PS , Rutooma Kihanga PS and Bikurungu Parents' PS at Ush. 396,543,000/=

- Under output(0781810): Renovation at Karire PS at Ush. 36,708,442/=

- Under output(078280): construction of Kebisoni Seed school at Ush. 786,627, 558

- Under output(078280): construction of Nyakishenyi HS at Ush. 851,223, 000/=

- Investment costs at Ush. 50,000,000/=

Therefore, education development grant was used on eligible activities, thus score of 2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The DEO, District Engineer, DCDO and Senior Environment Officer certified works on Education construction projects in FY 2021/2022 before the LG made payments to the contractors.

The projects were as follows;

1. Construction of a 2-classroom block and supply of furniture at Katunga p/s by Tical Construction Company Ltd. RUK550/WKS/2021/22/0003. Requisitioned on 15/06/2022. Certified works on 10/06/2022. Paid on 29/06/2022 by EFT. 44591632, UGX.. 38,084,154.

2. Completion of 4-classroom block at Karire P/S by Fair Multiplier Holdings Ltd. Ruk550/WRKS/2021-2022/00027. Requisitioned on 14/04/2022. Certified works on 16/04/2022. Paid on 22/04/2022 by EFT. 42112407, UGX. 36,062,950.

3. Construction of a 2- classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga P/S by Ruhinda Technical Services Ltd. RUK550/WORKS/2021-2022/00009. Requisitioned on 21/02/2022. Certified works on 24/02/2022. Paid on 25/03/2022 by EFT. 40284883, UGX. 40,284,483.

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	This particular indicator was tagged to Seed Secondary Schools, yet Rukungiri District LG did not have such projects in the FY under review.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	This could not be tracked since the indicator was tagged on Seed Secondary Schools which were not implemented in Rukungiri.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	According to the Education staffing structure, the LG has an approved 1040 teaching staff with a staffing of 1495 making a 143% staff filling	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 		

<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>The LG education department had two consolidated schools' asset registers for FY 2021/22 and FY 2022/23.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The register for FY2021/2022 dated 17th June 2021 covered (161) UPE schools and (17) USE schools. - The register for FY2022/2022 signed on 14th Jan 2022 contained the (162) UPE schools and (23) USE schools. - All the registered captured the number of classrooms, number of latrines, number of desks and teacher accommodation as per format 1, (page 60) provided in the Education and sports planning, budgeting and implementation guidelines for LG (FY 2021/2022). - The review of the consolidated schools' asset register for FY 2022/23 revealed that 10 out of 162 (6.0%) primary schools, recording permanent teachers, accommodating four and more than (4) teacher houses. The teacher housing state in FY2022/23 remained the same as per the asset register 2021/2022. <p>During the verification, none of the (03) sample schools could meet the basic requirement and standard set by DES. That is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mabanga PS with enrollment(301), classroom-pupil ratio(1:33), latrine-pupil ratio(1:30) , desk-pupil ratio(1:3.0) and teacher accommodation(0) - Karike PS with enrollment(459), classroom-pupil ratio(1:51), latrine-pupil ratio(1:46) , desk-pupil ratio(1:2.3) and teacher accommodation(1) - Katungu PS with enrollment(442), classroom-pupil ratio(1:31), latrine-pupil ratio(1:29) , desk-pupil ratio(1:1.5) and teacher accommodation(2) - Therefore, only 8(4%), which is less than 50% of UPE schools meeting the basic requirements and minimum standard set by DES, score 0.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The review of the list of primary school teachers for FY 2021/22, accessed from the DEO's office revealed that a total of 1495 teachers were deployed in 162 UPE schools in Rukungiri District.

Verification was done in 3 sampled UPE schools and the following was established as per the deployment list from the DEO's office.

(1) The number of (09) teachers on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (09) in Mabanga PS, Kebisoni S/C

(2) The number of (13) teachers on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (13) in Karire PS, Kebisoni TC

(3) The number of (08) teachers on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (08) in Katungu PS, Buyanja S/C

It was verified that the total number of teachers as indicated on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list in all the (3) sampled UPE schools i.e., Mabanga PS, Karire PS, and Katungu PS as shown above. Therefore, the information on the deployment list of teachers is 100% accurate, thus score 2.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

The assessor obtained and reviewed consolidated school asset registers for FY 2021/22 and FY2022/23 and individual school asset registers in the 03 sample schools. It was noted that the information on the consolidated asset register is consistent with the information recorded on the school's asset register.

Specific details are documented below:

- Karire PS: The education department consolidated the school asset registers for FY 2021/22 and indicated that the school had (9) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (195) desks and (1) teacher accommodations, which is 100% accurate as the school asset-register with (9) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (195) desks and (1) teacher accommodation.

- Mabanga PS: The education department consolidated the school asset registers for FY 2021/22 and indicated that the school had (9) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (101) desks and (00) teacher accommodations, which was consistent as the school asset register with (9) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (101) desks and (0) teacher accommodation

- Katungu PS: The education department consolidated school asset registers for FY 2021/22 indicated that the school had (14) classrooms, (15) latrine stances, (296) desks and (02) teacher accommodation houses while the school asset register had (14) classrooms, (15) latrine stances, (296) desks and (02) teacher accommodation.

Therefore, there is evidence that the information on the school asset registers in all 03 sample schools is 100% accurate as that found at the office of DEO, hence score 2

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:

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

- Between 80 – 99% score: 2

- Below 80% score 0

There was non-compliance with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines. There was no evidence of submitted annual school reports and budgets highlighting; (i) school performance, (ii) reconciled cash flow statements, (iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and (iv) an asset register to DEO by January 30th 2022. The verification from a field visit in the (3) UPE sample schools (Mabanga, Karire PS and Katungu PS) revealed that all the headteachers did not prepare and compile the school reports that are signed by the chairperson of SMC and Headteacher as required in planning, budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools (May 2019). The assessor noted that the schools had attempted to prepare and submit highlights of school performance, which is only part of the school report while reconciled cash flow and annual budget and expenditures had not been prepared and submitted.

Therefore, LG had not ensured that all registered primary schools complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and none of them had submitted reports. Hence, the score is 0

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:

- If 50% score: 4
- Between 30– 49% score: 2
- Below 30% score 0

There was evidence that the Education UPE schools were supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations. The LG Education had a file containing SIP reports from 162 UPE schools in accordance with the format/checklists required in the planning, budgeting and implementation guidelines for LGs for the education sector (May 2019).

So, the same format was replicated in the 3 sample schools. There was evidence that the school had been visited for inspection for FY2021/2022. In the school planned, issues to be addressed were as follows:

(1) Mabanga PS: There was a SIP displayed on the wall of the headteacher's office. The SIP includes issues of improving academic performance, teacher/pupil attendance, improving disciplines of learners and teachers and security of the schools.

(2) Karire PS: had prepared an improved SIPs and displayed it on the wall of the office after the feedback report by the school inspector (Jackeline) in her feedback report on 26th July 2022. The SIPs focused on addressing issues such as pupil absenteeism, renovation of the office block and levelling of a school compound.

(3) Katungu PS: prepared and displayed a SIP following the recommendation of the school inspector (Solomon) on 27th September 2022.

The education department held capacity-building workshops with headteachers and close supervision to support. This was confirmed during verification done in (3) UPE schools (Karire PS, Mabanga PS & Katungu PS). Despite the varying quality, all the schools (100%) had prepared SIP following format in the planning, budgeting and implementation guidelines of the education sector with support from the DEO and school inspectors, scoring 4

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

The list of government UPE schools and USE schools captured in Rukungiri DLG Performance contract FY 2021/22 is consistent with the number of schools (162) in excel data sheet (OTIMS) for FY 2021/22

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 4 or else, score: 0

Rukungiri DLG budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of (7) teachers per school or a teacher per class in all the (162) Government aided primary schools. Total of (1,515) primary teachers were budgeted for as per LG approved work plan FY 2022/23. The total wage bill for primary teaching services was UGX 11,037,670,000/= as per the LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2022/23. It was noted that 7 of 162 UPE schools had had classes below P7 with at least a teacher per class. Hence, there is evidence that 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 2022/2023 and a score 4.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

The education department primary school deployment list for FY 2021/22 obtained from the DEO revealed that a total of (1515) teachers were deployed in 162 UPE schools. There were (7) out of 162 UPE schools with classes up to P7 and each has a minimum of (7) teachers. Only 3 UPE schools with below P7 classes with a teacher per class, including Kigarama PS (P.4), Ibanda PS (P.5), Rutete PS (P.6), Nyabare PS (P.5), Nyamihuku PS (P.6), Kafuka PS(P5) and Omurutoma PS in FY 2021/22 as per sector guidelines.

Verification was done in 3 sampled UPE schools and the following was established as per the deployment/staff lists from the DEO's office.

(i) Karire PS: The number of teachers (13) on the staffing list in PBS 2022/23 is consistent with the number of teachers (13) on the school staff list.

(ii) Mabanga PS: The number of teachers (09) on the staffing list in PBS 2022/23 is consistent with the number of teachers (09) on the school staff list

(ii) Katungu PS: The number of teachers(8) on the staffing list in PBS 2022/23 is consistent with the number of teachers (8) on the school staff list. It was validated that the number of teachers on the staff lists in PBS 2022/23 was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list of the 3

Therefore, in each of the 3 sampled UPE schools, there is a minimum of 7 teachers or at least one teachers per class, hence score 3.

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

The teacher deployment data had been displayed on school notice-board in all the 03 sampled UPE schools as indicated below:

(i) Karire PS (Kebisoni T/C) deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (13) teachers i.e., Male (07) and Female (06)

(ii) Mabanga PS (Kebisoni S/C) deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (09) teachers i.e., Male (06) and Female (03)

(iii) Katungu PS (Buyanja S/C) deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (8) teachers i.e., Male (01) and Female (07)

1

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

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence produced to show that all Primary School Head teachers were appraised and reports submitted by SAS for the previous academic year.

A sample of 10 files for primary schools' head teachers was taken as follows:

1. Asiiimwe Molly, of Nyakanyinya PS was appraised on 17/12/2021

2. Karakwenda Sarapios of Kyantarega PS was appraised on 27/12/2021

3. Muhangisa Boaz of Kyamurari PS was appraised on 31/12/2021

4. Kyomugisha Editor of Nyakinengo PS was appraised on 13/12/2021

5. Katemba Molly of Rushasha PS was appraised on 31/12/2021

6. tweheyo Bennet of Nyakisoroza PS was appraised on 7/12/2021

7. Tumwujukye Naboth of Kehembe PS was appraised on 31/12/2021

8. Habinsinguza Richard of Nyakagyeme PS was appraised on 24/2/2021

9. Chance Moses of Rubirizi PS was appraised on 31/12/2021

10. Mutekanga Jimmy of Karukata PS was appraised on 31/12/2021

2

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that all Secondary School head teachers were appraised by D/CAO for the previous FY.</p> <p>Files for secondary school head teachers were not available for assessment</p>	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the staff in the education department were appraised against thier performance plans in the previous FY .</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gumisiriza Keishiki Adah Senor Inspector of schools was appraised on 31/6/2022 2. Amperize Anthoney the Inspector of schools was appointed in May 2022 and therefore not yet due for appraisal 3. Mutungi Abel the Inspector of schools was appointed in May 2022 and therefore not yet due for appraisal 4. Arinaitwe Solomon the Inspector of schools was appointed in May 2022 and therefore not yet due for appraisal 5. Nyesiga Amon, the Inspector of schools was appointed in May 2022 and therefore not yet due for appraisal 6. Muzoora Bruce the Inspector of schools was appointed in May 2022 and therefore not yet due for appraisal 7. Nuwamanya Topher the Inspector of schools was appointed in May 2022 and therefore not yet due for appraisal 8. Tushemetairwe Lydia the Inspector of schools was appointed in September 2022 and therefore not yet due for appraisal 9. Mpirirwe Jackeline the Inspector of schools was appointed in May 2022 and therefore not yet due for appraisal 	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the education department had developed a training plan developed over FY 2021/2022. Instead, the presented training plan had been developed over the current FY2022/2023, stamped and signed by the DEO on 1st July 2022, which was outside the assessment period.</p> <p>Therefore, LG education had not prepared a training plan for the FY 2021/2022, hence the score of 0.</p>	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessor observed from DEO, that the district was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrolment data. Therefore, there was no need of communicating corrections/revisions of school lists and enrolment data submitted in PBS as well as adjusting the IPFs for Rukungiri district</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG allocated UGX 64,512,000/= for school inspection and UGX 24,718,000/= for monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary education during FY 2021/22, as per performance contract Q4 report FY 2021/22 (page 80). The allocated funds were more than a minimum of 57,544,000/= for output (078401) and (Output 078401) as per the Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for LGs for the Education Sector (FY 2021/2022, page 11). i.e., $(4,000,000 + (100,000 \times 183) + 4,500,000 + (168,000 \times 183)) = 57,544,000/=$</p> <p>where 183 is the total number of schools(162 UPE and 21 secondary schools) in the district. Therefore, there was evidence that the LG was 100% compliance, score:2</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The evidence shows the LG did not submit warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters.</p> <p>Time taken:</p> <p>Q 1- 9 days</p> <p>Q 3 -21 days</p> <p>Q 4- 17 days.</p> <p>They were invoiced on the following dates;</p> <p>Notification of Expenditure Limits Warranted</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Q 1 –06/07/2021</td> <td>15/07/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 3- 22/12/2021</td> <td>12/01/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 4– 04/04/2022</td> <td>21/04/2022</td> </tr> </table>	Q 1 –06/07/2021	15/07/2021	Q 3- 22/12/2021	12/01/2022	Q 4– 04/04/2022	21/04/2022	0		
Q 1 –06/07/2021	15/07/2021											
Q 3- 22/12/2021	12/01/2022											
Q 4– 04/04/2022	21/04/2022											
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>												
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence shows the LG did not invoice and communicated capitation releases to schools within three working days of release of MoFPED.</p> <p>Time taken;</p> <p>Q 1-71 days</p> <p>Q3- 37 days</p> <p>Q 4- 24 days</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Notification of Cash release by MoFPED</td> <td>Invoiced</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 1 –06/07/2021</td> <td>05/10/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 3- 22/12/2021</td> <td>28/01/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 4– 04/04/2022</td> <td>28/04/2022</td> </tr> </table>	Notification of Cash release by MoFPED	Invoiced	Q 1 –06/07/2021	05/10/2021	Q 3- 22/12/2021	28/01/2022	Q 4– 04/04/2022	28/04/2022	0
Notification of Cash release by MoFPED	Invoiced											
Q 1 –06/07/2021	05/10/2021											
Q 3- 22/12/2021	28/01/2022											
Q 4– 04/04/2022	28/04/2022											
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>												
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education department held meetings to plan for inspection activities as indicated by the school inspection work plan – FY 2021/22.</p> <p>(i) In the departmental meeting to plan for school inspection dated 13th July 2022. From Min.24/2022 to Min.26/2022, the education staff discussed the presentation of the school inspection workshop that took place in Soroti and members that attended demonstrated how to use inspection tools. In the same meeting, under Min. 23/2022, the sector accountant guided the education staff about the budgeting of school inspection, monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary schools following the planning, budgeting and implementing guidelines of MoES.</p> <p>(ii) In a departmental meeting held on 26th April 2022, the CAO remarked on the poor results of the previous assessment in the Education department and encouraged the staff to work together to improve the assessment results.</p>	2								

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:

- If 100% score: 2
- Between 80 – 99% score 1
- Below 80%: score 0

There was no evidence of a complete set of school inspection reports for Term III- 2021, Term-I-2022 and Term II-2022 to calculate the percentage of schools inspected.

The school inspection/monitoring reports for FY 2021/22 got and reviewed included the following specifics:

(1) The school inspection Term I, 2022 in FY 2021/2022 that was compiled and submitted on 09th August 2022, and all UPE schools inspected, representing 100%.

(2) The school inspection Term II, 2022 in FY 2021/2022 that was compiled and submitted on 25th May 2022 includes all UPE schools inspected, representing 100%. For instance, in the findings in Kaire PS, - the school inspector, reported an enrollment of 413, no display of SIP and COVID-19, the inadequacy of teaching staff and full vaccination of only one teacher.

(3) There was no evidence that school inspection Term III, 2021 in FY 2021/2022 had been compiled.

NB. The school inspection report, which was presented showing the submission date of 17th December 2021, was inaccurate, i.e., it contained information term 1–2021 4th Quarter of FY 2020/2021. Perhaps, at that time education lacked adequate staff to conduct inspections as one of the challenges reported by the DEO in the social service committee meeting held on 18th March 2022.

Hence, there was no sufficient evidence to establish the number of schools inspected (or calculate the percentage of schools inspected) in term III 2021, hence score is 0.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

There was evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to recommend corrective actions.

(i) In the departmental meeting of 29th July 2022, the education staff discussed the school inspection findings under MIN30/2022. Among the key aspects were: delayed management meetings, absenteeism of teachers and learners, lack of changing room for girls and female teachers, and maintenance of the school compound and classrooms.

Some of the recommendations by school inspectors were:

- The need for community sensitization to curb absenteeism and dropouts
- To plan for CPD at the zonal level
- The need for intensive monitoring and supervision

Under Min 31/2022, the staff proposed the following actions:

- Staff submit weekly output to the DEOs every Thursday for further compilation. There was evidence that the staff implemented this good practice of weekly reports of inspection activities of schools assigned to him/her. For example, in the week of 26th /August/2022, the school inspector (Muzoora Bruce) reported to the DEO the findings of 2 primary schools and 2 secondary schools. In the week of 8th -12th /August 2022, the school inspector (Mpiriwe Jackeline) reported 5 primary schools. School inspection in the district is an ongoing activity by inspectors.

- Teacher Komugisha Ketra to be transferred from Katojo PS to Rugarama PS

- The headteachers of Agaabito – Kicwamba PS and Niwamanya Rodgers- Ibanda PS to be awarded as a sign of appreciation for best performance.

(ii) In the meeting of 30th September 2022, under Min 47/2022, the school inspection and monitoring reports were presented and the key issues included drunkard teachers, retired teachers, requests from Karire PS, and rejected a teacher in Kibiizi PS. Under Min 50/2022, staff recommended that: indiscipline teachers are submitted for disciplinary action and newly appointed teachers are posted in schools with staff challenges

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was confirmation by DES acknowledgement note with the official stamp that 2 out of 3 school inspection reports were compiled and submitted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The school inspection Term III, 2021 in FY 2021/2022 was not compiled and submitted. The information provided as a school inspection report submitted on 17th December 2021 was inaccurate - The school inspection Term I, 2022 in FY 2021/2022 was compiled and submitted on 25th May 2022. - The school inspection Term II, 2022 in FY 2021/2022 was compiled and submitted on 09th August 2022. <p>Hence a score of 0.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Social Services Committee handles education, Health and Community-Based Services. The chairperson Social Services Committee presented to the District Council meeting on 4th November 2022 issues of the social services committee meeting held on 21 October 2022. In the education department, the social service committee recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bujumbura should get at least one tertiary institution - education inspectorate should desist from transferring indiscipline teachers to Nyakishenyi - the district should embark on a sensitization programme about the importance of education to the parents, guardian and all stakeholders in Nyakishenyi S/C <p>In the social services committee on 18th March 2022, the DEO reported a number issues on school inspections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - some teachers have neglected duty—they are doing their own business at the expense of teaching - many of the schools lack latrines - lack of staff in the department, especially in the inspectorate department <p>In the same meeting, the DEO recommended the approval SMC proposal in 7 schools e.g. Rusheshe PS, Kafuka PS, Kajunju PS e.t.c.</p>	2

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the education department had conducted activities to attract and retain learners to schools.</p> <p>In every PTA general meeting, the staff of the education department is invited to talk to the parents, teachers and learners so that learners attend school. For instance, the education inspectors attended the PTA General Meeting at Munyeganyegye primary schools, Nyakishenyi primary school, in July 2022, where parents from different villages registered their attendance; notably Tumwengabirwe Mary (0789356298) for Nyakishanyi PS in Rwonyo village and peter Tibarimu(0783043161) for Munyeganyegye PS.</p> <p>Hence, score of 2</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>There was an evidence of an up to-date LG asset register. The review and validation of the LG-consolidated register FY 2021/22 and FY 2020/21, respectively.</p> <p>In the sampled schools revealed that all the (03) UPE had an up-to-date and consistent with information in the consolidated school asset register showing number of classrooms, latrine stances, desks and teacher houses.</p> <p>- Karire PS: The education department consolidated the school asset registers for FY 2021/22 indicated that the school had (9) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (195) desks and (1) teacher accommodation, which was 100% accurate as the school asset register with (9) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (195) desks and (1) teacher accommodation.</p> <p>- Mabanga PS: The education department consolidated the school asset registers for FY 2021/22 indicated that the school had (9) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (101) desks and (00) teacher accommodations, which was consistent as the school asset register with (9) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (101) desks and (0) teacher accommodation.</p> <p>- Katungu PS: The education department consolidated school asset registers for FY 2021/22 indicated that the school had (14) classrooms, (15) latrine stances, (296) desks and (02) teacher accommodation while the school asset register had (14) classrooms, (15) latrine stances, (296) desks and (02) teacher accommodation.</p> <p>Therefore, there is evidence that the information on the school asset registers in all 03 sample schools is 100% accurate as that found at the office of DEO, hence score 2</p>	2
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III;</p>	<p>The LG conducted desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget and investments were obtained from the LGDP III-2019/2020 -2024/2025. The projects were appraised by; DEO, District Planner, DCDO and Senior Environment Officer on 16/12/2020 and 17/12/2020.</p> <p>The following projects were appraised;</p>	1
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

(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, *score: 1 or else, score: 0*

1. Construction of Nyakishenyi Seed secondary school in Nyakishenyi Sub county
2. Construction of a 5-stance latrine at Rwetuha primary school in Buyanja sub county
3. Construction of three classroom block at Kakindo primary school in Bugangari sub county
4. Construction of two classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga primary school
5. Supply of classroom furniture (3 seater-twin desks) at Rusheshe PS in Buhunga
6. Construction of Kebisoni Seed Secondary school at Magoma in Kebisoni sub county
7. Construction of a Lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kafunjo primary school in Nyakishenyi
8. Construction of a Lined 5 Stance VIP latrine at Katerampungu in Bugangari
9. Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Mashongora primary school in Nyakagyeme
10. Rehabilitation of a 2 classroom block and construction of a latrine at Kasheshe primary school in Buyanja
11. Construction of 4 classrooms and a 2 stance latrine at Katungu primary school in Buyanja
12. Construction of 3 classrooms at Karire primary school in Kebisoni sub county
13. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kiborogota primary school in Kebisoni TC
14. Construction of a 4 classroom block and 5 stance latrine at Rumbugu primary school in Kebisoni Town Council
15. Construction of 4 classrooms and 2 stance latrine at Mitooma primary school in Nyakagyeme
16. Construction of a multi-purpose hall at Kashenyi primary school in Ruhinda
17. Renovation of 4 classrooms and office at Rusheshe primary school in Nyakishenyi sub county
18. Completion of hall and classroom block at Ihimbo primary school in Bwambara sub county
19. Completion of a 4 classroom block at Karire in Kebisoni
20. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Bugarama in Nyakishenyi
21. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Rwerere in Nyakagyeme
22. Renovation of laboratory , art building and OPD in Ruhinda and Kikara
23. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine in Kayanga in Nyarushanje
24. Supply of 83 three seater twin desks at Katonya in Nyakishenyi

25. Construction of multi-purpose hall and staffroom in Kasheshe in Buyanja
26. Construction of Seed secondary school in Nyebeigo in Kebisoni
27. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP LATRINE at Kichwamba in Ruhinda
28. Construction of a 2 room classroom block at Katungu in Buyanja
29. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Rutooma in Rubirizi
30. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Nyakariro in Bugangari
31. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Mabaaga in Kebisoni
32. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Rwekuriijo in Buyanja

12

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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, score 1 else score: 0

The LG provided a field appraisal for, technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs. The appraisal dates were; 12/01/2021, 14/01/2021 and 15/01/2021. The appraisals were carried out by; DEO, Inspector of Schools, District Planner, DCDO and Senior Environment Officer.

The following projects were appraised;

1. Construction of Nyakishenyi Seed secondary school in Nyakishenyi Sub county
2. Construction of a 5-stance latrine at Rwetuha primary school in Buyanja sub county
3. Construction of three classroom block at Kakindo primary school in Bugangari sub county
4. Construction of two classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga primary school
5. Supply of classroom furniture (3 seater twin desks) at Rusheshe PS in Buhunga
6. Construction of Kebisoni Seed Secondary school at Magoma in Kebisoni sub county
7. Construction of a Lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kafunjo primary school in Nyakishenyi
8. Construction of a Lined 5 Stance VIP latrine at Katerampungu in Bugangari
9. Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Mashongora primary school in Nyakagyeme
10. Rehabilitation of a 2 classroom block and costruction of a latrine at Kasheshe primary school in Buyanja
11. Construction of 4 classrooms and a 2 stance latrine at Katungu primary school in Buyanja
12. Construction of 3 classrooms at Karire primary school in Kebisoni sub county

1

13. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kiborogota primary school in Kebisoni TC
14. Construction of a 4 classroom block and 5 stance latrine at Rumbugu primary school in Kebisoni Town Council
15. Construction of 4 classrooms and 2 stance latrine at Mitooma primary school in Nyakagyeme
16. Construction of a multi purpose hall at Kashenyi primary school in Ruhinda
17. Renovation of 4 classrooms and office at Rusheshe primary school in Nyakishenyi sub county
18. Completion of hall and classroom block at Ihimbo primary school in Bwambara sub county
19. Completion of a 4 classroom block at Karire in Kebisoni
20. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at bugarama in NAYAKISHENYI
21. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Rwerere in Nyakagyeme
22. Renovation of laboratory , art building and OPD in Ruhinda and Kikara
23. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine in Kayanga in Nyarushanje
24. Supply of 83 three seater twin desks at Katonya in NYAKISHENYI
25. Construction of multi purpose hall and staffroom in Kasheshe in Buyanja
26. Construction of Seed secondary school in Nyebeigo in Kebisoni
27. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP LATRINE at Kichwamba in Ruhinda
28. Construction of a 2 room classroom block at Katungu in Buyanja
29. Construction of a 2 classroom block at Rutooma in Rubirizi
30. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP Latrine at Nyakariro in Bugangari
31. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Mabaaga in Kebisoni
32. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine at Rwekuriijo in Buyanja

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	Review of Rukungiri District LG Consolidated Procurement and Disposal Plan FY 2022/23, there was evidence of incorporation of seed secondary school. This was Nyakishenyi seed secondary school with a planned budget of UGX 900,094,000/= Proposed procurement method was open national bidding and a lumpsum contract was proposed. (Page 7)	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG contracts committee approved school infrastructure projects implemented in FY 2021/2022. For example, the contracts committee approved the construction of 2-classroom block at Kashese Primary School on 27th/09/2021 under minute number MIN:27/08/DCC/2021-22 awarded the contract to M/S Kinombe Nyaruzinga Construction Co. Ltd at contract sum of UGX 116,070,128/=	1
			For construction of 2-classroom block at Katungu Primary School, the contracts committee approved the contract on 27th/09/2021 under minute number MIN:27/07/DCC/2021-22. The contract was awarded to M/S Tical Construction Co.Ltd at contract price of UGX98,644,310/=. The construction of 5-stance VIP latrine was approved by the contracts committee on 30th/03/2022 under minute number MIN:101/06/DCC/2021/2022 and contract awarded to M/S Kyoyekirwe Loydah at a contract sum of UGX 29,562,500/=	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team for school construction projects in FY 2021/2022. Reviewed was a letter dated 2nd/07/2021 from Management Support Services Ref.105/5 appointing Project Manager, Project Supervisor, Environment Officer, District Community Development Officer and Labour Officer as members of PIT for education projects. However, composition lacked Clerk of Works.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	Since this was tagged to seed secondary school, it could not be assessed in the period under review in Rukungiri District LG.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	Like earlier pointed out this particular indicator was tagged to seed secondary schools which the LG did not implement in the FY under review.	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was sufficient evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects joint supervision involving key technical officers was done. For instance, presented for review was supervision report dated 20th/01/2022 for construction of school facilities at Kashese Primary School (multi-purpose hall and staff room) In the report, civil works were reported at 100% completion, environment concerns like removal of debris from site and planting of trees, creeping grass and more than 10 seedlings of fruit trees was adhered to. Report was signed by civil engineer-In charge of buildings, CDO and Environment officer.</p> <p>For the construction of 2-classroom block at Katungu Primary School the inspection report indicated that physical works were practically complete and facility ready for use. Environment concerns like planting of fruit seedlings and removal of accumulated debris from site was reported conducted. Planting of grass around the classroom block executed as required.</p> <p>The construction of 5-stance lined VIP latrine was reported complete at 100%. High grade materials used, all contracted civil works executed. Environmentally, creeping grass was reported planted however, accumulated debris during construction was not removed hence pausing danger to school pupils.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The CFO provided evidence to the assessor that indicated the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors. The projects were certified by the DEO, District Engineer, DCDO, Senior Environment Officer.</p> <p>The sample projects were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 2-classroom block and supply of furniture at Katunga p/s by Tical Construction Company Ltd. RUK550/WKS/2021/22/0003. Requisitioned on 15/06/2022. Certified works on 10/06/2022. Paid on 29/06/2022 by EFT. 44591632, UGX. 38,084,154. 2. Completion of 4-classroom block at Karire P/S by Fair Multiplier Holdings Ltd. Ruk550/WRKS/2021-2022/00027. Requisitioned on 14/04/2022. Certified works on 16/04/2022. Paid on 22/04/2022 by EFT. 42112407, UGX. 36,062,950. 3. Construction of a 2- classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga P/S by Ruhinda Technical Services Ltd. RUK550/WORKS/2021-2022/00009. Requisitioned on 21/02/2022. Certified works on 24/02/2022. Paid on 25/03/2022 by EFT. 40284883, UGX. 40,284,483. <p>The payment to contractors were not made within the 14 days limit.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG Education user department submitted procurement plan on 11th/05/2021. This was beyond the stipulated time of 30th April hence the score awarded.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	The indicator was tagged to seed secondary school which the LG did not implement in the period under review.	1
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

15	Safeguards for service delivery. <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	Rukungiri DLG provided evidence that education guidelines had been disseminated to schools as per letter dated 15/07/2021 to all headteachers of primary and secondary schools signed by the District Education Officer- Mr. Turyahumura Jackson . Attached to the letter were the education guidelines.	3
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that Education projects had costed ESMPs incorporated within the BOQs; Completion of a 4 classroom block at Karire primary school had ESMPs valued at UGX: 3,804,000. Construction of a VIP latrine with a changing room for girls at Nyakariro primary school had ESMPs valued at UGX: 780,600. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine with a changing room at Rwerere primary school had ESMPs costed at UGX: 885,000.	2
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was no evidence of land ownership of land on which projects under Education had been implemented for the previous financial year.	0
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and prepared monthly monitoring reports;</p> <p>Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine with changing rooms for girls at Rwerere primary schools had evidence of monitoring reports dated; 28/04/2022, 28/01/2022 and 30/06/2022.</p> <p>Construction of a classroom block at Karire primary school had evidence of monitoring reports dated; 28/04/2022, 28/01/2022 and 30/06/2022.</p> <p>Construction of a lined five stance VIP latrine with changing room for girls at Nyakariro primary school had evidence of monitoring reports dated; 28/04/2022, 28/01/2022 and 30/06/2022.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments as observed below;</p> <p>Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine with changing rooms for girls at Rwerere primary schools had evidence of E&S certifications signed on 16/06/2022.</p> <p>Construction of a classroom block at Karire primary school had evidence of E&S certifications signed on 16/06/2022.</p> <p>Construction of a lined five stance VIP latrine with changing room for girls at Nyakariro primary school had evidence of of E&S certifications signed on 16/06/2022.</p>	1

Health Performance
Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By 20% or more, score 2• Less than 20%, score 0	<p>The LG did not register more than 20% increase in utilization of health care services in deliveries.</p> <p>The sampling done from the 25 Health facilities conducting deliveries of the health unit annual reports (HMIS 107) for financial years 2020/2021 and 2021-2022 indicated 10.9% which did not meet the required procedure of 20 and above %</p> <p>This was evidenced as below;</p> <p>Financial year 2020-2021 total deliveries indicated a total of 13598</p> <p>Financial year 2021-2022 total deliveries indicated a total of 15081</p> <p>Previous financial year –the year before divided by year before * 100.</p> <p>Therefore, $15081 - 13598 = 1483$ divided by $13598 * 100 = 10.9\%$</p> <p>The LG therefore scored zero.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The LG budgeted for Shs. 672,495,000 (Annual Budget Performance Report-page 16) for health sector development grant spent Shs. 672,495,000 (Annual Budget Performance Report-page 62).

The projects were.

1. Face-lifting of building at DHOs office UGX. 25,000,000 (ABPR, page64).
2. Procurement of a laptop and desktop computers, UGX.130,000,000 (ABPR, page64).
3. Renovation of kikarara HC II building, UGX. 12,170,000 (ABPR, page6).
4. Completion of staff house at Ngoma HC II, UGX.12,000,000. (ABPR, page,6).
5. Construction of 2 VIP latrine constructed at Nyabitete HC II,UGX.13,000,000 (ABPR, page, 64).
6. Supply of basic dental equipment for HC IV, UGX. 11,325,000 (ABPR, page,64).
7. Face-lifting of OPD block and maternity unit at Buyanja HC III, UGX. 30,000,000 (ABPR, page64,)
8. Renovation of Nyarwimuka Health centre,11 UGX.1,000,000 (ABPR, page, 64).
9. Face-lifting of OPD at Ruhinda HC III, UGX. 18,000,000 (ABPR, Page 64)
10. Face-lifting of Masya health center II..., UGX. 11,736,210(APBR, page, 64).
11. Construction of a staff house at karuhembe III, UGX. 150,000,000 (ABPR, page, 65).
12. Face-lifting of Katoonya Health center II, UGX. 10,000,000 (ABPR, page 64).
13. Renovation and face-lifting of Kisiizi HCII, UGX. 119,000,000(ABPR, page, 64).
14. Supply of equipment at Kasheshe HCIII, UGX.180,000,000 (ABPR, page,65).

Total, UGX. 672,495,000 .

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHO , District Engineer, District Natural Resource Officer, DCDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the Contractors and suppliers.</p> <p>The payments made were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing of Bugangari Health Centre IV Phase II. Requisitioned for funds on 20/06/2022. Certified works on 20/06/2022.Paid on 29/06/2022 by EFT.44461227, UGX. 2,376,483. 2. Payment for Remodeling of former S/C Admin Block into Buhunga Hc IV Staff Qtrs. Requisitioned on 20/02/2022. Certified works on 22/02/2022.Paid on 07/05/2022 by EFT.43162351,UGX.13,463,836. 3. Construction of A 3-Roomed Kitchen for Staff, 3 Stance Bathroom and 3-roomed Staff Quarter at Kisiizi HC III. Requisitioned for funds on 06/06/2022. Certified works on 14/06/2022. Paid on 22/06/222 by EFT.44461193, UGX. 43,227,733 	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not implement any health facility upgrade in the FY under review.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The indicator was tagged on health centre upgrade. The LG did not implement such projects in FY 2021/2022</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>According to the Health staffing structure, the approved staff positions are 728 and 450 are filled making a 62% staff filling</p>	0

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <p>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The indicator was tagged to health centre upgrade. The LG did not have such projects in the FY under review.</p>	2
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The information on positions of health workers filled was accurate. This was evidenced on the deployment staff lists from the DHO of 8th August 2022 and that on the staff lists and attendance registers at the 3 sampled health facilities of Kebisoni Health centre IV, Bwambara Health centre III and Bikurungu Health centre III as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At Kebisoni Health center IV, 39 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 39 staff list of June 2022 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility 2. At Bwambara Health center III, 16 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 16 staff list of 24th November 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit. 3. At Bikurungu Health center III, 17 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 17 staff list dated 21st March 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board. <p>The information on positions of health workers filled was accurate thus awarded a maximum score</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The information on health facilities upgraded or constructed was accurate.</p> <p>There was no upgrade of any health facility in the previous financial year as reflected in the PBS report</p>	2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>The Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Work plans and budgets to the DHO for the previous financial year.</p> <p>The sampled health facilities of Kebisoni, Bikurungu and Bwambara submitted as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kebisoni Health centre IV submitted on 30th March 2021 2. Bikurungu health center III submitted on 10th March 2021 and; 3. Bwambara Health centre III submitted on 22nd March 2021 <p>All the three submissions were before 31st March which was within the timeline and also conformed to the prescribed formats. The LG therefore scored maximum.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>The sampled Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>The submissions were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kebisoni Health center IV submitted on 30th June 2022 2. Bikulungu Health center III submitted on 30th July 2022 and; 3. Bwambara Health center III submitted on 30th July 2022 <p>The submissions however did not comply to the timeline submission by July 15th of the current FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines and therefore no score attained</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>The health facilities did not develop and report on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporated performance issues identified in assessment reports for the current financial year.</p> <p>There was no documentary evidence availed to the assessment team during the time of visit. This was presented in the exit meeting and documented on the exit form.</p> <p>The LG therefore scored zero</p>	0

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

• score 2 or else score 0

The health facilities submitted 100% up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter).

Monthly and quarterly reports for the 3 sampled health facilities of Kebisoni health center IV, Bikurungu health center III and Bwambara Health center III as evidenced below;

Bwambara health facility submitted as follows; 6th Aug, 5th Sept, 6th Oct, 4th Nov, 5th Dec, 6th Jan, 7th Feb, 7th March, 7th April, 5th May, 7th Jun and 6th July

Bikurungu health facility submitted as follows; 5th Aug, 2nd Sept, 4th Oct, 2nd Dec, 5th Jan, 7th Feb, 5th March, 6th April, 6th Mat, 4th Jun and 6th July

Kebisoni Health facility submitted as follows; 6th Aug, 6th Sept, 5th Oct, 5th Nov, 5th Dec, 5th Jan, 6th Feb, 7th Mar, 6th April, 6th May, 5th Jun and 6th July

The submissions of 3 facilities were timely of all monthly (12) and quarterly (4) reports for the previous FY thus scored maximum

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

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

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

The health facilities submitted 100% of the Results Based Financing (RBF) invoices but not timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter).

The submission of the consolidated invoice dated 23rd July 2022 as signed by the DHO and CAO indicated the 20 health facilities enrolled on RBF scheme.

The dates of submission however did not comply to the timelines as it was beyond 15th July hence scored zero.

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG verified and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all the 20 RBF Health Facilities.</p> <p>This was evidenced by the system generated invoice dated 23rd July 2022 at 10:51am this was past the 3rd week deadline thus the LG does not get a score.</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>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compile and submit all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports and status as follows;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="799 857 1334 1111"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date submitted</th> <th>Required Date of Submission</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q 1</td> <td>-30/10/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 2</td> <td>-24/01/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 3</td> <td>-27/04/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 4</td> <td>-26/08/2021</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The reports were not submitted within the one month deadline after the quarter.</p>	Date submitted	Required Date of Submission	Q 1	-30/10/2021	Q 2	-24/01/2022	Q 3	-27/04/2021	Q 4	-26/08/2021	0
Date submitted	Required Date of Submission													
Q 1	-30/10/2021													
Q 2	-24/01/2022													
Q 3	-27/04/2021													
Q 4	-26/08/2021													
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>The LG developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). This was evidenced from the PIP dated 28th June 2022 signed the DHO and approved by the CAO on 28th June 2022</p> <p>The PIP however did not incorporate plans for the weakest performing Health facilities</p>	0										

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.

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

The assessment team could not establish whether the LG implemented Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities as this was not incorporated in the PIP.

0

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

Human Resource Management and Development

7

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

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

The LG did not budget for health workers following guidelines / staffing norms. Under vote 550 on page 2, the LG budgeted for 450 staff instead of the 728 approved structure.

LG did not budget for health workers in accordance with the staffing norms hence scored zero.

0

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG did not deploy health workers as per guidelines as all the health facilities did not have at least 75% as staff required in accordance with the staffing norms.

The staff lists of the facilities against the staffing norms were;

1. Kasheshe III had 15 out of 17 =78%
2. Kebisoni IV had 39 out of 49=79.5%
3. Buyanja III had 17 out of 19=89.4%
4. Karuhembe III had 15 out of 19=78%
5. Kisizi III had 15 out of 19=78%
6. Nyakishenyi III had 17 out 19 =89.45%
7. Buhinda III had 18 out of 19=94%
8. Buhunga IV had 34 out of 49=69%
9. Nyakagyeme III had 17 out of 19=89%
10. Bugangani IV had 38 out of 49=77%
11. Bwambare III had 16 out of 19=84%
12. Rwenshama III had 12 out of 19=63% and;
13. Bikurungu III had 17 out of 19=89%

Buhunga=69% and Rwenshama HC III had 63% which did not make it to at least 75% as a requirement. The LG therefore scored 0

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health workers were working in health facilities where they were deployed.</p> <p>The reviewed Health workers' staff lists, facility attendance book/register (DHMT supervision/ monitoring reports; Automated Attendance Analysis (AAA) indicated that the health workers were working where they were deployed as reflected from the 3 sampled facilities below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At Kebisoni Health center IV, 39 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 39 staff list of June 2022 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility 2. At Bwambara Health center III, 16 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 16 staff list of 24th November 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit. 1. At Bikururngu Health center III, 17 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 17 staff list dated 21st March 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board <p>The LG was awarded a maximum score</p>	3
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had publicized health worker's deployment and disseminated as evidenced by the display of the list of deployed health workers on health facilities notice boards.</p> <p>The displayed lists indicated the name of the facility, name of the staff, cadre, and gender among others as they appeared on the deployment list from the DHO's office</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. At Kebisoni Health center IV, 39 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 39 staff list of June 2022 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility 3. At Bwambara Health center III, 16 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 16 staff list of 24th November 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit. 1. At Bikururngu Health center III, 17 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 17 staff list dated 21st March 2022 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board 	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

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

1. Mukisa Serunjogi Jimmy of Buhunga HC IV was appraised on 28/7/2022
2. Natukunda Emily of Byuanja HC III was appraised on 14/7/2021
3. Katushabe Peaxe of kashshe HC III was appraised on 1/8/2022]
4. Tucungwirwe Godfrey of Bikurungu HC III was appraised on 1/7/2022
5. Agaba Richard of Kisizi HC III was appraised on 28/7/2022
6. Kahigwa Josph of Rweshama HC III was appraised on 28/7/2022
7. Bagaba Gordon of Kamuhembe HC III was appraised on 30/8/2022
8. Tushabe Ohurura of Nyakagyeme HC III was appraised on 14/7/2022
9. Muhimbise Catherine of Masya HC II was appraised on 6/7/2022
10. Tusiimw Anibo of Nyakishenyi HC III was appraised on 22/7/2022

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that facility in charges conducted appraisals for health workers in the previous FY. A sample of 10 files of health workers was reviewed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baryomunsi Emmanuel a Senior Clinical officer was appraised on 28/7/2022 2. Shabomwe M. Assan a Senior Clinical officer was appraised on 30/7/2021 3. Ahabwe Onesmus Magezi a Senior Clinical officer was appraised on 28/7/2022 4. Kemigisha Scovet an Enrolled midwife was appraised on 29/9/2022 5. Mukudenta Kennth an Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 27/8/2022 6. Kyankunda Sylvia an Enrolled Nurse was appraised on 30/8/2022 7. Kanyesigye Priscilla an Enrolled Comprehensive Nurse was appraised on 4/8/2022 8. Akatukunda Shiphra a Clinical officer was appraised on 28/7/2022 9. Musinguzi Corinelious an Assistant Nursing officer was appraised on 12/8/2022 10. Mpime Boniface a Lab assistant was appraised on 20/7/2022 	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of corrective action by DHO based on appraisal reports</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District. These trainings included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training of Health workers on COVID 19 vaccination dated 9th Sept 2021 2. Frontline Field Epidemiology training dated 19th September 2021 3. Home based care training dated 28th September 2021 4. Training on Digital RBF systems dated 3rd February 2022. 5. PMTCT training dated 4th March 2022 6. Mental health training dated 21st March 2022 <p>The LG therefore scored maximum</p>	1
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG documented training activities in the training /CPD database. All the Health workers who underwent through any trainings were entered into the DHO's training book and in the system database.</p>	1
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The letter from the CAO notifying the MOH in writing of the list of facilities accessing the PHC NWR Grants (GoU and PNFP that received PHC NWR grants) was written confirming that all the facilities received PHC.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the letter dated 28th September 2022, Ref no CR.109/1 from the CAO to the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health.</p>	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Rukungiri LG PHC budget for FY 2020/21 was UGX. 1, 180,583,000 (ABPR, page, 21) and allocated, UGX. 73,391,000 (page,56) for monitoring and service delivery. This was 6.2% which met the requirement of 15% maximum.</p>	2										
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>													
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not timely warrant direct transfers to health facilities in accordance to the requirements of not more than 5 working days. Time taken;</p>	0										
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Q 1-9 days Q 2-12 days Q 3-21 days Q 4-17 days</p> <p>The warrants were made on the following dates;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="799 987 1350 1238"> <thead> <tr> <th>Notification of Expenditure Limits</th> <th>Warranted</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q 1 -06/07/2021</td> <td>15/07/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 2 -30/09/2021</td> <td>13/10/2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 3 -22/12/2021</td> <td>12/01/2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q 4 -04/04/2022</td> <td>21/04/2022</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Notification of Expenditure Limits	Warranted	Q 1 -06/07/2021	15/07/2021	Q 2 -30/09/2021	13/10/2021	Q 3 -22/12/2021	12/01/2022	Q 4 -04/04/2022	21/04/2022	
Notification of Expenditure Limits	Warranted													
Q 1 -06/07/2021	15/07/2021													
Q 2 -30/09/2021	13/10/2021													
Q 3 -22/12/2021	12/01/2022													
Q 4 -04/04/2022	21/04/2022													
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not invoice and communicate PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter.</p>	0										
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular was dated 06/07/2021, warranted by CAO on 15/07/2021 and the funds released to LLGs and facilities on 04/08/2021.</p> <p>For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30/09/2021, warranted by CAO on 13/10/2021 and released funds to LLGs and facilities on 20/10/2021.</p> <p>For Quarter 3, the MoFPED circular is dated 22/12/2021, warranted by CAO on 12/01/2022 and released funds to LLGs and facilities on 13/01/2022.</p> <p>For Quarter 4, MoFED circular is dated 04/04/2022, warranted by CAO on 21/04/2022 and released funds to LLGs and facilities on 26/04/2022.</p> <p>In all the four quarters, the transfer of PHC NWR grants was not effected within the 5 days deadline.</p>											

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Evidence that the LG publicized all the quarterly financial releases through noticeboard but did not release to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED. Time taken;

1 Q-8 days

Q 2- 6 days

Q 3-13 days

Q 4-7 days.

Notification of Cash release	Communicated
Q 1- 06/07/2021	14/07/2021
Q 2- 30/09/2021	06/10/2021
Q 3 -22/012/2021	04/01/2022
Q 4 -04/04/2022	11/04/2021

0

10

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

The LG health department implemented the actions recommended by the DHMT quarterly performance review meetings held during the previous FY.

This was evidenced from the implementation reports and quarterly review minutes below as required by the assessment procedure.

The evidenced quarterly review meeting minutes and implementation reports dated; 15th June 2022, 30th May 2022, 13th June 2022 and 30th April 2022

Recommendations noted from 13th June 2022 under minute 8/PRM/2022 included;

1. Improvement on uptake of IPT3 among pregnant women from 57.4% to 65%

2. Conduct support supervision to health facilities with low cure rate

3. Improve linkages among HIV positive infants from 75% to 100%

4. Send reminder messages to all health facilities to screen all patients at OPD for TB and report in HMIS 105

2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG performance review meetings involved all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs and key LG departments.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the attached attendances of the minutes of the meetings held on;</p> <p>13th June 2022 with 39 participants, 22nd February 2022 with 99 participants and 14th December 2021 with 31 participants</p> <p>The participants included Health facility In-charges, focal persons, JEPHEIGO, RHITES, JCRC project, EGPAF project DHT members and the DHO</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG supervised 100% of Hospitals and HC IVs at least once every quarter in the previous FY</p> <p>The Assessment Team reviewed the supervision reports for all the quarters for FY 2020/2021 and evidenced that 100% supervision was conducted as indicted below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. QTR 1 dated 2nd October 2021 2. QTR 2 dated 29th December 2021 3. QTR 3 dated 31st March 2022 and, 4. QTR 4 dated 21st June 2022. <p>Some of the recommendations included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensured supply of normal malaria channel graphs to all facilities. 2. Routine supply of vaccines from Bugangari health sub district to Rwengiri HC III 3. Aailed performance graphs and annual targets 	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>There was no evidence the health sub district carried out supervision of lower facilities in 2021/22. There are four sub districts in Rukungiri District. Kebisoni Supervised by Kebisoni HC IV, Rubabo supervised by Kisiizi Hospital, Rujumbura supervised by Nyakibaale HC IV and Bugangari supervised by Bugangari HC IV.</p> <p>There were supervisions reports for Rubabo, Kebisoni, and Bugangari health sub districts. Rujumbura reports were not in DHOs office. The missing reports of Rujumbura indicated that HSD supervision was not conducted 100%</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG used the results / reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits for the 4 quarters reviewed to make recommendations for specific corrective actions.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>This was evidenced from Health facility activity reports and Supervision Books from the three visited health facilities as indicated the following actions;</p>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The non-functionality of UNEPI fridges at Bwambara and Bikurungu to be followed up no. 2. To construct and restore toilets at Rwakabengo Health facility 3. To distribute normal malaria channel graphs in all the health facilities. 4. Avail annual performance graphs and targets in all the health facilities. 	
			<p>The support supervision books from the three visited health facilities of Bikurungu, Bwambara and Kebisoni also indicated the same recommendations and actions.</p>	
			<p>At Kebisoni HC IV, supervision was conducted from 3th August 2021 to 29th June 2022, at Bikurungu HC III, supervision was conducted from 14th September 2021 to 16th June 2022 and at Bwambara HC III, supervision was conducted from 6th July 2021 to 7th June 2022</p>	
			<p>The LG therefore scored maximum</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies in FY 2021/2022.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>These reports (M-SPARS) indicated that guidance was given to health facility in-charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies</p>	
			<p>This was evidenced from the Medicine Management and supervision and monitoring reports of 27th October 2021, 20th January 2022, 3rd February 2022, 2nd April 2022 and 4th July 2022.</p>	
			<p>Some of the recommended actions included;</p>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The In-Charges not to regularly rotate stores and ART service providers for a streamlined supply 2. Conducting regular CMEs for the stores persons 3. Ensure quality data and information management systems. 	
			<p>The LG scored maximum</p>	

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0	The LG DHOs health office budget was UGX. 73,391,000. The total amount allocated to health promotion and prevention activities was UGX. 40,000,000(ABPR-pages-61). This was a proportion of 54.5% which was more than 30% maximum.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	The DHT implemented the led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs were conducted during the previous FY.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		This was evidenced from the Health Promotion Activity reports and DHMT meeting minutes which established that implementation of health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in the previous FY were conducted.	
			The documentary evidence availed during the assessment time included reports of the conducted activities below;	
			The evidenced implementation reports included;	
			1. Sensitization and risk communication on COVID-19 report dated 6th July 2022	
			2. Radio talk shows report dated 31st May 2022	
			3. Condom distribution and dispenser report dated 24th May 2022	
			4. Child health days report dated 29th June 2022	
			The LG therefore scored maximum	

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	<p>The DHT followed up the actions taken by the DHT on health promotion and disease prevention from the Health promotion.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the Quarterly progress reports, DHT/ MHT minutes follow-up actions were taken on the health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization.</p> <p>Actions included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Controlled spread of Covid-19 as a result of mass awareness and sensitization radio talk shows 2. Community response towards child health days immunization 3. Increased uptake of male condoms and reduced new HIV infections 	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0	<p>There was no evidence the LG had updated asset register with details for each health facility and equipment relative to the medical equipment list and service standards.</p> <p>The evidenced asset registers was dated 30th June 2022, and arranged in the following categories: Transport Equipment to include cars and motorcycles, furniture and fittings, machinery, office equipment and ICT equipment. This asset register wasn't in the prescribed format.</p>	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p>	<p>The evidence showed the prioritized investments in the health sector were desk appraised and were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines, funding source, development grant and Discretionary Development Equalization Grant. The desk appraisals were discussed in the TPC meeting held on 16/12/2020.</p> <p>These were profiled in LG DP III, pages 207, AWP-page 57.</p> <p>Projects were appraised by; DHO, District Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment Officer and District Engineer.</p> <p>Projects appraised were.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partial renovation of 2-NO OPDS at Rushasha and Nyarwimuka in Nyakagyeme and Ruhinda respectively. 2. Renovation of laboratory and OPDS at Ruhinda and Kikarara in Ruhinda and Bwambara respectively. 3. Partial renovation of DHO'S office, drug store and construction of main entrance gate at Rwamahwa, Northern ward, Rukungiri municipality. 4. Construction of a 3-roomed kitchen for staff members, 3-stance bathroom and renovation of 3-roomed staff houses at Kisiizi, Nyarushanje. 	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else score 0		

5. Upgrade of Kasheshe HC11 to HC111 in Kasheshe, Nyakabungo, Buyanja.
6. Renovation of 2 NO staff houses at Kisiizi Nyarushaje.
7. Renovation of maternity wards and OPD blocks at Kisiizi, Nyarushaje.
8. Remodeling of former Buhunga S/C council hall into staff units at Buhunga .
9. Partial renovation of OPD and completion of staff house at Katonya and Ngoma respectively in Nyakishenyi subcounty.
10. Partial renovation of OPD and G/ward and construction of a lined 5-stance VIP latrine at Buyanja TC and Nyabitete respectively in Buyanja.
11. Construction of a chain link fence in Bugangari Rukungiri.
12. Construction of a staff houses in Karuhembe, Kebisoni.
13. Construction of a twin staff house at Karuhembe Health centre III in Kebisoni subcounty
14. Remodeling of former Buhunga SC Office block into staff quarters for Buhunga HC IV
15. Construction of chain link fence at Bugangari HC IV
16. Construction of chain link fence and gate keepers house at Kebisoni HC IV
17. Construction of chain link fence and gate keeper's house phase 1 at Bugangari HC IV
18. Construction of a Lined 4 stance VIP latrine at Buyanja Health centre III in Buyanja Town Council
19. Upgrade of Kasheshe HC II to HC III in Kasheshe in Buyanja sub county

12

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

The LG provided evidence it conducted field appraisals to check for technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability, and customized designs to site. These were profiled in the LG DP III, pages 207, AWP- page 57. The projects were appraised by; DHO, District Planner, DCDO, Senior Environment Officer 16/12/2020.

Appraised projects were;

1. Partial renovation of 2-NO OPDS at Rushasha and Nyarwimuka in Nyakagyeme and Ruhinda respectively.
2. Renovation of laboratory and OPDS at Ruhinda and Kikarara in Ruhinda and Bwambara respectively.
3. Partial renovation of DHO'S office, drug store and construction of main entrance gate at Rwamahwa, Northern ward, Rukungiri municipality.
4. Construction of a 3-roomed kitchen for staff

1

members, 3-stance bathroom and renovation of 3-roomed staff houses at Kisiizi, Nyarushanje.

5. Upgrade of Kasheshe HC11 to HC 111 in Kasheshe, Nyakabungo, Buyanja.

6. Renovation of 2 NO staff houses at Kisiizi Nyarushaje.

7. Renovation of maternity wards and OPD blocks at Kisiizi, Nyarushaje.

8. Remodeling of former Buhunga S/C council hall into staff units at Buhunga .

9. Partial renovation of OPD and completion of staff house at Katonya and Ngoma respectively in Nyakishenyi subcounty.

10. Partial renovation of OPD and G/ward and construction of a lined 5-stance VIP latrine at Buyanja TC and Nyabitete respectively in Buyanja.

11. Construction of a chain link fence in Bugangari Rukungiri.

12. Construction of a staff houses in Karuhembe, Kebisoni.

13. Construction of a twin staff house at Karuhembe Health centre III in Kebisoni subcounty

14. Remodeling of former Buhunga SC Office block into staff quarters for Buhunga HC IV

15. Construction of chain link fence at Bugangari HC IV

16. Construction of chain link fence and gate keepers house at Kebisoni HC IV

17. Construction of chain link fence and gate keeper's house phase 1 at Bugangari HC IV

18. Construction of a Lined 4 stance VIP latrine at Buyanja Health centre III in Buyanja Town Council

19. Upgrade of Kasheshe HC II to HC III in Kasheshe in Buyanja sub county

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 that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist ;</p> <p>Partial renovation of DHO's office , drug store, construction of main entrance gate was screened on 21/06/2021 with ESMPs costed at UGX: 890,000 dated 22/06/2021.</p> <p>Renovation of maternity ward, OPD building at Kisizi HC III was screened on 22/06/2021 with ESMPs costed at UGX: 890,000 dated 22/06/2021.</p> <p>Construction of a lined stance VIP latrine with urinal and screen walling at Karushonga HC III was screened on 21/06/2021 with ESMPs costed at UGX: 890,000 dated 22/06/2021.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Submission was made on 14th/April/2022</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The LG Health department submitted request form (Form PP1) to PDU for construction of a lined 4-stance pit latrine and two bathrooms at a cost of UGX 29,125,421/= on 11th/November/2022. This was beyond 1st quarter of FY 2022/2023. This gap was presented and captured in the Exit report signed by the LG and consultancy firm representatives.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for FY 2021/2022 were approved by contracts committee. Review of District Contracts Committee meeting minutes dated 8th/03/2022 under minute number MIN 87/09/DCC/2021/2022 the committee approved evaluation report and awarded contract of renovation of Maternity ward and OPD building at Kisizi HCIII in Nyarushaje Sub-County to M/S Talented Engineering and Supplies at a contract price of UGX 31,173,200/=</p> <p>The contracts committee approved the contract for the construction of staff house at Karuhembe HC during the sitting held on 21st/02/2022 under minute number MIN:80/48/DCC/2021/2022. Contract was awarded to M/S Kinombe Nyaruzinga at contract price of UGX 149,503,168/=</p> <p>The construction of a lined 2-stance latrine at Nyabitende was approved in a meeting held on 14th/01/2022 under minute number MIN:63/05/DCC/2021-2022. Contract was awarded to M/S Ndere Investments Ltd at contract sum of UGX 42,321,800/= . All the sampled contracts did not require approval by Solicitor General</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The established project implementation team as per presented appointment letter from office of the CAO dated 2nd/07/2021 for health projects included Project Manager, Environment officer, District Health Officer and District Community Development Officer. Composition missed out Clerk of Works as required by the guidelines</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>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>This particular indicator was tagged to Health Centre upgrade. Rukungiri District LG was not allocated facility upgrade in the FY under review.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Clerk of Works mentioned daily records. The LG did not have a Clerk of Works in the period under review.</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>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>This specific indicator was applicable for health centre upgrades. In the FY under review the LG was not allocated such projects</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Reviewed was supervision report dated 10th/05/2022 compiled by the project manager. Under civil works, sub-structure works, reinforcement concrete frame and walling was reported complete. The Environment Officer and CDO equally supervised the project and reported compliance by the contractor.</p> <p>Supervision report for construction of Maternity ward/OPD Building at Kisizi HC III in Nyanshange Sub-County dated 13th/06/2022. There was evidence of supervision by CDO and Environment Officers. Where environmental and social issues in the BoQs were reported adhered to.</p> <p>Dated 21st/03/2022 was a supervision report for construction of VIP latrine with urinal. In the report it was pointed out that the contractor adhered to the technical specifications. All accumulated debris were removed, and creeping grass planted to meet environmental concerns.</p>	1

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The LG showed DHO , District Engineer, DCDO, Senior Environment Officer, verified works and initiated payments of contractors but were not within the specified timeframe of 14 days.

The LG showed the, verified works and initiated payments of contractors.

The sample of payments were;

1. Fencing of Bugangari Health Centre IV Phase II. Requisitioned for funds on 20/06/2022. Certified works on 20/06/2022. Paid on 29/06/2022 by EFT.44461227, UGX. 2,376,483.

2. Payment for Remodeling of former S/C Admin Block into Buhunga HC IV Staff Qtrs. Requisitioned on 20/02/2022. Certified works on 22/02/2022. Paid on 07/05/2022 by EFT.43162351, UGX.13, 463,836.

3. Construction of A 3-Roomed Kitchen for Staff, 3 Stance Bathroom and 3-roomed Staff Quarter at Kisiizi HC III. Requisitioned for funds on 06/06/2022. Certified by works on 14/06/2022. Paid on 22/06/222 by EFT.44461193, UGX. 43,227,733.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with records as required by PPDA law. The construction of staff house at Karuhamba, lined 2-stance latrine at Nyabitete HCII on 18th/11/2021 and Renovation of OPD at Kisizi HCIII had procurement requisition duly signed by relevant officers 14th/11/2021. On file there was evidence of approval of procurement method (Selective bidding), bidding documents and Technical Evaluation Team by contracts committee for renovation of OPD at Kisizi HCIII in meeting of 14th/02/2022 under minute number MIN:69/06/DCC/2021-22

In a meeting of 2nd/12/2021 under minute number MIN:48/09/DCC/2021-22 the contracts committee approved for construction of OPD and General Ward using selective bidding.

In a meeting held on 14th/01/2022 the contracts committee under minute number MIN:62/02/DCC/2021-22 Open National bidding was approved for the construction of staff house at Karuhembe HC III

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence adduced to show that grievances under Health had been recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework .</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not issue guidelines on medical waste management and followed up on the implementation of the health care waste management guidelines by HCs. There was no documentary evidence availed to the assessment team indicating dissemination of the guidelines to the health facility In-Charges.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management and a central infrastructure for managing medical waste. Green label services limited was the service provider managing medical waste. This was evidenced from the contract letter dated 23rd November 2017 and the resumption letter dated 27th October 2019.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had conducted trainings and created awareness in healthcare waste management. This was evidenced from the Health care waste management training report dated 4th May 2022.</p>	1

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	<p>There was evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY;</p> <p>Partial renovation of DHO's office , drug store, construction of the main entrance gate had its BOQ an ESMP costed at UGX: 510,000.</p> <p>Construction of a lined VIP latrine with urinal and screen walling at Karushonga HC II had its BOQ an ESMP costed at UGX: 359,700.</p>	2
	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	There was no evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has 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.	<p>Evidence was availed to show that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provide monthly reports;</p> <p>Partial renovation of DHO's office , drug store, construction of the main entrance gate had monitoring reports dated 28/03/2022, 28/04/2022 and 28/06/2022</p> <p>Construction of a lined VIP latrine with urinal and screen walling at Karushonga HC II had monitoring reports dated 28/03/2022, 28/04/2022 and 28/06/2022.</p> <p>Renovation of maternity ward ,OPD building at Kisizi HC III had monitoring reports dated 28/03/2022, 28/04/2022 and 28/06/2022</p>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

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

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;

Partial renovation of DHO's office , drug store, construction of the main entrance gate had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

Construction of a lined VIP latrine with urinal and screen walling at Karushonga HCII had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

Renovation of maternity ward ,OPD building at Kisizi HCIII had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 22/06/2022.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	From the Ministry MIS for current FY, the % of rural water sources that are functional is 86%.	1
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	From the Ministry MIS for current FY, the % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs) is 89%.	1
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	N/A.	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on</i>	b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY. o If 100 % of water projects	From AWP 2021/2022 FY and the 4th quarter progress report, the list of projects planned and constructed were as follows: A. Construction of a public latrine at a budget of UGX 45,000,000/= in Nyarushanje S/C, Ibanda parish, Ibanda cell. B. 3No., Medium spring protection planned and	0

this performance measure

are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

constructed, of which 2No., were in Bwambara S/C, Kahimbi cell, and Katunguru cell respectively. The third one was planned and constructed in Kihengamo village, Buyanja S/C. The total budget for the 3 was UGX 21,000,000/= according to the AWP.

C. Construction of piped water supply system (GFS), in Kateramo village, Kikongi parish, Bwambara S/C at a budget of UGX 245,091,000/=.

D. 10No. Borehole rehabilitation were planned and constructed at a budget of UGX 69,000,000/= according to the AWP.

Note: From the 4th quarter report, the district had planned to rehabilitate 10 boreholes but due to the difference in quotations by the contractors, the district made a saving and was able to rehabilitate additional 2 boreholes. In total 6 boreholes and 6 shallow wells were constructed in the following sub-counties:

1. Rusoroza village –Rwerere T/C
2. Rwengyerero village – Bugangari S/C
3. Kyabugashe village – Nyakagyeme S/C
4. Kahoro village – Bugangari S/C
5. Nyakabungo village – Bwambara S/C.
6. Nyarurara village – Buyanja S/C
7. Rwentuha village – Buyanja S/C
8. Buguma village – Buyanja S/C
9. Kafujo village – Bwambara S/C
10. Nyakatembe village – Bwambara S/C
11. Nyakabungo village – Bwambara S/C
12. Kahimbi village – Bwambara S/C

E. Promoting domestic rainwater harvesting to increase safe water coverage in Bwambara S/C at a budget of UGX 33,000,000/=.

All projects were completed 100%.

From the MIS for the previous FY, the district average access was 85%.

Access by sub-county, according to the MIS previous FY records, stood as follows:

1. Buyanja, 95%
2. Kebisoni, 95%
3. Nyakishenyi, 95%
4. **Nyarushanje, 82%**
5. Bugangari, 95%
6. Buhunga, 95%
7. Bwambara, 86%
8. Nyakagyeme, 95%
9. Ruhinda, 95%
10. Eastern DIV, 95%
11. Southern DIV, 95%
12. Western DIV, 95%

Only one (1) sub-county with safe water coverage below that of the district average had projects implemented in the previous FY. The total number of projects implemented in the district in the previous FY was 18. Out of 18 projects, only 1 project was built in Nyarushanje sub-county with water access below the district average representing 5.56%.

Conclusion

Fail.

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

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

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

The three (03) WSS contracts reviewed were as follows:

A. Construction of Kateramo water supply system.

- Contractor was SBR general supply and construction ltd, P.O. Box 249, Rukungiri, Plot 29, independence road,
- Contract sum: UGX 220,202,591 /=-.
- The annual budget for this project was UGX 221,091,000/=-.
- **Therefore, the variation was -0.402%.**

B. Construction of a 3 –stances VIP toilet with changing room for girls at Ibanda P/S in Nyarushanje sub-county.

- Contractor: Ndere investments limited, P.O.Box 2929 Kampala,
- Contract sum: UGX 44,998,112/=-
- The annual budget for this project was UGX 45,000,000/=-.
- **Therefore, the variation was -0.004%.**

C. Spring protection at Kihigamo, Nyakitunguru, and Kihimbi in Buyanja and Bwambara S/C respectively.

- Contractor: OWIT Technical Services Limited, P.O.BOX 25568 Kampala.
- Contract sum: UGX 19,133,500/=-.
- The total budget for the 3 was UGX 21,000,000/=- according to the AWP.
- **Therefore, the variation was -8.89%.**

Conclusion

Pass. All variations are within +/-20% of engineer's estimates.

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

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

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

From a review of the annual budget performance report, 100% of WSS infrastructure projects were completed as per annual work plan by end of the 2021/2022 FY.

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>From the Ministry MIS, the functionality of water facilities for previous FY but one was 86% and that of the previous FY was 86%. There was no percentage increase in functionality of water supply facilities.</p>	0
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>From the Ministry MI, the functionality WSCs for previous FY but one was 89% and the functionality of WSC for the previous FY was 89%. There was no percentage increase on functionality of WSCs.</p>	0
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>From the DWO, the annual performance report for previous FY was reviewed and the list of constructed WSS facilities obtained.</p> <p>Three (03) WSS facilities were sampled and visited. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rwakirungura COU Borehole in Buyanja S/C. 2. Kihegamo protected spring, Buyanja S/C. 3. Karuhembe rainwater harvesting tanks, in Bwambara S/C 	3
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Findings

WSS facilities were constructed and are functional as reported in the annual performance report for previous FY

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>From a review of the quarterly WSS reports, there was 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.</p>	2
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was 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.</p> <p><i>Evidence of filling forms 1 and 4 was availed.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fourth quarter filled forms were submitted to ministry of water and environment (MWE) on 14/7/2022, forms 1 and 4 included in the submission. 2. Third quarter filled forms were submitted to MWE on 13/04/2022, form 4s only. 3. Second quarter filled forms were submitted to MWE on 14/01/2022, form 4s only. 4. First quarter filled forms were submitted to MWE on 14/10/2021, form 4s only. 	3
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Conclusion

Satisfactory.

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

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District Water Officer budgeted for critical staff (Water officer, Assistant Engineering officer and Assistant water officer for mobilization) to a tune of 38,566,000/=for the current financial year. (LG approved budget estimates, 2022/23, vote 924</p>	2
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District Natural Resources Officer budgeted for critical staff (District Natural Resources officer, Senior Environment officer, Assistant Forest officer, Senior Land management officer and Physical planner) to a tune of 84,997,800/- for the next financial year. (LG approved budget estimates 22/23, Vote 924</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>There was evidence that the District Water officer staff were appraised during the previous FY.</p> <p>1. Civil Engineer Nsamba Best Henry was appraised on 12/7/2022</p> <p>2. Borehole Maintenance officer Kobusheshe Martin was appraised on 22/8/2022</p> <p>3. Water mobilisation officer Tumusiime Kate was appraised on 2/8/2022</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 to show that the DWO submitted staff capacity needs to the PHRO as per district training plans</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The projects planned in the current AWP and budget for 2022/2023 FY are as follows:

A. Construction of public latrines in RGCs at a budget of **UGX 45,000,000/= planned in Ruhinda S/C, Rwamugoma parish, Nyakanyinya village.**

B. Spring protection in Kabaranga village, Murama parish, **Nyakishenyi S/C, at a budget of UGX 5,000,217/=.**

C. Construction of piped water supply (GFS), Kateramo phase II, - (**UgiFT funder**), **at a budget of UGX 141,757,826/=, Kateramo village, Kikongi parish, Bwambara S/C.**

Construction of piped water supply (GFS) – Kateramo pahse II, (**DWSCG fund**), **at a budget of UGX 163,242,174/=, Kateramo village, Kikongi parish, Bwambara S/C.**

D. Borehole rehabilitation, 3No., **at a budget of UGX 22,190,000/=.**

1. 1No. in Nyakibare parish, eastern division, **Rukungiri municipality.**
2. 1No. in Mabanga primary school in **Kebisoni S/C.**
3. 1No. Nyamambo shallow well in **Kebisoni T/C.**

E. Rainwater harvesting tank at a budget of **UGX 5,000,000/=** at Nyakishenyi seed school, in **Nyakishenyi S/C.**

A total of seven (07) projects are planned for implementation in the current AWP 2022/2023.

The district rural average access to water is 92% for the current FY.

Access to water by sub-county:

1. Bugangari, 95%
2. Buhunga, 95%
3. **Bwambara, 86%**
4. Buyanja NWSC
5. Eastern DIV NWSC
6. Kebisoni NWSC
7. Nyakagyeme NWSC
8. Nyakishenyi, 95%
9. **Nyarushanje, 82%**
10. Ruhinda, 95%
11. Southern DIV NWSC
12. Western DIV NWSC

Only two (2) sub-counties have access to water below the district average. The total budget for all projects is UGX 240,432,391/= excluding UgiFT funds. With UgiFT funds, it is UGX 382,190,217/=.

Based on **DWSCG funding**, the percentage of the budget allocated to projects in sub-counties whose access to water is below the district average is thus 69.97%, i.e., UGX 168,242,391.00/=.

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO Communicated to the LLGs the projects to be constructed in the Current FY as follows:

1. A letter from CAO dated 1st November addressed to the Senior Assistant Secretary, Ruhinda Sub-County and titled construction of a water borne toilet informs the sub-county of the planned project in their area.
2. A letter from the Senior Civil Engineer Dated 1st July addressed to the Bwambara Sub-County chief and titled construction of Kateramo Water project Phase II informs the sub-county of the planned continued implementation of the water supply system.
3. A letter from the Senior Civil Engineer dated 1st July addressed to the Nyakishenyi Sub-County Chief and titled construction of a medium protected spring informs the Sub-County of the planned project implementation in their sub-county.

The DWO displays the information on their notice boards.

3

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

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

The district has over 2197 different types of water points.

1. Protected springs are 1236
2. Shallow wells are 86
3. Deep boreholes are 61
4. Rainwater harvesting tanks are 254
5. Public tap stands are 434
6. Institutional connections are 126.

The DWO presented a monitoring report which lacked in completeness. **The DWO claimed to have monitored about 500 water points but not in each quarter which was less than the 80% to warrant a score.** No satisfactory monitoring plan and associated reports were presented to back this monitoring.

0

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>DWSCC meeting minutes were availed. The dates were captured as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fourth quarter DWSCC meeting was held on 15/June/2022. 2. Third quarter DWSCC meeting held on 6/04/2022. 3. Second quarter DWSCC meeting was held on 22/12/2021. 4. First quarter DWSCC meeting was held on 21/9/2021. <p>From the second quarter DWSCC meeting, under Min: 11/CCM/2021/22:</p> <p><i>The DWO forwarded issues raised from the extension workers' meeting. It was agreed that the community sensitization meetings be continuous in areas where wetland restoration is being done.</i></p> <p>Under Min: 13/CCM/2021/22, matters arising, discussion and way forward:</p> <p><i>Item (d): Communities should be sensitized to own projects in their communities.</i></p> <p>From the AWP, 2022/2023,</p> <p><i>Item (6), Software (6.10), follow up for O&M, behavior change, and environmental issues was budgeted for UGX 3,788,800/=</i></p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Satisfactory</p>	2
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO publicized budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties. Through the letter dated 8th July 2022 displayed at noticeboards, the DWO publicised the budget allocations per source.</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The NWR budget for the previous FY was UGX 79,282,458/=, out of which mobilization activities took UGX 59,662,458/=. This represented 75.25% of the NWR budget which was significantly above the minimum 40% required as per sector guidelines.</p>	3

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.	Evidence was availed that WSCs were established and trained. A report dated 22/02/2022 outlined the WSCs that were established and trained. Three WSCs were sampled as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kahimbi cell (1), Bwambara S/C - spring well protection. 2. Nyakatunguru spring, Kikonji parish, Bwambara S/C – spring well protection. 3. Kihigamo spring in Rubanga, Buyanja S/C – spring well protection. 	3
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Training content

1. Roles of beneficiary communities which included paying water user fees, holding monthly meetings, fixing community days for cleaning, and having a register of users, among others.
2. Preventive maintenance mechanisms
3. Reporting problems/faults to the authorities.

Investment Management

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0	A detailed up-to-date asset register was availed.	4
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	----------

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:

Score 4 or else score 0.

Evidence was provided which showed the, LG DWO, District Engineer, Senior Environment Officer conducted desk appraisals for all WSS projects for FY 2022/2023. The prioritized investments were profiled in the LG DP III and in the approved AWP. The plans are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines. The projects were appraised by, DWO, District Engineer, Senior Environment Officer and DCDO on 16/12/2020.

The projects were.

1. Construction of Kabisha GFS in Kitumba S/C.
2. Construction of Phase II Rusisiro GFS in Butanda S/C
3. Construction of Katere GFS in Kaharo S/C
4. Rehabilitation of four boreholes and shallow wells in Kebisoni town council.
5. Construction of waterborne toilet at Nyakanyinya-Ruhinda S/C.
6. Construction of spring in Nyakishenyi- S/C.
7. Constructions of Kateramo phase two, in Bwambara sub county.
8. Sealing of leakages in rain water, gutter, and cleaning of external cladding/glass and window in Northern ward, Rukungiri municipality.
9. Construction of a water borne toilet at Ibanda p/school in Ibanda Nyarushaje.
10. Spring protection in Rushinya Burama Bugangari.
11. Spring protection in Nyamitooma western ward, Bikurungu town council.
12. Supply and installation of tanks at Karuhembe HC 111 in Ruyedwa Karuhembe, Kebisoni.
13. Spring protection in Rwesigiro Kikarara Bwambara.
14. Construction of Kateramo water supply in Kikongi Bwambara.
15. Spring protection in Kihengamo , Rubanga, Buyanja

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2

Application files were availed

1. Letter dated 29th April 2022 by the school head teacher requested to construct a latrine at the school. The letter was signed and stamped by the head teacher and addressed to the DWO.
2. Letter dated 23rd April 2021, the chairperson LC1 Kateramo village applied for a gravity flow scheme (GFS) construction. The letter was addressed to DWO and signed and stamped on 23rd April 2021.
3. Letter dated 29th April 2022, from Kakibanga 'A' cell, southern ward Kebisoni T/C, chairperson LC1, Kakibanga 'A' cell and beneficiary community members applied to rehabilitate Nyamambo shallow well in Kebisoni T/C. The letter was signed and stamped by LC1 chairperson.
4. Letter dated 25th August 2021, from chairperson LC1 Nangaro cell and chairperson LCII, Murama parish, applied to CAO Rukungiri district through the S/C chief, for the rehabilitation of Kakongozo water spring. The letter was signed and stamped by both chairpersons.
5. RWH-Tank to seed secondary school is a guideline from ministry of water and environment to provide water to every seed school.
6. Nyakagando cell B, Mabanga parish, Kebisoni S/C, Rugabe – Rukungiri Chairman LC1 and beneficiary communities/water users with all contacts attached applied to DWO for borehole rehabilitation, through health inspector, letter dated 15/8/2021. The letter was signed and stamped by chairperson. The source name is Mabanga P/S borehole.
7. Senior health inspector, office of public health, Rukungiri municipal council, applied for a borehole rehabilitation. Borehole name: Omukarere borehole (Nyakibare). The letter was dated 11/04/2022. It was signed and stamped and addressed to DWO.

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>Evidence was provided that the LG DWO, Senior Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer conducted field appraisal to check technical feasibility, environmental social acceptability and customized designs for Water Supply and Sanitation Services projects. The field appraisal was carried out as per reports dated 13/12/2020, 14/12/2020 and 15/12/2021.</p> <p>The projects to be implemented are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitation of four boreholes and shallow wells at Kebisoni TC 2. Construction of waterborne toilet at Nyakanyinya-Ruhinda S/C. 3. Construction of spring in Nyakishenyi- S/C. 4. Construction of Kateramo phase two, in Bwambara sub county. 5. Sealing of leakages in rain water, gutter, and cleaning of external cladding/glass and window in northern ward Rukungiri municipality. 6. Construction of a water borne toilet at ibanda p/school in Ibanda Nyarushaje. 7. Spring protection in Rushinya Burama Bugangari. 8. Spring protection in Nyamitooma western ward, Bikurungu town council. 9. Supply and installation of tanks at Karuhembe HC 111 in Rugyedwa Karuhembe, Kebisoni. 10. Spring protection in Rwesigiro kikarara Bwambara. 11. Construction of Kateramo water supply in Kikongi Bwambara. 12. Spring protection in Kihengamo , Rubanga , Buyanja. 	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>While the water projects for the previous FY were screened for environmental and social impacts and ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction, costed ESMPs were not incorporated into the BOQs.</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>The LG had incorporated water infrastructure investments in the approved procurement plan. Review of Rukungiri District LG Consolidated Procurement and Disposal Plan FY 2021/2022 water investment projects were incorporated. For example, capture was the implementation of Kateramo Mini Solar Power Water Supply System Phase I at 245,091,000/=, Rehabilitation of Boreholes at UGX 69,000,000/=, Construction of Public Latrines at UGX 45,000,000/=, Protected springs at UGX 2,000,000/= and Construction of Rainwater Harvesting Tanks at UGX 33,000,000/=</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 proof that the contracts committee approved water supply and public sanitation infrastructure projects for FY 2021/2022. For instance, in the 10th DCC meeting held on 14th/02/2022 under minute number MIN:69/07/DCC/2021-22 approved the rehabilitation of boreholes and 7 shallow wells.</p> <p>The contracts committee as well approved evaluation report under minute number MIN:55/03/DCC/2021-22 for construction of Kateramo Water Supply System to M/S SBR General supply and construction Ltd at contract price of UGX 220,202.598/=.</p> <p>There was evidence that the contract signed between Rukungiri District LG and M/S SBR General Supply and Construction Ltd was cleared by Solicitor General as per reviewed letter dated 3rd/01/2022 Ref.DLAS/MBR/072/2022 addressed to CAO giving clearance for contract signing.</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>Dated 2nd/07/2021 Ref.No.105/5 was a letter from Management Support Services appointing the Project Manager, Environment Officer, District Water Officer and Labour Officer as members of the Project Implementation Team for Water Supply and Sanitation Investment Projects. However, composition of the team lacked inclusion of Clerk of Works as required by the guidelines.</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>Three (03) WSS facilities were sampled and visited. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rwakirungura COU Borehole in Buyanja S/C. 2. Kihigamo protected spring, Buyanja S/C. 3. Karuhembe rainwater harvesting tanks, in Bwambara S/C. <p>All WSS infrastructure were constructed as per the technical design specifications.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>Presented as evidence was supervision report dated 11th/04/2022 for rehabilitation of water facilities/boreholes and shallow wells in FY 2021/2022. The report pointed out that the contract executed works as per technical specifications, facilities reported functional and in use. The Environment and Community Development Officers equally supervised the project as per Environmental and Social report dated 24th/11/2021 presented. All environment mitigation measures were reported implemented and compliance ensured.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>Field supervision report for construction of Kateramo water supply phase I in Kikongi, Bwambara Sub-County. The report was dated 29th/04/2022. The project had a number of supervision and inspection reports indicating progress in terms of percentage completion. Equally reviewed was environment and social reports compiled by Environment Officer and CDO dated 8th/06/2022 confirming adherence and conformity to measures in BoQs</p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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>The DWO, District Engineer, CDCO, and Senior Environment verified works and initiated payments of contractors and was within specified timeframes in the contracts.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0</p>	<p>1. Construction of Kateramo GFS Phase I by SBR General Supply and Construction Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021/2022/000183. Requisitioned for funds on 02/05/2022. Certified the works on 05/05/2022. Paid on 08/06/2022 by EFT.343821886, UGX.214,599,761.</p> <p>2. Supply and Installation of Water Tanks by Daikam Technologies Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021/2022/00038. Requisitioned for funds on 11/04/2022. Certified the works on 12/04/2022. Paid on 12/05/2022 by EFT. 43275718, UGX. 46,820,250.</p> <p>3. Springs Protection by Owit Technical Services Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021/2022/00036. Requisitioned for funds on 16/05/2022. Certified the works on 16/05/2022. Paid on 30/05/2022 by EFT. 43729579, UGX. 18,034,325.</p>	

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2, If not score 0

The was evidence of complete procurement files for water and sanitation investment projects for FY 2021/2022. Reviewed was contracts committee decision of 7th DCC meeting held on 2nd/12/2021 under minute MIN:48/05/DCC/2020-22 the contracts committee approved Open National Bidding as a procurement method, UGX 100,000/= as non-refundable cost of bid documents, Technical Evaluation Committee and evaluation methodology for the construction of Kateramo Solar Powered Water Supply System. For the rehabilitation of boreholes, the contracts committee approved in its 10th meeting held on 14th/02/2022 under minute number MIN:69/07/DCC/2021-22 (selective bidding method, shortlisted firms UGX 50,000/= non-refundable bid fee and Technical Evaluation Committee were approved). For the supply and installation of Rainwater Harvesting Systems the contracts committee approved selective National bidding, evaluation team and bidding documents in a meeting held on 23rd/08/2021 under minute number MIN:19/06/DCC/2021-22

Evaluation report dated 8th/12/2021 for construction of solar powered system was reviewed on file. The evaluation report was approved by contracts committee under MIN:55/03/DCC/2021-22 in the 8th sitting held on 10th/12/2021. The report recommended M/S SBR General Supply and Construction Co. Ltd. For Rainwater Harvesting System the evaluation report was dated 22nd/09/2021 and approved by contracts committee on 27th/09/2021 under minute number MIN:27/05/DCC/2021-22. In the 12th sitting of the contracts committee held on 8th/03/2022 under minute number MIN:87/06/DCC/2021-22 the evaluation report for rehabilitation of RWHTs was approved.

On file was contract agreements signed between the Local Government and Contractors including agreement signed between Rukungiri District LG and M/S SBR General Supply and Construction Co.Ltd signed on 24th/01/2022. Contract cleared by Solicitor General as required by PPDA law

Rehabilitation of Boreholes, contract signed between LG and ITRACK Services Ltd on 22nd/03/2022 at UGX 49,885,000/=

Contract agreement signed between LG and M/S Daikam Technologies Ltd at contract sum of UGX 34,807,540/= for Rainwater Harvesting systems.

Environment and Social Requirements

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

Maximum 3 points this performance measure

Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:

Score 3, If not score 0

There was no evidence 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.

14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:	The DWO and the Environment Officer disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs as per the meeting minutes dated 15/07/2021 under which agenda 9 was dissemination of guidelines to the CDOs. In the same vein a distribution list to the agenda item was attached.	3
		Score 3, If not score 0		
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented:	Rukungiri DLG provided evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented as per the plan prepared and signed by the senior environment Officer and Senior Community Development Officer dated 29/07/2021. A further review of the performance reports and field visits affirmed that the plans had been implemented as planned.	3
		Score 3, If not score 0		
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:	<p><i>Evidence that all WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g., a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances was availed. These were captured as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public latrine built on untitled government land – in Nyarushanje S/C. Note: The head teacher Ibanda P/S consented to construct a latrine/water borne at the school on 10/3/2022. The letter was signed and stamped by the head teacher, Mr Niwamanya Rogers. 2. Spring protection, Nyakatunguru water source, Bwambara S/C, letter was dated 26/03/22. Kyomukama Evas consented to donate land to community and Muhumuza JB/Chairman LC1, sub-county chief, and DWO, all witnessed. 3. Kihigamo spring, Buyanja S/C Kyohairwe Zamudah Aminah consented to donate land The witnesses were chairperson LC1, Sub-county chief, and DWO. The letter was dated 29/03/2022. 4. Kahimbe spring, in Bwambara S/C, Mugamando Toffir, signed a consent on 30/3/2022, witnessed by chairperson LC 1, Sub-county chief and DWO. The letter was dated 30/03/2022. 5. Kateramo village, Kikongi parish, Bwambara S/C. The landowner Mr Ngabirano Venasio entered into an agreement with the community. The community was represented by chairperson project implementation committee, Mr Geoffrey Tumworobore. The letter was dated 7/09/2022, and consideration amount of UGX 1,500,000/= was paid for the land. The land was bought for the water source, and the agreement was stamped and signed by the LC1 chairperson, John Tumushabe on 7th September 2022. 	3
		Score 3, If not score 0		

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	<p>There was evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Kateramo GFS Phase I by SBR General Supply and Construction Ltd. UKU550/WRKS/2021/2022/000183. Requisitioned for funds on 02/05/2022. Certified the works on 05/05/2022. Paid on 08/06/2022 by EFT.343821886, UGX.214,599,761. 2. Supply and Installation of Water Tanks by Daikam Technologies Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021/2022/00038. Requisitioned for funds on 11/04/2022. Certified the works on 12/04/2022. Paid on 12/05/2022 by EFT. 43275718, UGX. 46,820,250. 3. Springs Protection by Owit Technical Services Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021/2022/00036. Requisitioned for funds on 16/05/2022. Certified the works on 16/05/2022. Paid on 30/05/2022 by EFT. 43729579, UGX. 18,034,325. 	2
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	<p>The CDO and environment officer undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and prepared monthly reports,</p> <p>Upgrading of ECOSAN toilet to water borne toilet , construction of septic tank and raised reservoir at the district headquarters had monitoring reports dated 28/04/2022, 28/03/2022 and 08/06/2022.</p> <p>Construction of Kateremo water supply system had monitoring reports dated 28/04/2022, 28/03/2022 and 08/06/2022.</p> <p>Construction of 3 stance toilet with changing room for girls at Ibanda primary school had monitoring reports dated 28/04/2022, 28/03/2022 and 08/06/2022.</p>	2

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per a report titled “Cumulative data on irrigated land for FYs 2020/2021 and 2021/2022” dated 5th July 2022, in FY 2020/2021 there was a total of 63 acres of land under irrigation. 3 acres was under micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries while 60 acres under micro-scale irrigation non-beneficiaries. As per the same report in FY 2021/2022, there was 165 acres of land under irrigation. 105 acres was under micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and 60 acres under non-beneficiaries.</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>As per the report titled “Cumulative data on irrigated land for FYs 2020/2021 and 2021/2022” dated 5th July 2022, in FY 2020/2021 there was 63 acres of land under irrigation. Also in FY 2021/2022 there was 165 acres of land under irrigation. Therefore increased acreage in newly irrigated land was 102, hence over 5% increase.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation Budget performance report for previous FY, 75% of the total funds received (1,166,054,962/-) was 874,541,222/- which was used for procurement and installation of irrigation equipment within the previous FY.</p>	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Rukungiri LG provided evidence the approved farmers signed Acceptance Forms confirming that equipment were working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers.	1
	Maximum score 6		<p>Sampled suppliers were.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply of Micro-scale Irrigation by Sprinktech Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021-22/00020/41.UGX. 23,459,300. 2. Supply of Micro-scale Irrigation by Kaftech Investments Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021-2022/00056/04.UGX. 23,655,000. 3. Supply of Micro-scale Irrigation by Kaftech Investments Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021-2022/00013/03 LOT2, UGX. 21,964,000. 	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	As per the supplier contracts and quotes, and as per the Agricultural engineers cost estimates, the cost of installing the following irrigation sites were as follows;	0
	Maximum score 6		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rwembogo site, Agricultural engineers cost = 19,658,000/- and suppliers cost = 23,649,000/-, the percentage variation in the contract price = +20.3%, hence above +20.0% 2. Mugamba site, Agricultural engineers cost = 14,540,000/- and suppliers cost = 13,038,000/-, the percentage variation in the contract price = +10.3%. 3. Rukonkoma site, Agricultural engineers cost = 16,145,000/- and suppliers cost = 13,630,000/-, the percentage variation in the contract price = +16%. 	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY	Completion certificates dated 26th March 2022 and supplier contracts dated 19th May 2022 indicated that micro-scale irrigation equipment installation was completed in previous FY.	2
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure	The LG approved structure and staff establishment of 25/17/2017 (ARC/135/306/01), had a total of 57 extension workers for the Lower Local Government facilities. However, the LG has a total of 43 extension workers making a 75% recruitment	1
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 		

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Key items observed at the three installed sites include: Rukonkoma site (Petrol fuel pump, sprinkler 40 mm radius, portable rain gun, drip lines, water tank 5000lts and drag hose pipe kits) and Mugamba site (water tank 5000 liters, HDPE transmission pipe, portable sprinkler rain gun, drip irrigation kit, and drag hose pipe kit and Rwembogo site (sun light solar surface, pump 40m head, 315kW solar panel, 5000lts water tank, drip irrigation kit and drag hose pipe kit, HDPE delivery pipe). These features were in conformity with the technical designs and the inventory (list of irrigation equipment or items).</p>	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The three sampled installed micro-scale irrigation sites; Rwembogo site (drip irrigation and drag hose pipe kits), Rukonkoma site (sprinkler, portable rain gun and drag hose pipe kits) and Mugamba site (drip irrigation and drag hose pipe kits). Every irrigation system was switched on and water was supplied, field photos captured at the time of assessment.</p>	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that positions of extension workers deployed in the 2 sub counties and the town council was accurate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buyanja TC had 2 extension worker deployed there and these were available 2. Buyanja Sub county had extension 3 worker deployed there and these were available 3. Kebisoni Sub country had had extension 3 worker deployed there and these were available 	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The key information obtained from each of the three demonstration sites were in line with the inventory. Key items observed at the sites include: Rwembogo site (sun light solar surface, pump 40m head, 315kW solar panel, 5000lts water tank, drip irrigation kit and drag hose pipe kit, HDPE delivery pipe), Rukonkoma site (Petrol fuel pump, sprinkler 40 mm radius, portable rain gun, drip lines, water tank 5000lts and drag hose pipe kits) and Mugamba site (water tank 5000 liters, HDPE transmission pipe, portable sprinkler rain gun, drip irrigation kit, and drag hose pipe kit etc).</p>	2
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	As per the quarterly activity reports on implementation of micro-scale irrigation program in the District, dated 11th October 2021 (for quarter one), 10th January 2022 (for quarter two), 4th April 2022 (for quarter three) and 5th July 2022 (for quarter four), there was information collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest.	2
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	MIS/Irritrack information contains awareness raising events on micro-scale irrigation, farmer Expression of Interests (EOIs) and farm visits. 711 farmers had expressed interest as compared to the targeted 450 EIOs. 604 out of 711 were successfully at the time of assessment. No information in MIS concerning installed irrigation sites	1
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	As per the Micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarterly reports, information compiled from LLGs and entered into MIS was about farm visits and farmer EOIs: Q1 report dated 30th September 2021 (513 submitted, 481 successfully); Q2 report dated 10th January 2022 (529 submitted and 493 successfully); Q3 report dated 4th April 2022 (598 submitted, 524 successfully) and Q4 report dated 5th July 2022 (640 submitted, 544 successfully).	1
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Development and approval of Performance Improvement Plans for the lowest performing LLGs was not done during FY 2021/2022.	0
Maximum score 6	Maximum score 6	Maximum score 6	Maximum score 6	

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Implementation of Performance Improvement Plans for the lowest performing LLGs was not done during FY 2021/2022.	0
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	As per the approved Budget for production Department FY 2022/2023, Vote 924, there was budget allocated for the wages of full positions for extension staffs at various LLGs, total wages amounts to Ugx 1,482,590,000/-	1
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	As per the production Department deployment register pinned on notice board, deployment of extension workers was as follows; 1 Senior Agricultural Officer, 12 Agricultural Officers, 14 Assistant Agricultural Officers, 14 Assistant Animal Husbandry Officers and 2 Assistant Fisheries Officers, hence 43 extension staffs deployed at 13 LLGs, hence the deployment is adequate as per the guidelines.	1
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed according to the staff lists obtained from HRM Division and the staff lists, attendance register and TPC minutes in the LLGs.	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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	There was evidence of publicizing of extension workers in the LLGs on noticeboards in sub counties visited. Staff list with contact details were on the LLGs noticeboards.	2
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the available extension workers were appraised by the District Production officer for the previous FY and copies submitted to HRO. A sample to 10 appraisal files for extension workers was reviewed as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rukundo Alex an Agriculture Officer was appraised on 30/8/3022 2. Kanyesigye Plan an Assistant Agriculture officer was appraised on 11/7/2022 3. Muhereza Fred an Assistant Veterinary Office was appraised on 22/8/2022 4. Kasibayo Exavier an Agriculture officer was appraised on 30/8/2022 5. Atuhaire Norah a Senior Agriculture officer was appraised on 9/8/2022 6. Atuhaire Phiona an Assistant Agriculture officer was appraised on 28/7/2022 7. Karenzi Stephen an Assistant Agriculture officer was appraised on 21/7/2022 8. Kanyankire Geoffrey an Assistant Animal Husbandry officer was appraised on 29/7/2022 9. Byamukama Precious an Assistant animal husbandry office was appraised on 30/8/2022 10. Aikuhizi Emmanuel a Veterinary officer was appraised on 14/7/2022 	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that corrective action was taken for extension workers arising out of their appraisal reports. forexample, Karenzi Stephen an Assistant Agriculture officer was recommended for a promotion to a senior position on 5/8/2022, he applied for a promotion as recommended. On 1/9/2022, the CAO responded recognizing the need for a promotion but which could not be effected because of limited wage.</p>	1
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>	<p>LG trained extension staffs on micro-scale irrigation guidelines (the need for irrigation in the local environment, what is irrigation? financing and purchasing process, especially the requirement for a co-payment etc) and how to show EOIs, this was as per the Micro-scale Irrigation Sub-grant quarterly report dated 30th September 2021.</p>	1

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	There was extension staff training database indicating that staff from 9 LLGs were trained on the micro-scale irrigation guidelines.	1
	Maximum score 4			

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	The LG appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant of UGX.122,690,784,000. i) Capital Development - 75%, UGX.917,018,095 II) Complimentary services, 25%, UGX. 305,672,699.	2
	Maximum score 10			
9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0	The LG evidence provided showed budget allocations were made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines as follows. i. Complementary, UGX.305,672,699 a. Awareness, UGX. 45,850,905 (UGX. 305,672,699 X 15%). b. Procurement, UGX.30,567,269 (UGX. 305,672,699 X 10%) ii. Monitoring and supervision. 75% = 229,254,521 a. Awareness (25%) UGX.61,134, 539 b. Famers visits (20%), UGX. 61,134, 539 c. Demonstration sites (10%) UGX. 30,567,269 d. Farmers visits, UGX.(25%) UGX.76,418,175	2
	Maximum score 10			

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence that the co-funding was reflected in the LG Budget and allocated UGX.254,000,000 (Annual Budget Estimates, page, 16) in FY 212021/2022 but was not utilized as per guidelines because the LG was rolling the programme in FY 2022/2023. These funds have been used the current FY 2022/2023.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant as per reports and payment vouchers on 28th November 2022. This was as per ABPR, page, 58. Some of the farmers for co-funding were; Kanyonyo Stanely Bugongo, Karibyenda Stella, Mugisha Abel and Mutamura Frank.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the Farm visit report dated 12th July 2021, LG did awareness creation on micro-scale irrigation including information dissemination on the use of farmer co-funding (cost sharing of the irrigation equipment).</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation monitoring and supervision reports dated April 2021, 1st June 2021 and 20th July 2021, the monitoring was not monthly from April 2021 to the month commissioning took place (September 2021). but the reports did not capture any information on environmental and social safeguards and adequacy of water source as required.</p>	0
Maximum score 8				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70-89% monitored score 1 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 70% score 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	LG did oversee approved farmer training and support to the micro-scale irrigation equipment beneficiaries as evidenced by monitoring & supervision report dated 20th May 2022.	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	The LG did not provide hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services, although there was an online training which was done remotely but not physically.	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	No farmer field schools established as evidenced by lack of reports on farmer field schools.	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	As per the report titled "Farmer field days at Rukonkoma Irrigation Demonstration site for farmers from Buhunga, Ruhinda and Buyanja" dated 17th December 2021, 36 farmers were sensitized on micro-scale irrigation. Field based photos included in the report. Similarly as per another farmer filed day report dated 26th November 2021, 43 farmers were sensitized on irrigation.	2
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	An annual report dated 20th July 2022 indicated that LG trained and sensitized District leaders (LC V, Vice Chair LCV, RDC, Deputy RDC, CFO, SFO, SPO, PO etc) and also LCs I & II on micro-scale irrigation.	2

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>An updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to the beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation equipment was availed. Key items in the register include: Rwembogo site (sun light solar surface, pump 40m head, 315kW solar panel, 5000lts water tank, drip irrigation kit and drag hose pipe kit, HDPE delivery pipe), Rukonkoma site (Petrol fuel pump, sprinkler 40 mm radius, portable rain gun, drip lines, water tank 5000lts and drag hose pipe kits etc) and Mugamba site (water tank 5000 liters, HDPE transmission pipe, portable sprinkler rain gun, drip irrigation kit, and drag hose pipe kit etc).</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Up-to-date database of applications for EOIs for current and previous FYs were accessed from the MIS. At the time of assessment 711 EOIs were recorded or captured in the data base, while 604 were successfully while 107 not successfully. Screen shot for MIS on EOIs was captured.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per a report titled "Farm visits to farmers who expressed interest in micro-scale irrigation program" dated 20th May 2021, indicated that LG made farm visits to farmers who submitted complete EOIs. Signed Agreement to proceed for quotation forms were availed</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of publishing approved farmers on noticeboards by the Senior Agriculture Engineer.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in FY 2022/2023 LG approved procurement plan. On page 9 of the plan, captured under Production and Marketing Department was the Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation equipment at a cost of UGX 1,205,397,000/= with planned funding from MIDG and LR sources. Selective National bidding was the proposed procurement method in plan.</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation institutional Demo site with planned budget of UGX 31,000,000/= with funding from MIDG and selective national bidding as the procurement method</p>	1
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>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</p>	<p>Presented for review was a copy of a letter dated 25th/10/2022 Ref.105/5 from Management Support Services Directorate of call for submission of Bills for design, supply and installation of Micro-Scale irrigation systems for 20 selected farmers in Rukungiri District LG. The letter was addressed to;</p> <p>Davis and Shirliff, Associated Design and Build Engineering Co. Ltd. Sprinktech, Kaftech Investments Ltd, Adritech Uganda Ltd for 5 lots. These were on prequalified list by MAAIF as per reviewed Submission of pre-qualified equipment suppliers to District LGs FY 2022/2023 Ref.FAD F50/181/02</p>	2

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

Reviewed was contracts committee decision on submission (LG PP Form 20) design, supply and installation of Micro-Scale irrigation system for randomly sampled farmers. For example, the award for supply to M/S Erina Hellen Kabajungu (No.RKG/2020-08-21/F/838) was awarded to M/S Kaftech Investments Ltd at a contract price of UGX 18,330,000/= in a meeting held on 15th/11/2021 under minute number MIN42/04/DCC/2021.

Under minute number MIN:80/01/DCC/2021-22 of the contracts committee meeting held on 21st/02/2022 contract award to M/S Kaftech Investments Ltd for design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation system for Mr. Turyabe Abel (RKG/2020-10-06/M/8336 at contract price of UGX 17,582,000/= winning M/S Sprinktech Ltd that had bided UGX 18,612,000/=

Review of contracts committee minutes dated 21st/02/2022, under minute number MIN:80/01/47/DCC/2021-22 contract for supply and installation of equipment for Tukundane Curthbert was awarded to M/S Sprinktech Ltd at a contract price of UGX 19,180,000/= winning M/S Kaftech Investments Ltd that had bided UGX 21,885,000/= . The awarded equipment suppliers were the lowest bidders for each respective farmer and technically responsive since they had been on MAAIF pre-qualified list distributed to LGs.

Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines

Maximum score 18

d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that contracts committee approved micro-scale irrigation systems of FY 2021/2022 before commencement of installation. The district contracts committee approved evaluation report and awarded contracts for design, supply and installation system for 23 selected farmers in Rukungiri District (farmer, farmer ID number, contract and contract sum) This was approved in committee meeting held on 21st/02/2022 under minute number MIN:80/01-47/DCC/2021-22 of the 11th DCC meeting.

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>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</p>	<p>The was evidence that the LG signed contracts with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as witness. Sampled farmers included;</p> <p>1-Tukundane Curthbert where two firms bided including M/S Sprinktech Ltd at UGX 19,180,000/= and M/S Kaftech Investments Ltd at UGX 21,885,000/=. The LG signed with Sprinktech Ltd and there was evidence that the farmer signed as a witness on the contract agreement dated 25th/04/2022.</p> <p>2-Turyabe Abel: Two firms bided namely M/S Kaftech Investments Ltd at UGX 17,582,000/= and Sprinktech Ltd at UGX 18,612,000/=. The LG evaluation committee recommended award of contract to lowest technically responsive firm (Kaftech Investments Ltd) The contract agreement was signed between Rukungiri District LG and M/S Kaftech Investments Ltd on 8th/03/2022 with the farmer appending signature as witness.</p> <p>3-Erina Hellen Kabajungu: Three firms including Sprinktech Ltd, Adritex (U) Ltd and Kaftech Investments Ltd. Other two firms dropped off because never attached documents evidencing the qualifications of solar/ electrical and mechanical personnel as required in the submitted bid. M/s Kaftech won the bid at UGX 18,330,000/=</p>	2
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>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</p>	<p>The key aspects of the installed systems at the time of assessment include the following: Rukonkoma site (Petrol fuel engine 10 hose power, sprinkler 40 mm radius, portable rain gun, water tank 5000lts and drag hose pipe) and Mugamba site (water tank 5000 liters, HDPE transmission pipe, portable sprinkler rain gun, drip irrigation lines, and drag hose pipe and Rwembogo site (sun light solar surface pump 40m head, 315W solar panel, 5000lts water tank, drip irrigation lines and drag hose pipes and HDPE delivery pipe. These system parameters were in line with the design generated from Irritrack App</p>	2
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>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>According to the technical supervision and monitoring reports dated 9th March 2022, 12th May 2022, 10th June 2022 and 1st July 2022, indeed LG did regular technical supervision of the irrigation demonstration sites. Visitor books were signed by the DPO and Agricultural Engineer.</p>	2

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>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites monitoring and supervision reports dated April 2021, 1st June 2021, 20th July 2021 and also commissioning of demonstration equipment dated 20th September 2021, LG oversaw the supply, installation and testing of the irrigation equipment.</p>	1
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>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</p>	<p>As per a report titled “Commissioning of Rwembogo and Rukonkoma irrigation demonstration sites” dated 20th September 2021, LG did oversee the irrigation equipment commissioning or hand over to the approved host farmer.</p>	1
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>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</p>	<p>Evidence showed LG made payment to the supplier subject to the presence of the Approved farmer’s signed acceptance forms.</p> <p>Sample of payments were.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply of Micro-scale Irrigation by Sprinktech Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021-22/00020/41.UGX. 23,459,300. 2. Supply of Micro-scale Irrigation by Kaftech Investments Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021-2022/00056/04.UGX. 23,655,000. 3. Supply of Micro-scale Irrigation by Kaftech Investments Ltd. RUKU550/WRKS/2021-2022/00013/03 LOT2, UGX. 21,964,000. <p>However, payment to suppliers were not effected within the 14 days limit.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>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</p>	2
		<p>There was evidence of complete procurement file for each contract with all records required by PPDA law.</p> <p>Reviewed was evaluation report dated 10th/02/2022 for Mr.Curthbert Tukundane (RKG/2020-11-24/M/15811) The contracts committee approved contract under minute MIN:80/38/DCC/2021-22. A Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the farmer and the LG for commitment of co-funding on 10th/11/2021 and the LG signed contract agreement with equipment supplier (M/S Sprinktech Ltd) on 29th/11/2021 with the farmer as a witness.</p> <p>Erina Hellen Kabajungu, the evaluation was on 15th/10/2021. The contracts committee approved the report under minute number MIN:42/04/DCC/2021-22. An MoU signed on 10th/11/2021 and contract agreement signed on 29th/11/2021 between the LG and Kaftech Investments Ltd with the farmer as witness</p> <p>Turyabe Abel (RKG/2020-10-06/M/8336) the contracts committee approved the evaluation report under minute number MIN:80/01-47/DCC/2021-2022. The LG signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the farmer committing co-funding on 10th/11/2021 and the contract agreement was signed on 29th/11/2021 between the LG and Kaftech Investments Ltd.</p>	

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	0
		<p>There was no evidence that the Local Government had displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas.</p>	
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	0
		<p>There was no evidence that micro scale irrigation grievances had been recorded.</p>	

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

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

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that micro scale irrigation grievances had been reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework.</p>	0
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>DLG did not disseminate micro-scale irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access, proper use of agro-chemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers since there was no farm visit report about the dissemination.</p>	0
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.

i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening had been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment as thus;

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Kanyonyo Stanley Bugongo was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Karibyenda Stella was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Mugisha Abel was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Muramura Frank was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum score 6

ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that monitoring of irrigation impacts was carried out for micro scale irrigation projects;

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Kanyonyo Stanley Bugongo was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Karibyenda Stella was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Mugisha Abel was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Muramura Frank was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.

15

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum score 6

iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor;

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Kanyonyo Stanley Bugongo had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Karibyenda Stella had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Mugisha Abel had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Muramura Frank had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

15

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum score 6

iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor;

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Kanyonyo Stanley Bugongo had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Karibyenda Stella had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Mugisha Abel had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Muramura Frank had an E&S certification form prepared and signed on 16/06/2022.

1

Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Ahumuza Alfred as Senior Agriculture Engineer under Min. 040/2021, in a letter dated 19/3/2021, Ref. CR/156/1</p>	70
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Rukungiri DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p>Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Kanyonyo Stanley Bugongo was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.</p> <p>Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Karibyenda Stella was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.</p> <p>Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Mugisha Abel was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.</p> <p>Design, supply and installation of micro scale irrigation for Muramura Frank was screened for E&S on 23/07/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 240,000.</p>	30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Twekwase Deus as Civil Engineers (Water) under Min 035/2021, in a letter dated 19/3/2021, Re. CR/160/1	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The LG seconded Twesigomwe John Bosco as Assistant water officer for mobilization in a letter dated 12/4/2012, Ref. CR.156/2	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	This position was reported vacant	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	This position is not in the LG structure	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Gumoshabe Memory is the substantive Environment Officer as per the Min.no. 028/2022, Ref. No. CR. 156/1 dated 31/3/2022	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Twinomujuni Arthur as Senior Forestry Officer under Min. 146/2019, in a letter dated 12/11/2019, Ref. CR/160/1	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.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY was carried out as per the sampled projects below; Upgrading of ECOSAN toilet to water borne toilet , construction of sceptic tank and raised reservoir at the district headquarters was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 with ESMPs prepared and costed at UGX: 890,000. Construction of Kateremo water supply system was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 with ESMPs prepared and costed at UGX: 890,000. Construction of 3 stance toilet with changing room for girls at Ibanda primary school was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 with ESMPs prepared and costed at UGX: 890,000.	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	The projects under water for the previous fianacial year did not qualify undergoing an Environment and Social Impact Assessment.	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Rukungiri DLG didnot have piped water system projects implemented the previous financial year.	10

Health Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Mucunguzi Akasiima as DHO under Min 81/2017(1) in a letter dated 30/6/2017, Ref. CR/156/1</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Kyomuhangi Christine Kakuru as Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, under Min 107/2020, in a letter dated 26/7/2020, Ref. CR/160/1</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Nsengiyunva Confidence Imanishimwe as Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health under Min. 181/2021, in a letter not dated, Ref. CR/161/1</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Nowomuhwezi Judith as Biostatistician under Min 72/2010, in a letter dated 30/11/2010, Ref.CR.156/1</p>	10

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Nshemereirwe Gard as Cold Chain Assistant under Min. 25/2006, in a letter dated 30/5/2006.</p>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>	
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>	
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>	

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that all Health projects for the previous FY under went Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening;</p> <p>Renovation of maternity ward, OPD building at Kisizi HC IV was screened for E&S on 22/06/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 890,000.</p> <p>Partial renovation of DHO's office , drug store, construction of main entrance gate was screened for E&S on 22/06/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 890,000.</p> <p>Construction of a lined 2 stance VIP latrine with urinal and screen walling at Karushonga primary school was screened for E&S on 22/06/2021 with an ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 890,000.</p>	15
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

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.

The projects implemented under Health for the previous financial year did not qualify undergoing an Environment and social Impact Assessment.

Education Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Turyahumura Jackson as District Education Officer under Min 077/2021, in a letter dated 25/5/2021, Ref. CR/156/1	30
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	<p>The LG substantively appointed the following as Inspectors of schools:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amperize Anthoney appointed under Min. 050/2022(1) in a letter dated 11/5/2022, ref. CR/156/1 2. Mutungi Abel appointed under Min. 050/2022(3) in a letter dated 11/5/2022, Ref. CR.156/1 3. Arinaitwe Solomon appointed under Min 050/2022(2), in a letter dated 11/5/2022, Ref. CR.156/1 4. Nyesiga Amon, appointed under Min. 050/2022(6), in a letter dated 11/5/2022, Ref. CR/156/1 5. Muzoora Bruce appointed under Min. 050/2022(3) in a letter dated 11/5/2022, Ref. Cr/156/1 6. Nuwamanya Topher appointed under Min. 050/2022(5), in a letter dated 11/5/2022, Ref. CR/156/1 7. Tushemetairwe Lydia appointed under Min. 098/2022(6), in a letter dated 2/9/2022, Ref. CR/156/1 8. Mpirirwe Jackeline appointed under Min. 050/2022(7), in a letter dated 11/5/2022, Ref. CR/156/1 9. Gumisiriza Keishiki Adah appointed under Min. 056/2015(2), in a letter dated 12/3/2015, Ref. CR/160/1 	40

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	Rukungiri DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for projects under Education; Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine with changing rooms for girls at Rwerere primary school was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 with costed ESMP of UGX: 890,000. Construction of a 4 classroom block at Karire primary school was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 with costed ESMP of UGX: 890,000. Construction of a lined 5 stance VIP latrine with changing rooms for girls at Nyakairo primary school was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 with costed ESMP of UGX: 890,000.	15
	The Maximum score is 30			
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	The projects implemented under Education didnot qualify undergoing an Environment and Social Impact Assessment.	15
	The Maximum score is 30			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Asiimwe Joram as CFO under Min. 60/2019, in a letter dated 25/3/2019, Ref. CR.160/1.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	This position was reported vacant at the time of assessment	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Tukamushaba Kajuba Innocent as District Engineer under Min. 99/2020, in a letter dated 26/2/2020, Ref. CR/156/1	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Rukwago Severino as DNRO under Mi. 19/2006, dated 30/5/2006, Ref. CR.160/1	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Karyaija Zepha Byarugaba as District Production Officer under DSC. Min. No. 50/2015(1), in a letter dated 2/3/2020, Ref. CR/156/1	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Agaba Posias Names as District Community Development Officer under DSC. Min. No. 105/2020, in a letter dated 26/2/2020, Ref. CR/160/1	3

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Nkwabwe Adams Bwisho as District Commercial Officer under DSC. Min. No. 59/2019, in a letter dated 25/5/2019, Ref. CR/156/1	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The LG substantively appointed Murekyezi Gordon Vons as Senior Procurement officer under DSC. Min. No. 4/2011, in a letter dated 25/2/2011, Ref. CR/156/1	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Ahimbisibwe Richard Kabutembe as Procurement officer under Min. 201/2015, in a letter dated 18/12/2015, Ref. CR.160/1	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Tumwebaze Ivan as the Principal Human Resource Officer under 041/2022, in a letter dated 24/4/2022, Ref. CR/160/1	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Mbabazi Caroline as Senior Environment Officer under DSC. Min. No. 48/2018, in a letter dated 25/5/2018, Ref CR/160/1	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The LG substantively appointed Agaba Martin as Senior Land Management Officer under DSC.Min.14/2017(i), in a letter dated 15/3/2017, Ref. CR/160/1	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Katungwesi Denis Bataka as the Senior Accountant under DSC. Min. No 119/2020, in a letter dated 2/6/2020, Ref. CR/160/1</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Arinaitwe Florence as Principal internal Auditor under Min. 92/2009, in a letter dated 20/1/2010, Ref. CR/160/1</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG substantively appointed Mutungi W.K.Katirimba as Principal Human Resource officer (Secretary to DSC) under Min. 89/2016(1), in a letter dated 16/11/2016, Ref/161/02</p>	2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

There was no evidence that the LG substantively appointed SAS in all sub counties and Town Clerks in all town councils. The LG has a total of 13 Lower Local governments: 9 Sub Counties and 4 Town Councils. There was evidence that the LG substantively appointed 10 of these: 6 Senior Assistant Secretaries and 4 Town Clerks as follows;

1. Kemigisha Sylvia appointed under Min. 026/2022(3), in a letter dated 31/3/2022, Ref. CR/160/1 (Buyanja TC)

2. Kshaaha Adrine Nyetume appointed under Min. 026/2021(1), in a letter dated 31/3/2022, Ref. CR/160/1 (Kebisoni TC)

3. Nayebare Wilber appointed under Min. 026/2022(2), dated 31/3/2022, Ref. CR.160/1 (Rwerere TC)

4. Najuna Charles appointed under Min. 56/2019, in a letter dated 25/3/2019, CR/160/1 (Bukurungu TC)

5. Tucungwire Lauben appointed under Min. 36/2006, in a letter dated 23/6/2006, Ref CR/160/1 (Ruhinda SC)

6. Kalanzi Fatuma appointed under Min. 84/2017(4), in a letter dated 30/6/2020, Ref. CR/160/1 (Nyakagyeme SC)

7. Tuheirwe Eldah Kananura appointed under Min. 94/2020, in a letter dated 26/2/2020, Ref. CR.160/1 (Buyanja SC)

8. Kansiime Wilberforce appointed under Min. 101/2022, in a letter dated 2/9/2022, Ref. CR/161/1 (Bwambara SC)

9. Kwizera Gershom appointed under Min. 7/2008, in a letter dated 19/3/2008, Ref. CR.160/1 (Buhunga SC)

10. Tumwijukye Deo Kirenzi appointed under Minn. 31/2007(b), in a letter dated 4/6/2008, Ref. CR.160/1 (Kebisoni SC)

The rest of the LLGs have no substantively appointed SASs.

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

Maximum score is 15

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

There was no evidence that the substantively appointed 13 Community Development officers or Senior CDOS for the 9 sub counties and 4 town councils. There was evidence presented for only 11 CDOs out of 13 as follows;

1. Byamukaman Jackson appointed under Min. 61/2019(1) in a letter dated 25/3/2019, Ref. CR.160/1

2. Arinda Constance appointed under Min. 90/2016(2) in a letter dated 16/11/2016, Re. CR.160/1

3. Tukwamuhembwa Sergius appointed under Min 078/2021, in a letter dated 24/5/2021, Ref. CR.160/1

4. Barigye Martin appointed under Min 031/2021, in a letter dated 19/3/2021, Ref. CR.160/1

5. Tushemerwirwe Alice Honest appointed under min. 61/2019(2), in a letter dated 25/3/2019, ref. CR/160/1

6. Tusingywire Esther appointed under Min. appointed under Min. 106/2020(1) in a letter dated 26/2/2020, Ref. CR.160/1

7. Nahabwe Ronald appointed under Min. 91/2019(1), in a letter dated 6/6/2019, Ref. CR.160/1

8. Mugabe Lawrence appointed under Min. 106/2020(2) in a letter dated 26/2/2020, Ref. CR.160/1

9. Taremwa Rolland Mathew appointed under Min 079/2021, in a letter dated 24/5/2021, Ref. CR.156/1

10. Muhanguzi K Arthur appointed under Min 143/2016(1) in a letter dated 6/12/2016, ref. CR.1600/1

11. Biryomumisho Stephen appointed under Min. 53/2003, in a letter dated 4/6/2003, Ref. CR/156/1

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

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

Maximum score is 15

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

There was evidence that the LG recruited Senior Accounts Assistant of Accounts assistants in all the 13 LLGs as follows;

1. Ampaire Laban appointed under Min. 100/2022, in a letter dated 2/9/2022, Ref. CR.160/1
2. Owoyesiga Bless appointed under Min. 55/2015(6) in a letter dated 12/3/2015, Ref. CR.156/1
3. Mugisha K.B Andrew appointed under Min 7/2011, in a letter dated 25/2/2011, Ref. CR.156/1
4. Tusingwire Ivas appointed under Min. 16/96, in a letter dated 24/5/1996
5. Tusiime Sarah Viorah appointed under Min. 020/2022(1) in a letter dated 9/3/2022, CR.160/1
6. Natwera Kate appointed under Min 65/2019(3) in a letter dated 25/3/2019
7. Anyorekire Hildah appointed under Min 103/2020(2), in a letter dated 26/7/2020, CR. 156/1
8. Kabasinguzi Enid appointed under Min. 43/2004, in a letter dated 10/2/2004, CR. 157/1
9. Buhungiro Hans Bategeka appointed under Min. 28(1/2014, in a letter dated 25/4/2014, Ref. CR/D/11617
10. Tirwomwe Geoffrey appointed under Min 67/2005, in a letter dated 30/6/2010, Ref. CR.160/1
11. Musimenta Wilson appointed under Min. 50/2008. in a letter dated 22/2/2008, CR.160/1
12. Tibemanya Emmanuel appointed under Min 6/2018(1) in a letter dated 26/6/2018, Ref. CR/160/1
13. Twinomujuni Frankline appointed under Min 157/2020(1), in a letter dated 5/8/2020, Ref. CR/160/1

Environment and Social Requirements

3

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

For Rukungiri LG Natural Resources Department, The amount allocated for FY 2021/2022,(ABPR, page, 34) was UGX. 363,389,144, and released Shs. 337,953,855. This was a ratio of 93%, which was less than 100%.

0

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	For Rukungiri LG Community Based Services Department, The amount allocated for FY 2021/2022, (ABPR, page, 34) was UGX.299, 204,203, and released UGX. 277,526,746.This was a ratio of 92.7%, which was less than 100%.	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	There was evidence that Rukungiri DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for DDEG projects implemented the previous financial year; Remodeling of the former sub county administration block into staff house was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 and ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 610,000. Construction of 2 classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga primary school was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 890,000. Completion of fencing at Bugangari HC IV was screened for E&S on 10/06/2021 with a costed esmp of UGX: 880,000.	4
	Maximum score is 12			
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),	The projects implemented using the DDEG didnot qualify undergoing an Environment and Social Impact Assessment .	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Rukungiri DLG had Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);</p> <p>Remodeling of the former sub county administration block into staff house was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 and ESMP prepared and costed at UGX: 610,000.</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Rutooma Kihanga primary school was screened for E&S on 21/06/2021 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 890,000.</p> <p>Completion of fencing at Bugangari HC IV was screened for E&S on 10/06/2021 with a costed esmp of UGX: 880,000.</p>	4
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>LG has a clean audit opinion</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>As per the submissions to the Internal Auditor General's office and records at Rukungiri DLG, a report on the implementation status of AG for FY 2020/2021 was submitted to the office of MoFPED by the CAO Mr. Masokoyi Swalikh Wasswa on 23/12/2021. The report contained actions taken on 16 recommendations against all findings (pages, 2-7)The submission was made on within the February end deadline.</p>	10
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG in Pursuant to the Public Financial Management Act of 2015, Part VII and according to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the Rukungiri DLG. Performance Contract for FY 2022/2023, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) Mr. Masokoyi Swalikh Wasswa was submitted and acknowledged by PS/ST on 19/07/2022. This was before the deadline of 31st August.</p>	4

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/22, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) Mr.Masokoyi Wasswa Swalikh was submitted on 24/08/2022. This was before the deadline of 31st August.</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>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG, Quarterly Performance Reports for FY 2021/22, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) Mr.Masokoyi Wasswa Swalikh were submitted as follows.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report on 30/10/2021</p> <p>Quarter 2 report on 18/01/2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 report on 26/04/2022</p> <p>Quarter 4 report on 24/08/2022</p> <p>All the reports were submitted within the mandatory August 31 deadline.</p>	4