



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kisoro District

(Vote Code: 526)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	61%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	90%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	53%
Educational Performance Measures	58%
Health Performance Measures	50%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	50%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	3%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	Infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): There were 11 projects drawn as follows: Examples: (i) Completion of 2 classrooms at Gisozi SDA in Mulamba sub county for shs 21,293,000; Page 187 of the DDP visited on 2nd November, 2020. (ii) Renovation of a bridge in Bukozi village in Busanza sub county for shs 40,698,000 as reflected on page 227 of the DDP visited on 3rd November, 2020. (iii) Maziba Demonstration Farm in Bunagana parish in Mulamba sub county for shs 17,996,000 as reflected on page 213 of the DDP. Confirmation was done to the existence of the projects and their utilisation	4
2	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	Not applicable	0
2	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	<p>DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY 2019/2020 were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY. Examples: (i) Maziba Demonstration Farm in Mulamba sub county under the Production Department. (ii) Completion of Community Building at Gapfurizo HC II; under the Health Department (iii) Completion of 2 classrooms at Gisozi SDA under the Education Department. (iv) Renovation of a bridge at Bukazi under the Roads and Engineering Department. (iv) Tree planting under the Natural Resources Department.</p> <p>100% of the investment projects funded by DDEG were completed 11 projects as reflected in the Annual Performance Report page 34 for FY 2019/2020.</p>	3

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	Kisoro District budgeted and spent all the DDEG in FY 2019/2020 on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget and implementation guidelines as reflected in 4th Quarter Performance Report/Annual Performance Report pages 197 to 203.	2
3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	The variations in contract prices for sampled DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the financial year 2019/20 were within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimates. The three sampled infrastructure investments and their variations were as follows; 1. Phased completion of Gapfurizo Maternity ward had an Engineer's estimate of UGX 47,877,320 and actual cost of UGX 47,288,146, with a variation of +1.2% 2. Completion of 2 classroom block at Bikoro PS had an Engineer's estimate of UGX 41,859,650 and actual cost of UGX 41,383,780, with a variation of +1.1% 3. Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Rugo Primary School had an Engineer's cost of UGX 23,400,000 and actual cost of UGX 22,149,426, with a variation of +5.3% Please note that there was no project in water implemented using DDEG funding.	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The sampled Sub Counties had the following staff as per approved staff structure Substantively filled as per minimum staffing standards;</p> <p>MURORA SUB COUNTY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Thembo Stephenson Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) 2.Ndikuyeze Sawiya Community Development Officer (CDO) 3.Bizimana Agustine Senior Accounts Assistant(SAA) 4.Nkurunziza Robert Agricultural Officer(AO) <p>NYAKINAMA SUB COUNTY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Ahishakiye Johnson Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) 2.Samafara Pascal Senior Accounts Assistant (SAA) 3.Kampire Jolly (Assistant Veterinary Officer (AVO) <p>CHAHI SUB COUNTY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Twamabizimana Aaron Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) 2.Mugisha Emmanuel Senior Accounts Assistant (SAA) 	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>There was no evidence of the reports on infrastructure constructed</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results. Score: 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable because the LLG assessments has not been introduced	0
5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable because the LLG assessments has not been introduced	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the District consolidated and submitted staffing requirements for the coming FY 2021/2022 to the Ministry of Public Service by 30th September 2020	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	The District did not conduct a track and analysis of staff attendance as guided by the Ministry of Public Service	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	From the appraisal reports, it was established that it was only Kiramira James the Ag.District Engineer among the Heads of Department that was appraised on 13/8/2020 .Others were not appraised.	0

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	The District had not received the guidelines on establishment of consultative committee and the committee had not been constituted	0
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	The District did not recruit staff in financial year 2019/2020 because of inadequate wage	1
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.	From the list of retirees, it was established that only 4 staff retired in FY 2019/2020. Out of 4 retirees only one Mathew Buturu Niyibizi accessed the pension payroll within two month after retirement He retired on 30/3/2020 and accessed pension payroll in June 2020	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	MOFPED provides IPFs in respect of what each sub county should receive out of which each district undertakes allocation through the PBS based on guidelines at hand. The district adhered to the guidelines as DDEG transfers in full to LLGs were executed during FY 2019/2020: For example:	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>i) Nyakirama sub county had a transfer of shs 4,724,366 on voucher number 28381249 dated 29th April, 2020.</p> <p>ii) Murora sub county had a transfer of shs 4,657,342 on voucher number 283812258 dated 11th March, 2020.</p> <p>iii) Nyakabande sub county received a transfer of shs 5,677,677 on voucher number 28381252 dated 11th March, 2020.</p> <p>iv) Kivumbo sub county had a transfer of shs 8,166,083 on voucher number 263418836 dated 19th November, 2019.</p> <p>v) Rubuguru Town Council had transfer of shs 9,371,533 on voucher number 26341774 dated 19th November, 2019.</p>	
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:	As per the IFMS report, GOU approved Warrant Report for the DLG under reference 01/07/2019 to 30/06/2020 dated 3rd November, 2020, the DLG had warranted DDEG funds for FY 2019/2020 as detailed below:	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	<p>The district issued warrants for direct transfer of the DDEG to LLGs during FY 2019/2020 timely and in accordance with the budget requirements referenced as follows:</p> <p>Quarter One Development 526AW-2020-5;</p> <p>DDEG funds cash limits were received from MOFPED on 24th July, 2019 warranted on 28th July, 2019. The CAO's release letter was dated 3rd August, 2019 for release of funds to LLGs. This was compliant within five days after releases from MOFPED.</p> <p>Quarter Two Development 526AW-2020-16; DDEG funds cash limits were received from MOFPED on 14th October, 2019 warranted on 16th October, 2019. The CAO's release letter was dated 19th October 2019 for release of funds to LLGs. This was compliant with the requirement.</p> <p>Quarter Three Development 526AW-2020-26: DDEG funds cash limits were received from MOFPED on 14th January, 2020 warranted on 16th January, 2020. The CAO's release letter was dated 18th January, 2020 for release of funds to the LLGs. This was compliant with the established requirement.</p>	

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>In quarter one, invoicing was done on 31st July, 2019 and CAO's communication to LLGs done on 3rd August, 2019;</p> <p>In quarter two, invoicing was done on 17th October, 2019 and CAO's communication to LLGs done on 20th October, 2019;</p> <p>In quarter three, invoicing was done on 15th January, 2020 and CAO's communication to LLGs done on 19th January, 2020.</p> <p>To supplement the above, the CAO frequently communicated to LLGs as reflected in a circular letter dated 10th March, 2020 for transfer of shs 66,997,660. Another circular letter by the CAO to LLGs dated 15th November, 2019 that effected the transfer of shs 87,001,000 on 17th November, 2020.</p>	2
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines as reflected in examples below:</p> <p>(i) Monitoring report on construction of Nyakinama Seed School and upgrading of Maregamo HC III VIP latrines in quarter one dated 14th October, 2019.</p> <p>(ii) A report on water projects implemented during FY 2019/2020 in quarter four dated 16th August, 2020</p> <p>(iii) Mentoring report dated 12th February, 2020 for all sectors on Gender and Equity in quarter three dated 14th April, 2020;</p> <p>(iv) Quarter One report for FY 2019/2020.</p> <p>(v) Mentoring report dated 21st November, 2019 on local governance for quarter two.</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>Monitoring and supervision reports were discussed and action taken as well as follow up as reflected in the examples below:</p> <p>(i) TPC meeting held on 25th June, 2020 discussed departmental support supervision and monitoring reports</p> <p>(ii) TPC meeting held on 20th February, 2020 that discussed the District Development Plan and project profile.</p> <p>(iii) TPC meeting held on 22nd January, 2020 discussed Annual Work Plan and Budget for FY 2020/2021.</p> <p>(iv) TPC meeting held on 18th July, 2020 discussed departmental performance gaps.</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>Maintenance of updated Assets Register by the district: The district had in place an updated assets register details of vehicles, buildings, furniture and infrastructure. The register was computerized through the IFMS system. Examples of additional assets during FY 2019/2020 were as follows:</p> <p>(i) Ambulance registration UBG 045U Tata engine number 22DIGCR18, chassis ref. MAT464544 KCR13055 page 25</p> <p>(ii) Motorcycle UG6346M Yamaha engine number 3HA-245575, chassis 3HA245575 page 78.</p> <p>(iii) Pick up double cabin UG6474U engine number 22LDCOR18 chassis MAT 346353 KSR14875X page 98.</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>There was a Board of Survey Report for FY 2019/2020 in place dated 26th August, 2020. It was copied to IAG and OAG. In spite of the recommendations made by the board for course of action, nothing much was done because recommendations for FY 2018/2019 had not fully been implemented. For example disposal of all assets render to be boarded off. Disposal of printer had not been done at the time of the assessment. No action had been taken by the district for the Board of Survey Report of FY 2019/2020. Explanation was provided to the effect that the district was still waiting for the opinion of the Accountant General regarding management of the assets.</p>	0

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.

There was a functional Physical Planning Committee in place as reflected in meetings that were held.

(i) Minutes of the Physical Planning Committee held on 2nd June, 2020 were submitted to MLHUD and acknowledged on 9th September, 2020.

(ii) Minutes of the Physical Planning Committee held on 12th August, 2019 were submitted to MLHUD and acknowledged on 20th November, 2019.

(iii) Minutes of the Physical Planning Committee held on 17th December, 2019 were submitted to MLHUD and acknowledged on 9th September, 2020.

(iv) Minutes of the Physical Planning Committee held on 5th March 2020 were submitted to MLHUD and acknowledged on 9th September, 2020.

However, there was no approved Physical Development Plan by the district council and therefore no submission was done to the National Physical Planning Board.

The Building Plan and Registration Book were in place.

Membership to the Physical Planning Committee: That Committee had 15 members duly appointed by the CAO instead of 16 members as provided by section 9 of the Physical Planning Committee Act 2010.

Examples of the committee members that were appointed by the CAO:

DEO in letter dated 15th October, 2016 reference CR/156/5; Town Clerk Bunagana TC in letter dated 15th October, 2016 reference CR/156/5; Physical Planner in letter dated 5th June, 2018 reference CR/156/5; District Natural Resources Officer in letter dated 17th October, 2017 reference CR/156/5

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

d. For DDEG financed projects;

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

Score 2 or else score 0

Appraisal reports were prepared as required, derived from the DDP. Expenditure was based on guidelines for instance the DDEG and other funding sector guidelines. Examples:

(i) Four communal and institutional tanks valued at shs 366,184,000; page 175 of the DDP.

(ii) Construction of a hall at Mulamba Seed School valued at shs 404,600,000 on page 187 of the DDP.

(iii) Construction of 5 stance VIP latrines for 12 schools; page 187 of the DDP.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence at the time of the assessment that field appraisal reports were in place to check on technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Project profiles for investments for FY 2020/2021 with costing were all discussed by the TPC and complied with the Planning Guidelines as well as DDEG Guidelines. Example: A TPC meeting held on 26th May, 2020 dealt with the following projects minute KDLG/48/S/90</p> <p>(i) Renovation of Kagano HC III building in Kanaba sub county costed at shs 15,043,000. Page 226 of the AWP.</p> <p>(ii) Construction of Mwumba Progressive Secondary School in Nyarutu parish, Nyabiganya sub county costed at shs 344,284,000. Page 220 of the AWP.</p> <p>(iii) Construction of an onion store at Kanaba sub county costed at shs 15,350,000. Page 231 of the AWP.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Environmental, social and climate change screening was done and mitigation measures required put forward before the projects were approved for construction, for instance screening form of the completion of 2 classroom block at Bikore p/s signed the environmental officer on 20/ 08/2020 and that of renovating Kagano HC III dated 31/10/2020.</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan	According to the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2020/21, the infrastructure projects to be implemented using DDEG in the FY 2020/21 were; 1. Renovation of Kagano Health Centre Staff House at UGX 15,042,000 (Pg 24 of Budget and Pg 12 of Procurement Plan) 2. Classroom construction and rehabilitation at Gikoro Primary School at UGX 39,061,000 (Pg 31 of the LG Budget and Pg 11 of Procurement Plan) 3. And Stabilization works on Chahafi -Karago - Maregamo Roads (Pg 44) All these DDEG Projects were incorporated in the LG Procurement Plan for 2020/21	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the Contracts Committee approved infrastructure projects before commencement of construction. In the draft minutes of the Contracts Committee Meeting held on 1st October 2020 and yet to be confirmed in their follow up meeting, bid documents for two of three the DDEG projects, Renovation of Kagano Health Centre Staff House and Construction of the Classroom block at Gikoro Primary School, were approved.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	The LG did not properly establish Project Implementation Teams as required. For the sampled projects which included; Phased completion of Gapfurizo Maternity ward, Completion of 2 classroom block at Bikoro PS and Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Rugo Primary School, only Contract Supervisors/Managers had been appointed by the CAO. No appointment letters for Project Managers, Environment Officers and CDOs were provided as required. These simply assumed their roles. These projects also did not have Clerks of Work due to limited funding.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>Three infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG were sampled as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The completed classroom block at Bikoro Primary School. 2. The completed classroom block at Gisozi SDA primary school 3. And the maternity ward that was constructed at Gaphurizo Health Centre II. <p>Both classroom blocks were started by the parents and later taken up by the Local Government. These did not use the standard designs at setting out stage. For example the standard size of classroom blocks was 7.8 by 6.0m yet the classrooms constructed were 7.7 by 6.5m for Bikoro and 7.5 by 6.1m.</p> <p>Also the maternity ward at Gapfurizo Health Centre II was started by the community and it too did not follow the standard designs at setting out phase. For example the maternity section was supposed to have a width of 3.0 m but the constructed one had a width of 1.9m.</p> <p>There were also defects in the floor in one of the constructed classrooms at Bikoro Primary School. The Engineer attributed this to the poor sand found in the District and the contractor was yet to fix it as the contract was still in defects liability period.</p>	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Evidence of supervision by Technical officers was provided in form of completion reports which were produced as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On 22nd May 2020, a completion report was made for the phased completion of Maternity ward at Gapfurizo Health Centre II. 2. On 12th June 2020, a completion report was made for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Bikoro Primary School. 3. And on 23rd December 2019, a completion was made for the construction of the 5 stance VIP latrine at Rugo Primary School. Among others. <p>All the sampled completion reports were prepared by the respective Contract Supervisors and there was no evidence that the Environment officer and CDO among other Technical Supervisors participated in the said monitoring.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	The LG verified and initiated payments within 2 months upon completion. For example; 1. For phased completion of Maternity Ward at Gapfurizo Health Centre II, the certificate of practical completion was issued on 25th May 2020 and payment was effected on 18th June 2020. 2. And for construction of the 5 stance VIP latrine at Rugo Primary School, the certificate of practical completion was issued on 24th March 2020 and payment effected on 6th April 2020.	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	Ten procurement files were sampled and were assessed as follows; 1. Phased completion of Gapfurizo maternity ward 2. Construction of a Seed Secondary School in selected Sub Counties in Uganda (Nyakinama Sub County) 3. Completion of 2 classroom block at Bikoro Primary School 4. Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Kabuga Primary School 5. Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Rugo Primary School. 6. Completion of 4 classroom block at Busanza SS 7. Construction of Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Scheme. 8. Construction of Muyove Gravity Flow Scheme. 9. Construction of a 20 m3 ferro-cement rainwater tank at Birembo Village. 10. Construction of a 20 m3 ferro-cement rainwater tank at Gasave Primary School. All the sampled procurement files were found to be complete with among other items; Evaluation reports approved by the Contracts Committee, Works Contracts, and minutes of Contracts Committee decisions;	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Although there was an appointment letter for the grievance redress focal point person, Ms. Nyiramahoro Mary signed by the CAO on 27/04/2017, there were no minutes of the GRC.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Local government was in the process of finalizing a specified system for grievance handling and had not displayed any information about grievance redress mechanism on the district notice board.</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>There was no evidence showing that the Local government had publicized the grievance redress mechanism to make the aggrieved parties aware. The grievance focal point person had an unexplained radio talk show schedule.</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>Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets. Examples:</p> <p>(i) Interventions on Nursery Beds were integrated in the DDP on page 269 budgeted at shs 13,100,000. In the 4th Quarter Performance Report it was captured on page 80.</p> <p>(ii) Restoration of wetlands activity was detailed on page 259 of the DDP budgeted at shs 26,000,000 and page 81 of the 4th Quarter Performance Report for FY 2019/2020.</p> <p>(iii) Sensitization of communities about environmental and social safeguards budgeted for shs 13,583,000 was detailed on page 36 of the DDP and page 36 of the 4th Quarter Performance Report for FY 2019/2020.</p>	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Dissemination of guidelines to the LLGs:</p> <p>Dissemination of information to the LLGs was done through regular meetings that were held with sub county chiefs in all the 14 sub counties. Records of minutes indicated that all sub county chiefs attended the meetings. One of the meetings was held on 24th October, 2019 item 3 on Agenda.</p> <p>CAO's letter dated 25th May, 2019 to all sub county chiefs on guidelines under reference CR/134/1.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not avail evidence showing that costed ESMPs were incorporated into the designs, BOQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG projects of the previous year.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of projects with costing because of additional impact from climate change.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to prove land ownership of where the projects were implemented.</p>	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 no evidence of monitoring reports signed by both the environment officer and the CDO which ascertained that the ESMPs for projects under the health sector, water sector and education sector projects had the monitoring reports, for example there was monitoring report of Chuho primary school 5 stance latrine dated 11/03/2020.	0
----	--	--	---	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of certification forms signed by both the environment and the CDO prior to the payment of the contractor, for instance there was a certification form of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyamirembe P/S signed on 28/05/20202 by the environment officer and the CDO showing that the mitigation measures had been put in place.	1
----	--	---	---	---

Financial management

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0	The district prepared bank reconciliation statements in respect of 8 bank accounts on a monthly basis and up to date (30th September, 2020) as required. Examples: (i) TSA account number 0052605280000 had a reconciled balance of shs 0 as on 30th June, 2020. (ii) Kisoro DLG UNHCR account had a closing balance of shs 92,405,332 as on 30th June, 2020. (iii) Kisoro DLG General Fund account had a closing balance of shs 17,889,969 as on 30th June, 2020. (iv) TSA account number 0052605280000 had a reconciled balance of shs 1,244,876,439 as on 30th September, 2020. (v) Kisoro DLG YLP account had a closing balance of shs 24,081,904 as on 30th September, 2020.	2
----	---	--	--	---

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>All the quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2019/2020 were produced and accordingly submitted</p> <p>Quarter One report was produced on 17th October, 2019 and circulated to District Chairperson, IAG, LG Accounts Committee, OAG and CAO.</p> <p>Quarter Two report was produced on 29th January, 2020 and circulated to District Chairperson, IAG, LG Accounts Committee, OAG and CAO.</p> <p>Quarter Three report was produced on 28th April, 2020 and circulated to District Chairperson, IAG, LG Accounts Committee, OAG and CAO.</p> <p>Quarter Four report was produced on 29th July, 2020 and circulated to the District Chairperson, IAG, LG Accounts Committee, OAG and CAO.</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>There was no LGPAC in place to handle the quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2019/2020. In absence of the LGPAC, the District Council could not handle findings by the Internal Auditor as required. A LGPAC was however constituted on 28th May, 2020 to handle arrears of pending work. The LGPAC was scheduled to hold its first meeting on 9th November, 2020.</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Whereas the Internal Auditor produced all the required quarterly reports, there was no LGPAC to review the reports.</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>The district budgeted shs 820,107,505 for local revenue for FY 2019/2020. It however realized revenue collection amounting to shs 260,681,499 during the financial year equivalent to 31.7% performance.</p> <p>Poor performance in revenue collection was attributed to the coronavirus pandemic. Most business enterprises as revenue sources were interrupted and others closed down.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% - 10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>Revenue collection amounting to shs 260,681,499 was realised during financial year 2019/2020. In FY 2018/2019, the district collected shs 517,693401 as local revenue resulting in a decline in revenue collection totaling shs 257,011,902. This was 99% decline.</p>	0
----	--	---	---	---

20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Kisoro DLG remitted to LLGs the mandatory Share of local revenue for FY 2019/2020 for example:</p> <p>(i) Kanaba sub county received shs 1,201,802 on voucher number 27579441 dated 27th January, 2020 per LLG receipt number 52702 dated 5th May, 2020.</p> <p>(ii) Nyabwishenya sub county received shs 1,757,9552 on voucher number 275944 dated 27th January, 2020 per LLG receipt number 28604 dated 30th January, 2020.</p> <p>(iii) Muramba sub county received shs 10,040,000 on voucher number 29075402 dated 28th April, 2020 per LLG receipt number 28065 dated 30th May, 2020.</p>	2
----	--	--	---	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement plan for the financial year 2020/21 was displayed on the notice board.</p> <p>Also at the time of assessment, the contracts for 2020/21 had not been awarded. However on the notice board was a list of preselected bidders. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was a shortlist notice for the 5 stance latrine at Sooko Primary School in which Blanktec construction Co. Ltd, Kif Trading Co. Ltd and Kemic Technical Services Ltd had been pre-selected. 2. There was also another shortlist notice for the 5 stance latrine for Butooke Primary School in which Matinza Carpentry and Joinery Workshop Ltd, Utafu Engineering Services Ltd and Ndagajose Builders and Engineers Co. Ltd had been pre-selected. Among others. 	2
----	--	---	---	---

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Publicity of the District performance assessment results was done accompanied by circular letters from the CAO reference CR/465/0 dated 16th April, 2020.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Discussion with LLGs were held in the Mayor's gardens in respect of gender issues and domestic violence. Other discussions centered on project profiles/implementation. Further discussions were discouraged because of the break of the coronavirus. Publicity was also done through radio programmes.</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district publicized information regarding tax rates, collection procedures etc. Examples: (i) CAO's circular letter dated 11th August,2020 on local revenue methods and procedures for FY 2020/2021 (ii) CAO's circular letter dated 12th June,2020 reference CR/105/2 on local revenue collection.</p> <p>More publicity was done through radio programmes, newspapers, etc.</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared an IGG report which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of the assessment, there were two cases from the IGG being handled in the District namely; irregular appointment of a Senior Environment Health Officer in the District Health Department. The second was about overpayment of salary to the Headmaster of Kabindi Secondary School.</p> <p>Irregular appointment of a Senior Environment Health Officer:</p> <p>DSC letter dated 1st July, 2019 ref. DSC22/154/01. IGG's letter dated 7th November, 2019 ref. HQT/87/04/8. CAO's letter dated 23rd December, 2019 ref. CR/900/2. The Senior Environment Health Officer was regularly promoted and caused the case to emerge. Council discussed the case in a meeting held On 21/11/2019</p> <p>Overpayment to the head master: the amount of shs 1,757,232 has since been recovered through monthly deductions on salary.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>There was an improvement of 7% in PLE performance between 2018 and 2019 as indicated below</p> <p>In 2018 DIV 1 =255, DIV 2=1465, DIV 3=1433 bringing the total to 3153 pupils</p> <p>3153 divide by the total number of pupils who sat for PLE 4873 multiply by 100% =65%</p> <p>2019 DIV 1=294, DIV 2=1989, DIV 3 =1163 with all three divisions totaling to 3446 pupils divide by 4797 which was the total number of pupils who sat for PLE in 2019 multiply by 100% results into 72%</p> <p>72%-65% results into a 7% improvement</p>	4
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>There was an improvement of 14% in the UCE pass rate between 2018 and 2019 as indicated below.</p> <p>In 2018, 12 candidates passed in Div 1, 114 in Div 2 and 148 in Div 3 bringing the over roll total to 274 candidates. When the 274 are divided by the total number of candidates who sat for UCE that year being 425 multiplied by 100% the percentage is 64%</p> <p>In 2019, 10 candidates passed in Div 1, 78 in Div 2 and 158 in Div 3 bringing the total to 246. When the 246 are divided by 314 which was the number of candidates who sat multiplied by 100% the percentage pass is 78%</p> <p>78%- 64% results in a 14% improvement.</p>	3
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 	Not applicable	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	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, Page 6 of May 2019 guidelines states that the Education grant shall be used to pay salaries of education staff in primary, secondary, tertiary and vocational institutions this was evident on page 54 of budget performance report as payment of teachers up to shs 11,148,982 millions To finance sports activities which was visible on page 67 of the budget performance report as sports development and promotion in addition to payment for the district sports officer at a cost of shs 27,170,000 million	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	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, CDO, Environment Officer all certified payments for construction projects implemented in the Education Department before payments were effected: Examples: (i) Payment to Geses U Ltd for shs 177,955,433 on voucher number 26577196 dated 28th November, 2019. Payment was for construction of Nyakirama Seed Secondary School in Nyakirama sub county. DEO, CDO, CAO endorsed payment on 30/10/2019; D/E, Environment Officer on 2/11/2019. (ii) Payment to Sooko Farmers Company Ltd for shs 944,306 on voucher number 28003688 dated 2/3/2020. Payment was for construction of pit latrine at Gitovu Primary School in Butanza sub county. DEO, CDO, CAO, D/E, Environment Officer endorsed payment on 4/12/2019 respectively. (iii) Payment to Twez Enterprises Ltd for shs 19,309,259 on voucher number 288596681 dated 20/4/2020. Payment was for construction of a school in Butanza sub county. DEO, CDO, CAO, D/E, endorsed payment on 27/3/2020 whereas CDO and Environment Officer endorsed payment on 25/3/2020. (iv) Payment to Combined Technical Services Ltd for shs 19,335,496 on voucher number 28792640 dated 20/4/2020. Payment was for construction of HCIII. DEO endorsed payment on 19/3/2020; DEO on 16/3/2020; D/E, Environment Officer and CDO on 10/3/2020.	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure				

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variations in contract prices for sampled Education infrastructure investments for the financial year 2019/20 were within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimates. The three sampled infrastructure investments and their variations were as follows;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of 2 classroom block at Bikoro PS had an Engineer's estimate of UGX 41,859,650 and actual cost of UGX 41,383,780, with a variation of +1.1% 2. Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Rugo Primary School had an Engineer's cost of UGX 23,400,000 and actual cost of UGX 22,149,426, with a variation of +5.3% 3. Completion of a 4 classroom block at Busanza SS had an Engineer's Estimate of UGX 48,000,000 and actual cost of UGX 47,381,720, with a variation of +1.3% 	
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p>	<p>On page 65 of the Quarter Four budget performance report for 2019/20, it was reported that the LG planned to construct Nyakinama Seed Secondary school at a cost of UGX 827,723,000 and also reported that it did so at UGX 867,722,000 indicating that 100% of all the planned construction activities were done.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p>	<p>Kisoro LG structure had a provision for 1,357 teachers. Of these, 1,208 had been filled which represented 89%.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 		

<p>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% score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>Out of the total 153 schools in Kisoro LG which included 136 UPE Schools and 17 USE schools in 2018, only 48 met the minimum standard requirements accounting to 31%</p> <p>In 2019 out of the 153 schools, only 49 met the minimum standard requirements accounting to 32%</p> <p>The average percentage of schools that met the minimum basic requirements of DES for 2018 and 2019 was 31.5%.</p> <p>Average = $(31 + 32)/2 = 31.5\%$</p>
---	---	--

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the L.G had accurately reported on teachers and where they were deployed. From the three sampled Nyakabindo Primary school, Mubuga and Kabindi mixed primary school in Kisoro district local government,</p> <p>The deployment lists coordinated with the staff lists on the school notes board as follows</p> <p>In Nyakabindo Primary school teacher Ayinomugisha Barbara File number TSC/D/799485, Computer number 799485 , teacher GahinjaRauben file number TSC/D/12576 file number 227020, teacher Munyakazi Leonard file number TSC/D/11978 file number 223863 Where found present as deployed</p> <p>At Mubuga primary school teacher Tumwezereivan file number TSC/D/11976 computer number 225090, teacher BeinomugishaRonah file number TSC/D/12680 Computer number 227183</p> <p>In Kabindi mixed primary school teacher Ndizihwe Augustine file number TSC/D/10541 Computer number 222885, teacher Dusabe George file number TSC/D/ 12543 computer number 227477</p>
---	---	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence of an up to date school asset register compliant with format one of the education facility asset register on page 49 of the Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments</p> <p>for the Education Sector it included:</p> <p>Nyakabingo primary school EMIS NUMBER 529771 had 11 classrooms, 14 latrines, 198 desks, 2 teachers and a total 4 classrooms in need of rehabilitation.</p> <p>Mutolere primary school EMIS number 529767 with 11 classrooms, 6 latrines, 189 desks and 2 teacher accommodations as total existing facilities</p> <p>Mubuya primary school EMIS Number 523587 had 8 classrooms, 8 latrines, 200 desks and 0 teacher houses; it required 4 new facilities, 15 new toilets and 60 desks.</p>	2
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>No evidence was provided</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>Though the UPE schools had been inspected, there was no evidence to prove that they had been supported to prepare and implement SIPs</p>	0

6	School compliance and performance improvement: Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year: • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0	No evidence was provided	0
---	---	---	--------------------------	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY: Score 4 or else, score: 0	The LG Education Department had a final approved work plan for FY 2020/2021 for 136 schools having a student enrollment of 73,820 with a wage bill of UGX 12,165,39 9 for all primary teachers and a wage bill of 3,207,104 for secondary teachers on ground (i.e. 94 substantive H/Teachers, 14 substantive Deputies and the rest being teachers) as per the Kisoro District Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2020/2021, Vote: 526, Pages 25-33, Generated on 27/05/2020 1121/136=8.242 teachers per school	4
---	---	--	---	---

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	b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, Score 3 else score: 0	The LG had 136 government schools with a student enrollment of 73,820 with teachers deployed as per sector guidelines . (i.e. 94 substantive H/Teachers, 14 substantive Deputies and the rest being teachers) as per the staff list at the DEO's office. The following schools were sampled and visited; Gikoro P/s in Nyakabange Sub County with a Substantive H/Teacher and 14 teachers Kabindi P/s in Nyakabange Sub County with a substantive Deputy H/Teacher who is acting as a H/Teacher and 17 teachers. Mubuga P/S in Nyakinama Sub County with 1 substantive H/Teacher and 18 teachers.	3
---	---	--	---	---

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

Teacher deployment data had been displayed on the schools notice board for the three schools sampled as indicated below;

At Nyakabingo P/S

The teacher lists had a total of 17 staff among whom was, Ayinomugisha Barbara file number TSC/D/799485 computer 799485

Munyakazi Leonard file number TSC/D/11978 computer number 223863

At Mubuga P/S the displayed lists had 20 staff that included, Tumushime William as head teacher File number TSC/D/107533 and computer 227862

Tumwizere Ivan an education Assistant File Number TSC/D/11976 computer number 225090

At Kabindi mixed primary school the displayed lists had 18 teachers that included, Ndizihiwe Augustine Headteacher File number TSC/D/10541 computer number 222885

Dusabe George Deputy Head teacher Teacher File number TSC/D/12543 computer number 227477

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

The District had 135 Government aided primary schools, A review of 10 randomly sampled head teacher's files from among the 135 revealed that 01 of the 10 sampled head teachers were appraised in year 2019.

Those appraised included;

1. Bwambuhe K Gonzanga file No TSC/D/10091 of Rugandu P/S was appraised on 1/7/2020 passed the timeline of 31st January as per the guidelines of July 2007 from the Ministry of Public Service. There was no copy of performance Agreement on file.

2. Zarusua Adrian Nsenga file No TSC/D/10710 of Busamba P/S was appraised on 31/11/2019 and performance Agreement was signed on 4/3/2019

3. Twesigomwe Medard file No CR/D/10414 of Kateretere P/S was not appraised.

4. Kwizera K.M. Vicent File No TSC/D/10486 of Gikoro P/S was appraised on 7/2/2020.

There was performance agreement on file.

5. Niringiyimana Dennis file No TSC/D/10608 of Butongo P/S was not appraised on 4/4/2019 and performance agreement was signed on 12/12/2019.

6. Nteziyaremye Xavier File No CR/D/10432 of Gatete P/S was appraised on 31/12/2019 and performance agreements signed on 9/4/2019.

7. Ntahorutaba Geoffrey File No TSC/D/10586 of Mabungo P/S was appraised on 28/11/2019 and agreement signed on 23/9/2019

8. Nkundizana Christopher File No TSC/D/10764 of Mugatete P/S was appraised on 31/01/2020 and performance agreement was signed on 14/3/2019

9. Byekwaso Peter File No TSC/D/10127 of Rushabarara P/S was appraised on 31/12/2019

10. Maniraguha Stephen File No TSC/D/11034 of Rwabara P/S had no appraisal report on file

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Secondary school Head teachers were appraised</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>1.Mwumvaneza Emmanuel Ag. District Education Officer was appraised on 2/9/2020</p> <p>2.Nyiranganizi Kedress Education Officer (Guidance & Counselling) was appraised on 30/6/2020</p> <p>3.Twesigye Eric Sports Officer was appraised on 30/6/2020</p> <p>4.Mboanyebyombi Emmanuel Inspector of schools was appraised on 29/6/2020</p> <p>5.Ntiringanya Edward Principal Education Officer was appraised on 24/7/2020</p> <p>6.Twebaze Annuncianta Pool Stenographer was appraised on 30/6/2020</p> <p>7.Safari Edson Office attendant was appraised on 20/8/2020</p> <p>8.Kabarodi Peninah Office typist had no appraisal report on file.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 of the training plan provided .</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>Kisoro LG confirmed in writing submission of the list of schools, which were 298, with 136 primary schools government, 135 private, 13 government secondary and 11 private, 1 government tertiary and 2 private. The enrolment data for all schools was consistent with EMIS report and PBS with 728700 pupils as per the template for capturing Pupil Enrolment by Schools for FY 2020/2021 for Kisoro District Local Government. These submissions were within the time frame of 15 December.</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>In 2019/20, Kisoro District Local Government allocated shs 162,718,000 towards inspection and monitoring which was inline with the guidelines. Up to shs 103,944 000 was spent on monitoring and inspection of primary schools and shs 60,024,000 on secondary schools representing 100% compliance.</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>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>Q1 Cash limits were loaded on 24th/7/2019 and Schools Capitation was warranted on 6th/8/2019 (ref. 526AW -2020-5) which was outside the required 5 days.</p> <p>Q3 Cash limits were loaded on 14th/1/2020 however information on warranting for Schools Capitation was not provided.</p> <p>Q4 Cash limits were loaded on 11th/4/2020 and Schools Capitation was warranted on 24th/4/2020 (ref. 526AW -2020-26) which was outside the required five days.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The district Education department did not publicize capitation releases to school at both the district and 3 sampled schools notice boards.</p>	0
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>Kisoro district local government had a school inspection annual work plan for the financial year 2019-2020 with a budget allocation of shs 55,744,000.</p> <p>In the education sector committee meeting held on 13/12/2019 in the office of the district education officer, under minute 19/FPM/ 2019, the DIS presented the inspection findings that included understaffing, inadequate furniture and toilets in schools</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <p>• If 100% score: 2</p> <p>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</p> <p>• Below 80%: score 0</p>	<p>According to the school inspection reports for second term 2019, third term 2019 and first term 2020, a total of 125 schools were inspected for each term out of the 135 registered schools. This represented a inspection coverage of 93%.</p> <p>Inspection coverage = $(125/135) \times 100 = 93\%$.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The School Inspection reports had been discussed on 13th/12/2019 by the Education sector committee in MIN 19/CEC/2019 the DIS presented inspection report findings that included challenges of understaffing, lunch for pupils, inadequate furniture and toilets in schools. Much as the reports had been discussed, no actions were subsequently followed up.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education department presented inspection and monitoring results to DES as indicated below,</p> <p>on 20th September DES acknowledged receipt of the school inspection report for 2nd term 2019</p> <p>on 25th /02/2020 Des acknowledged receipt of monitoring report for term 3 2019 and on 02/March / 2020 Directorate of Education Standards acknowledged receipt of school inspection report for term three 2019</p> <p>In all the schools visited, the findings of inspection and monitoring were found as indicated below;</p> <p>At Mubuga p/s in Nyakinama sub county carbon copies of the inspection tool at the school left behind on 02/03/2020 Indicated that there was irregular attendance of some teachers and pupil attendance was often irregular during planting seasons.</p> <p>The report recommended for daily support supervision of teachers by the headmaster</p> <p>At Nyakabingo P/S the monitoring report observed that p1 class needed more teachers and streams</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>Although the education sector committee sat on 30/10/2019 and discussed the reports of 1st quarter and work plans for the 2nd quarter, it did not discuss LG PAC reports since the public accounts committee was not in place, neither did it discuss LG performance Assessment results</p>	0

11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	On 5/June/2019 the district inspector of schools Mr. Mbonyebyombi Emmanuel sensitized parents and learners about the value of education and the role of parents in encouraging learners to stay in school on Kisoro FM radio. On 6th /August /2019 the DEO Kisoro district Mr. Mwumvaneza Emmanuel while on Kisoro FM together with a police officer in charge of child protection and an official from save the children had an educational talk show under the theme of keeping the girl child in school. Based on the Audio recording of the presentation and report.	2
----	--	--	---	---

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was an updated LG asset register with primary 136 school and 17 USE schools Some of the schools in the register included Nyakabingo P/S EMIS 529771 had 11 classrooms, 14 latrines, 198 desks and two teacher accommodations Mubuya P/S EMIS 523587 had 8 classrooms, 8 latrines, 200 desks and no teacher accommodations. Kabindi P/S EMIS 523558 had 15 classrooms, 16 latrines, 167 desks and no teacher accommodations	2
----	---	--	---	---

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i>	The district conducted desk appraisal for all sector projects which included construction of latrines in Kabuga Primary School, Rugo Primary School and Bikoro Primary School among others.	1
----	---	---	---	---

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i>	The LG did not conduct field appraisals for education projects.	0
----	---	---	---	---

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>In the financial year 2020/21, the LG Education department budgeted for infrastructure projects as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classroom constructions in Nyakinama Seed Secondary School and Mwumba Progressive Secondary School 2. Construction of 5 stance VIP latrines in various primary schools which included Kashenyi Primary School, Kageyo Primary School and Rugeyo Primary School. <p>All these infrastructure investments had been incorporated in the approved LG procurement plan for 2020/21</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The evaluation report for Nyakinama Seed Secondary School was approved by the contracts committee on 6th June 2019, and the CAO sought clearance by the Solicitor General on 10th July 2020. The Solicitor General cleared it on the same day.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG did not properly establish Project Implementation Teams as required. For the sampled projects which included; Construction of the seed Secondary School in Nyakinama Sub County, Completion of 2 classroom block at Bikoro PS and Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Rugo Primary School, Contract Supervisors/Managers had been appointed by the CAO. Only the Seed Secondary School had an appointed Clerk of Works in the names of Barinda Didan. The other projects did not have Clerks of works due to funding constraints. Also no appointment letters for Project Managers, Environment Officers and CDOs were provided as required. These simply assumed their roles.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>Nyakinama Seed Secondary School was visited and assessed in the field. There was evidence that the standard technical designs provided by the ministry were followed. The walls had a thickness of 0.27 m which include the brick wall of 0.23m and plaster of 0.02m on either side. Also each classroom block had an internal dimension of 8.8m and the floor to wall plate height was 3.15m as designed.</p> <p>There were also no defects observed in the walls and floors among others.</p>	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>	There was evidence that monthly meetings were conducted for the construction of Nyakinama Seed Secondary School. For example on file were minutes of meetings held on 8th August 2019, 5th September 2019 and 9th December 2019 among others.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	In the site meetings held on 8th August 2019, 5th September 2019 and 9th December 2019 among the members present were Karamira Jame (the District Engineer), Akampurira Eunice (Environment Officer), and Niyonzima Sam (DCDO).	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	The project files sampled were as follows; 1. For the 5 stance latrine at Kabuga PS, the payment certificate was issued on 27th March 2020 and payment was made on 6th April 2020 2. For the 5 stance latrine at Rugo PS, the certificate was made on 27th March 2020 on 6th April 2020 3. And for the classroom block at Bikoro PS, the payment certificate was made on 12th June 2020 and payment was made on 28th June 2020. All payments were made within 2 months.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	The LG Education department submitted its input to the LG Procurement Plan on 15th April 2020. Among the projects submitted included; 1. Classroom constructions in Nyakinama Seed Secondary School at UGX 617,067,106 and Mwumba Progressive Secondary School at UGX 569,360,282 2. Construction of 5 stance VIP latrines in various primary schools which included Kashenyi Primary School, Kageyo Primary School and Rugeyo Primary School, each at UGX 23,800,000 This was within the dateline of 30th April 2020	1
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 procurement file for the seed secondary school was complete with an evaluation report and minutes of its approval by the Contracts Committee which sat on 6th June 2019, and with the contract on file.	1

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that showed that grievances in the education sector were recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>On March 18th 2019 Environmental and Social safeguard guidelines for education sector were issued out to all schools, among the key issues was that of schools being constructed on land owned by the school with evidence of land title or agreement</p> <p>Construction of school away from wetlands and all constructed facilities not restricting access to water points</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG had no evidence of costed ESPMs for the education sector projects.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was proof of land ownership for Gisozi SDA primary school dated 01/08/2019, signed by the church clerk and senior church elder but other education projects such as 5 stance VIP latrine at Nyabande primary school did not have any.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of joint monitoring reports of both the environmental officer and CDO, these included the monitoring report of the construction of 2 classrooms at Gisozi primary school dated 20/03/2020 and that of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Iravumba primary school.</p>	2

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 1, else score:0

There was evidence E & S certification proved and signed by the environment officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments. For instance, environment and social certification for the construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>Three health facilities were sampled and these were; Chahafi HC IV, Nyabuhuniko HC III & Nyakinama HC III. The health facilities had the following outputs:</p> <p>Chahafi HC IV</p> <p>For 2018/19, OPD attendance was 18,001 and deliveries were 717 whereas for 2019/20, OPD attendance was 17,056 and deliveries were 764</p> <p>Nyabuhuniko HC III</p> <p>For 2018/19, OPD attendance was 12,666 and deliveries were 276, whereas for 2019/20, OPD attendance was 10,222 and deliveries were 245</p> <p>Nyakinama HC III</p> <p>For 2018/19, OPD attendance was 18,878 and deliveries were 171, whereas in 2019/20, OPD attendance was 10001 and deliveries were 245.</p> <p>For the sampled facilities, the total OPD attendance in 2018/19 was 41,545 and in 2019/20 was 37,279. This represented a percentage change of -10.2% between 2018/19 and 2019/20.</p> <p>Also for the same sampled facilities, the total number of deliveries in 2018/19 was 1,164 whereas in 2019/20 was 1,159. The percentage change between 2018/19 and 2019/20 was -0.42%.</p> <p>The LG Health department attributed these decrements to the Covid - 19 lockdown.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 2 • 50 – 69% score 1 • Below 50%; score 0 	Not applicable	0

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 75%; score 2 • 65 – 74%; score 1 • Below 65% ; score 0 	<p>There were 18 health facilities with RBF and these had the following scores; Chahafi HC IV had 97.9%, Nyabuhiniko HC III had 94.3%, Nyakinama HC III had 94.6%, Bukimbiri HC III had 93.9%, Iremera HC III had 94.5%, Kagano HC II had 97.2%, Rubugure HC IV had 85.8%, Gateriteri HC III had 92.1%, Nyarusiza HC III had 96.3%, Muramba HC III had 96.3%, Busanza HC IV had 99%, Ntenko HC III had 88.8%, Ruhozi HC II had 96.8%, Gasovu HC III had 89.1%, Nyarubuye HC III had 86.9%, Kagezi HC III had 75%, Kananuza HC III had 87.3% and Rutaka HC III had 85%</p> <p>This made an average of 91.6% which was above 75%.</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>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The District budgeted and spent all the health development grant in FY 2019/20 on eligible activities based on the health grant and budget guidelines. For example the development grant was used on the phased completion of Gapfurizo HC II in Nyarubuye sub County.</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>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/MMOH, District Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before made were effected payments to the contractors! Suppliers. Examples:</p> <p>(i) Payment to Super General Technical Works Ltd for shs 41,871,478 on 24/6/2020 per voucher number 30028418 in respect of completion of Gapfurizo HC II in Nyarubuye sub county.</p> <p>CAO and DHO endorsed payment on 27/5/2020, D/E on 25/5/2020; CDO and Environment Officer on 26/5/2020.</p> <p>(ii) Riky Building Material Ltd was paid shs 178,517,149 on voucher number 30028411 dated 24/6/2020 for upgrading Maregamo HCII to HC III. CAO & D/E endorsed payment on 5/6/2020; CDO & Environment Officer on 10/6/2020.</p> <p>There were basically two projects as indicated above for the Health Department during FY 2019/2020.</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>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>In the financial year 2019/20, the LG had one infrastructure investment, the phased completion of Gapfurizo Maternity Ward. It had an Engineer's estimate of UGX 47,877,320 and actual cost of UGX 47,288,146, with a variation of +1.2%. This was within the +/-20% variation limit.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>There was no new contract signed for upgrade of HCII to HC III in the financial year 2019/20. The one that was upgraded, at Maregamo, was a carryover from 2018/19 and was implemented to completion.</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>There were 3 HC IVs and 12 HC IIIs in the LG and their staffing levels were 321 out of 372. This represented a percentage staffing of 86. This was between 75 and 90%</p>	1
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The upgraded Maregamo Health Centre III was visited and it was found to have been constructed as per the designs. For example the room arrangements were as shown on the designs and the dimensions of the PostNatal ward were 9.7 by 9.0 m. Also the window dimensions of the windows in the PostNatal ward were 1.5x1.15, which was within the designed dimension of 1.5 x 1.2m.</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>Chahafi HC IV</p> <p>Had 36 staff on list</p> <p>Dr. Kyambadde Robert MO computer no. 1004023 was present</p> <p>Nyabihuniko HC III</p> <p>Had 17 staff</p> <p>Mr, Niyonzima Silas SMCO no.752973 was present.</p> <p>Nyakinama HC III</p> <p>Had 17 staff on the list.</p> <p>Ms. Dushimimana Doreen MCO no.834353 was present.</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no health facility upgraded in 19/20</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>There was no evidence that the Health Facilities submitted Annual Work Plans and budgets to the DHO</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.

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

- Score 2 or else 0

There was no evidence that the Health facilities submitted to the DHO the Annual Budget performance reports 19/20

0

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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.

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

- Score 2 or else 0

There was no evidence that the health facilities developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports.

0

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Three sampled facilities submitted all the reports timely

For Chahafi HC IV monthly reports were submitted as follows;

July report on 6th August 2019

August report on 5th Sept. 2019

September report on 6th Oct 2019

October report on 4th Nov. 2019

November report on 5th Dec 2019

December report on 6th Jan 2020

January report on 6th Feb 2020

February report on 6th March 2020

March report on 6th April 2020

April report on 6th May 2020

May report on 6th June 2020

And June report on 6th July 2020

And quarterly reports as follows;

Quarter 1 report on 6th October 2019

Quarter 2 report on 6th January 2020

Quarter 3 report on 6th April 2020

And quarter 4 report on 6th July 2020

For Nyabuhiniko HC III, monthly reports were submitted on; 5th August 2019, 5th September 2019, 4th October 2019, 6th November 2019, 4th December 2019, 7th January 2020, 7th February 2020, 5th March 2020, 7th April 2020, 7th May 2020, 5th June 2020 and 6th July 2020. And quarterly reports on 4th October 2019, 7th January 2020, 7th April 2020 and 6th July 2020.

For Nyakinama HC III, monthly reports were submitted on; 6th August 2019, 5th September 2019, 3rd October 2019, 6th November 2019, 5th December 2019, 6th January 2020, 6th February 2020, 5th March 2020, 6th April 2020, 6th May 2020, 4th June 2020 & 6th July 2020. And quarterly reports on 4th October 20219, 6th January 2020, 6th April 2020 and 6th July 2020

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>April- June 2020 was submitted on 6/10/2020</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>All the 18 H/Fs performed above 75%. Kagezi HC III was the weakest with 75% and the PIP was made on 20/03/20.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports as follows:</p> <p>Quarter One was submitted on 14th October, 2019 under reference KDLG/13/08/12;</p> <p>Quarter Two was submitted on 18th January, 2020 under reference KDLG/34/18/20;</p> <p>Quarter Three was submitted on 15th April, 2020 under reference KDLG/89/34/20;</p> <p>Quarter Four was submitted on 16th July, 2020 under reference KDLG/23/90/20.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>All the 18 H/Fs performed above 75%. Kagezi HC III was the weakest with 75% and the PIP was made on 20/03/20.</p>	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG budgeted for 638 staff at 7,411,101,000= which was in line with staffing norms and accordance to guidelines</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Out of 42 HFs 18 HFs did not have 75% of the staff required even though the posts were 85% filled.</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>Chahafi HC IV had 36 staff on list</p> <p>Dr. Kyambadde Robert MO computer no. 1004023 was present and regularly attended duty.</p> <p>Nyabihuniko HC III had 17 staff</p> <p>Mr, Niyonzima Silas SMCO no.752973 was present and regularly attended duty.</p> <p>Nyakinama HC III Had 17 staff on the list.</p> <p>Ms. Dushimimana Doreen MCO no.834353 was present and regularly attended duty.</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Chahafi HC IV had 36 staff displayed, Nyabihuniko HC III had 17 staff displayed and Nyakinama HC III had 17 staff displayed on the notice board.</p>	2

8

1

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

A review of all the 10 Health In charge's files, revealed that only 03 health in charge's were appraised in FY 2019/2020 as indicated below;

1)Kyomugisha Sarah; Nursing Officer File No CR/D/12440;Busanza HCIV was appraised on 17/7/2020 .

2) Turyatunga Jephson; Senior Clinical Officer file No CR/D/12043; Nyaruboye HCIII was appraised on 18/8/2020

3) Kyambadde Robert;Medical Officer file No CR/D/12819; Chahafe HCIV was appraised on 15/7/2020

The rest of the health unit in charges sampled had no appraisal reports on their files.

8

0

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

A review of the 10 Health facility worker's files, revealed that 05 health facility workers were appraised in FY 2019/2020 as indicated below;

1)Muheirwe Lilian; Nursing Officer File No CR/D/12130;Kagezi HCIII was appraised on 7/10/2020 .

2) Nyirampano Immaculate;Enrolled Midwife file No CR/D/12533; Kisoro Hospital was appraised on 7/7/2020

3) Tumwine Grace;Enrolled Nurse file No CR/D/12499; Kisoro Hospital was appraised on 18/6/2020

4)Nuwamanya InnocentRuth; file No CR/D/12450;BukimbiriHCIII was appraised on 24/9/2020

5) Mpeirwe Shallon;Enrolled Nurse file No CR/D/12396; Kisoro Hospital was appraised on 18/9/2020

The rest of the health facility workers sampled had no appraisal reports on their files

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	There was no corrective actions based on the previous reports	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence to show that training plans were made.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	Training on DHIS2 was conducted from 15-16/06/2020; Training on Strengthening Uganda's Response to Malaria in Kisoro conducted at Mabano Hotel on 16/11/2019.	1

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum 9 points on this performance measure	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	There was no evidence that the CAO confirmed the list of health facilities receiving PHC to MOH.	0
---	---	--	--	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring services and management of health services. Shs. 7,313,628 was allocated as indicated on page 57 - 58 of the Fourth Quarter Performance Report for 2019/20.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Q1 Cash limits were loaded on 24th/7/2019 and warranting was done on 6th/8/2019 which was outside the required five days.</p> <p>Q2 Cash limits were loaded on 10th/10/2019 and warranting was done on 19th/10/2019 which was outside the required five days.</p> <p>Q3 Cash limits were loaded on 14th/1/2020 however information on warranting was not provided.</p> <p>Q4 Cash limits were loaded on 11th/4/2020 and warranting was done on 21st/4/2020 which was outside the required five days.</p> <p>All warranting was not done within the specified time frame of 5 working days hence no compliance.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG invoiced all PHC NWR grants for 2019/20 as follows;</p> <p>Q1 Cash limits were loaded on 24th/7/2019 and invoicing was done on 2nd/8/2019 which was outside the required five days.</p> <p>Q2 Cash limits were loaded on 10th/10/2019 and invoicing was done on 16th/10/2019 which was outside the required five days.</p> <p>Q3 Cash limits were loaded on 14th/1/2020 however information on invoicing was not provided.</p> <p>Q4 Cash limits were loaded on 11th/4/2020 and invoicing was done on 21st/4/2020 which was outside the required five days.</p> <p>All invoicing and communication was not done within the specified time frame of 5 working days hence no compliance.</p>	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED:</p> <p>Examples: Circular dated 23rd July. 2019 reference KDL/23/29/35 on quarter one releases in FY 2019/2020;</p> <p>CAO's Circular dated 18th January, 2020 for the third quarter release in FY 2019/2020.</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>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence to show that the recommendations were implemented</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 meetings were mainly attended by In-Charges and DHT members</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The reports by the DHO to CAO for FY 19/20 show that Chahafi HC IV and Kisoro Hosp. were supervised, (26/10/19, 27/01/20, 15/04/20 & 10/06/20)</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Kisoro Hospital (Bufumbira HSD) supervised Nyabuhiniko HC III (18/12/19) Nyakinama HC III (25/09/19) & (18/01/20)</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that recommendations were followed up</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>According to the records (14/5/20) 13 health facilities were supervised and mentored on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dispensing quality 2. Prescribing quality 3. Stock management 4. Storage management 5. Ordering and reporting quality 	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district allocated shs 112,000,000 for Health during FY 2019/2020 as reflected in the District Budget page 24. Allocation for promotion of health and prevention activities totaled shs 27,000,000 as detailed on page 24 of the approved budget equivalent to 31%.</p>	2

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Community dialogue meetings for Ebola Virus Disease held from 18/12/2019 to 14/02/2020 by District Health Inspector.</p>	1
----	---	--	---	---

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to the report made by the DHI made on 27/01/2020, monitoring and supervision on Infection Prevention Control was done.</p>	1
----	---	--	---	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had an Asset Register that details health facilities and equipment. This mentions the equipment, the number before, number existing now & its functionality.</p>	1
----	--	--	--	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)): score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of Desk Appraisal reports provided</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of Field appraisal reports provided</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening forms of the completion of Gapfurizo maternity ward which was 02/05/2019 and a compliance certificate ascertained that the mitigation measures suggested were put in place and these forms and the compliance certificates were signed by the CDO and environment officer.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG Health department submitted its input to the LG Procurement Plan on 8th April 2020. Among the projects submitted included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of Gapfurizo HCII community house at UGX 40,000,000 2. Construction of staff house at Gasovu Health Centre II at UGX 115,722,000 3. Renovation of staff house at Kagano HCII at UGX 15,043,000 <p>The submission was made within the deadline of 30th April 2020</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Procurement requisition forms were submitted for investment projects in the Health Sector in the financial year 2020/21 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of staff house at Kagano Health Centre III at UGX 15,043,000. 2. And Completion of community house at Gapfuzo Health Centre III at UGX 49,850,000. <p>Both submissions were made on 21st September 2020 which was within the first quarter of 2020/21 .</p> <p>There was however no requisition form for the staff house at Gasovu Health Centre II</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The contract for upgrading Maregamo HC II to HC III was done in 2018/19 and as such was outside the year of assessment.</p> <p>For the maternity ward at Gapfuzo HC II, Bid documents for the Completion of the maternity ward at Gapfuzo HC II were approved by the Contracts Committee on 15th October 2019 and the evaluation report was approved and contract awarded on 25th March 2020. It did not require clearance by the Solicitor General as it was below threshold of UGX 200,000,000.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>For both Upgrade of Maregamo HC II to HC III and phased completion of maternity ward at Gapfuzo HC II, the LG did not properly establish Project Implementation Teams as required. There were no appointment letters in place for the Project Manager, Environment Officer and CDO for the said projects. Also the projects did not have clerks of works due to funding constraints.</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>There was evidence that the upgrade of Maregamo HC II to HC III followed the standard technical designs. Upon assessing on site, it was found that the contractor had followed the plan layout and dimensions. For example the measurements of the Postnatal ward were about 7.0 by 7.0m internally. On the technical design the dimensions of the same room were 7.17 by 7.0m when the walls were removed.</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 were no daily records maintained both for the maternity ward constructed at Gapfurizo HC II and the general ward constructed at Maregamo HC III. This was attributed to the fact that both sites did not have clerks of works due to funding constraints.</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>Evidence of site meetings for upgrade of Maregamo HC II to HC III were provided in the form of site visit reports. These were produced only for the month of January (7th January 2020) and May (29th May 2020). There were no site visit reports for the month of February and June which were both outside the Covid 19 lockdown period.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>In the two site visit reports for Maregamo HC III seen, for 7th January 2020 and 29th May 2020, among the people present were Mr. Karamira James (District Engineer), Mr. Akankwasa Eunice (Environment Officer) and Mrs. Sawiya Ndikuyeze (for CDO).</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>For the upgrade of Maregamo HC II to HC III, the completion certificate was issued on 4th June 2020 and payment was made on 18th June 2020, and for the phased completion of Gapfurizo maternity ward, the certificate of completion was issued to the contractor on 25th May 2020 and payment was effected on 18th June 2020. The payment for Gapfurizo was beyond the required timeline of 2 weeks or 10 working days.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>For the phased completion of Gapfurizo maternity ward and upgrading of Maregamo HC II to HC III, the LG had complete procurement files which had among other items; Evaluation reports approved by the Contracts Committee, Works Contracts, and minutes of Contracts Committee decisions.</p>	1
----	--	---	---	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had no evidence of grievances 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>There was no evidence to show that the LG had disseminated guidelines on health care/medical waste management.</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 did not have a functional system for medical waste management or a registered waste management service provider.</p>	0
----	--	---	--	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence availed to show that the LG created awareness in health care management.	0
	Maximum 5 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	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	There was no evidence to show that the costed ESPMs were incorporated in the BOQs, bidding documents and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	There was no evidence availed for example land titles, Memorandum of understanding or agreements to prove that the health projects were implemented on the land owned by the district.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	There was no any evidence of monitoring reports signed by the CDO and the environment officer to ascertain compliance with the ESMPs availed to the assessor.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

16

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

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

No evidence was provided for assessment.

0

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	According to the MIS Water Summary report for 2019/20, the LG had a water source functionality of 93% which was in the range of 90 - 100%	2
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	Based on the MIS Water and Sanitation Committee report for 2019/20, the LG had a Water and Sanitation Committee functionality of 97%. This was in the range of 90 - 100%	2
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	Not applicable	0

2

0

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

- b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.
- o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2
 - o If 80-99%: Score 1
 - o If below 80 %: Score 0

At the time of preparation of the department work plan for 2019/20, the LG had a safe water coverage of 43%. The sub counties with safe water coverage below that of the district were; Bukimbiri (15%), Chahi (14%), Muramba (8%), Nyakinama (30%), Nyakabande (10%) and Nyarusiza (11%).

Of the planned and implemented WSS projects in 2019/20, 3 communal rainwater harvesting tanks each at UGX 27,649,180 and 3 institutional rainwater harvesting tanks each at UGX 9,800,252 were implemented in the targeted sub counties. This amounted to a budget allocation of UGX 112,348,296 to the targeted sub counties out of the total budget of UGX 337,842,417 for new water sources. The percentage of water budget implemented was 33%

It was noted that the LG had challenges in allocating water resources to underserved sub counties because they were not suitable for point water sources like boreholes and there were also no natural water sources like rivers and springs. The only possible solution were rain water harvesting facilities but these too had challenges of acquiring land.

2

2

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

- c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates
- o If within +/-20% score 2
 - o If not score 0

The variations in contract prices for sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the financial year 2019/20 were within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimates. The three sampled infrastructure investments and their variations were as follows;

1. Construction of Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Scheme had an Engineer's estimate of UGX 73,878,514 and actual cost of UGX 62,699,918, with a variation of +17.8%

2. Construction of Muyove Gravity Flow Scheme Phase 1 had an Engineer's estimate of UGX 192,142,581 actual cost of UGX 172,681,106, with a variation of 10.1%

3. Construction of a 20 m3 Ferro cement rainwater tank at Birembo village had an Engineer's estimate of UGX 24,393,689 and actual cost of UGX 23,975,499, with a variation of +1.7%

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>A total of 10 WSS infrastructure projects were planned in 2019/20. These included two gravity flow schemes, 4 community rainwater harvesting tanks, 3 institutional rainwater harvesting tanks and one protected spring. All planned projects were implemented representing 100% completion (pg 10 of the department Quarter 4 report).</p>	2
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>According to the MIS water summary report for 2018/19, the water source functionality was 87%, while according to that of 2019/20, it was 93%. This represented a percentage increase of 6% between 2018/19 and 2019/20</p>	2
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 5%: score 2 o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1 o If there is no increase: score 0. 	<p>According to the MIS water and sanitation committee report for 2018/19, the functionality of the water and sanitation committees was 90%, while according to that of 2019/20, it was 97%. This represented a percentage increase of 7% which was more than 5%.</p>	2

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>In the financial year 2019/20, the LG water department constructed Muyove Gravity Flow scheme, Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Scheme and rainwater harvesting tanks at Makurizo village, Bunama village, Birembo village and Matinza primary school among others.</p> <p>Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Scheme, and the rainwater harvesting tanks at Makurizo and Matinza Primary School were visited and these were found to be functional as was reported in the Quarter 4 Budget Performance report for 2019/20</p>	3
---	---	--	--	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>The LG Water Office collected and compiled information on sub county water supply and sanitation facilities on a monthly basis. For example for the month of September 2019, monitoring was done on 23rd, for October was done on 30th and for November was done on 29th</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG updated MIS data but this was done on an annual basis and not on quarterly basis as was required. A report on all existing water sources (Form 4) was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 7th August 2020 and another report on</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>Not applicable since LLG performance assessment had not started.</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The District Water Officer had budgeted Shs 54,978,000 for FY 2020/2021 page 45 of the Approved budget Estimates</p> <p>For the following staff;</p> <p>1.Civil Engineer, Sanitation staff, Assistant water officer for Mobilisation,Engineering Assistant and Borehole Maintenance Technician</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>Information was not availed</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 no evidence that the District Water Officer had appraised office staff against the agreed performance plans in FY 2019/2020</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 were no capacity gaps identified as performance appraisal of staff in the water sector was not conducted. As such, there was no capacity training conducted.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>At the time of preparation of the department work plan for 2020/21, the LG had a safe water coverage of 43%. The sub counties with safe water coverage below that of the district were; Bukimbiri (15%), Chahi (14%), Muramba (7%), Nyakinama (29%), Nyakabande (10%) and Nyarusiza (11%).</p> <p>Of the planned and implemented WSS projects in 2020/21, 9 communal rainwater harvesting tanks each at UGX 27,649,180 and 4 institutional rainwater harvesting tanks each at UGX 9,800,000 were earmarked for the targeted sub counties. This amounted to a budget allocation of UGX 288,042,620 out of the total budget of UGX 479,729,096 for new water sources. The percentage of water budget implemented was 60%</p>	1
---	---	---	---	---

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>An advocacy meeting for the financial year 2020/21 was held on 4th June 2020 in the District Council hall. Among the members present were the District Councilors, Heads of Departments, Development Partners, government Agencies and officials from the Ministry of Water and Environment. However, in the minutes of the meeting, there was no evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective WSS budget allocations as the presentation made by the DWO was not attached to the minutes.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>The LG Water department did monthly monitoring of WSS facilities. Monitoring reports for the months of October, November and December dated 30th October 2019, 29th November 2019 and 12th December respectively were assessed on consideration that these constituted monitoring for the 2nd Quarter of 2019/20. In these three months, a total of 122 existing WSS facilities were monitored out of the 1,257 facilities in the LG. This represented a percentage of facilities monitored in the 2nd quarter of 9.7% which was less than 80%.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>The DWO produced minutes of DWSCC meetings held on 25th September 2019, 10th January 2020, and 5th March 2020 which were for the 1st quarter, 2nd quarter and 3rd quarter respectively. Minutes for 4th quarter meetings were not provided.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 were no displays of budget allocations to LLGs seen on notice boards.</p>	0

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The LG water department budgeted and spent UGX 10,120,000 on stakeholder coordination and UGX 43,515,946 on software activities. This amounted to a budget allocation of UGX 53,635,946 towards mobilization activities against a budget of UGX 87,845,946 which represented 61.1%.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>Attendants and caretakers of selected Gravity Flow schemes were trained on 9th and 10th December 2019. Among the items the members were taken through was in relation to operation and maintenance like periodically tightening of the water connections, repairing broken parts of the water facilities and greasing of chains among others.</p> <p>In the report however, there was no evidence that the training had been conducted in liaison with the Community Development Officer.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG water department maintained an updated asset register with all facilities including those for 2019/20. Examples of these facilities included; Kakumiro protected spring, and the 20 m3 water tanks at Hamabende Trading Centre and Bunama village among others.</p>	4
----	--	---	---	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible: Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided</p>	0
----	--	---	---------------------------------------	---

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that communities applied for water facilities. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The community of Busiga village applied for a communal tank on 29th December 2014 2. The community of Gahiga village applied for a communal tank on 21st January 2019 3. The community of Kibande village applied for a community tank on 8th December 2019 	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening forms to prove that the water infrastructure project for the previous financial year were screened for the environment and social impacts, for example a screening form of Nyarukararanka gravity flow scheme dated 08/09/2019 and monitoring ascertaining that the mitigation measures were in place.</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>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>For the financial year 2020/21, the Water Sector work plan had among other projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Communal Rainwater tanks at Kigyeyo, Gahinga and Ndego among others 2. Construction of Muyove Gravity Flow Scheme (Phase II) 3. And Protection of springs at Rwabujara, Ruhange, Kiruhura and Kazooka. <p>All these projects were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</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>The contracts committee approved Water Supply and Public Sanitation infrastructure projects in the Financial year 2019/20 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bid documents for Muyove Gravity Flow Scheme and Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Scheme were approved on 9th September 2019 and the evaluation reports were approved and contract awarded on 4th December 2019 2. Bid documents for the 20 m3 rain water harvest tank at Birembo village were approved on 9th September 2019 and the evaluation report approved and contract awarded on 15th October 2019 	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>Appointment letters for Contract Supervisors/Managers were sampled as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mberwa Cranmer was appointed for Muyove and Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Schemes on 15th January 2020 (R/752/1). 2. Kazungu Gideon was appointed for Construction of 6 ferro-cement water tanks which included among others one at Gasave Primary School and another at Birembo Village. (CR/752/1) <p>There were however no appointment letters for the Project Managers, Environment Officers and CDOs. Also these projects did not have Clerks of Work due to funding limitations.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>Three facilities were visited and these were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Scheme 2. And the 20 m3 water tanks at Matinza Primary School and Mukurizo village. <p>The two water tanks assessed did not have working drawings but followed BOQs and did not have any defects at the time of assessment.</p> <p>The Gravity Flow scheme had working drawings and was compliant to them. For example the distribution points at Mulehe HC II and Birasi Trading centre had dimensions of 1.4 by 1.2m as was on the designs.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There were no monthly reports prepared for WSS projects implemented in the FY 2019/20 but completion reports were prepared and were sampled as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report on completion of Muyove Gravity Floor Scheme seen for 23rd December 2019 2. Report on construction of Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Scheme seen for 23rd December 2019 <p>It was noted that these projects were not jointly monitored to include the Environment Officer and the DCDO.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0 	<p>The DWO had verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts: Examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Payment to Bango Engineering Services Ltd for shs 134,651,801 on voucher number 29809646 dated 15/6/2020 for construction of Muyove GFS Scheme Phase One. <p>Payment was initiated on 22/5/2020 for which CAO and D/E endorsed on 1/6/2020. The DWO endorsed payment on 28/5/2020; Environment Officer and CDO on 29/5/2020.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (ii) Payment to Super General Technical Works Ltd for shs 53,044,130 on voucher number 28792639 dated 15/6/2020. Payment was initiated on 13th March, 2020. <p>CAO endorsed payment on 19/3/2020; D/E on 17/3/2020; DWO on 16/3/2020; CDO and Environment Officer on 19/3/2020. This was timely payment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (iii) Payment to Bankutec Construction Company Ltd for shs 7,417,220 on voucher number 28321700 dated 5th March, 2020. Payment was initiated on 27/1/2020. CAO and D/E endorsed on 13/2/2020; DWO endorsed on 11/2/2020; CDO & Environment Officer on 10th February, 2020. 	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Three Water infrastructure procurement files were sampled as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Nyarukaranka Gravity Flow Scheme 2. Construction of Muyove Gravity Flow Scheme under Phase 1 3. Construction of a 20m3 ferro cement rainwater tank at Birembo Village. <p>All these procurement files were found to be complete with among other items; Evaluation reports approved by the Contracts Committee, Works Contracts, and minutes of Contracts Committee decisions.</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening forms to prove that the water infrastructure project for the previous financial year were screened for the environment and social impacts, for example a screening form of Nyarukaranka gravity flow scheme dated 08/09/2019 and monitoring ascertaining that the mitigation measures were in place.</p>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO had disseminated guidelines on water source catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The LG was not able to avail the water source management plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous financial year.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent. Attached to the community applications were minutes of meetings in which the community allocated land to the LG to implement WSS projects and these were sampled as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The community of Gutagwa village held their meeting on 9th December 2019. 2. That of Gahiga village held theirs on 13th January 2019. 3. And the one of Businga village held theirs on 29th December 2014. 	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>Environment and social certification forms were provided for Nyarukaranka GFS which was certified on 19th March 2020 and Muyove GFS certified on 29th May 2020.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of monitoring reports by the Environment officer and the CDO to ascertain compliance of the ESMPs for instance the monthly monitoring report of water facilities such as Nyarukaranka GFS, Muvuyo GFS among others dated 10/07/2020.</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>	Not applicable	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	Not applicable	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 4 • 60 – 69%; score 2 • Below 60%; score 0 <p>Maximum score 4</p>	Not applicable	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	Not applicable	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	Not applicable	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	Not applicable	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	Not applicable	0

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	<p>As per the approved staff structure dated 18th May 2020 ref ARC/135/01 from ministry of Public Service Kisoro DLG staff structure provides for extension workers for Agriculture, Veterinary Services, Fisheries and assistants to all the officers. By the time of the assessment not all LLGs had substantively filled all positions of the extension workers as per staffing structure. Analysis of the staffing status by sub county by type of extension workers was done (based on the list of positions of extension workers filed presented by the PHRO) and it was established that: 1.</p> <p>Agricultural officers: Six (12) out of 13 sub counties had substantively filled the position of Agriculture Officer by the time of the assessment. 2. Veterinary Officers: None of the 13 subs counties had the position of Veterinary officer substantively filled by the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Assistant Agriculture Officers 02 out of 13 Approved</p> <p>4. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officers 13out of 13</p> <p>The District had not filled the position of Assistant Fisheries Development Officers as provided for in the staffing structure</p>	1
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 	Not applicable	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 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 	Not applicable	0

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>A review of the approved customised staffing structure for Kisoro District against the the actual number of extension staff recruited at the LLGs, indicated that ; while the numbers of extension staff positions filled at each LLG was consistent with information reflected on the customized staff list for FY 2020/2021, all LLGs did not fill all the required extension staff as per minimum standards. For instance none of the LLGs had filled the position of Veterinary Officers and fisheries extension workers.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 4</p>			
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 4</p>			
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
---	---	--	----------------	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	03 Lower Local Governments were sampled. These included Murora SubCounty, Nyakinama and Chahi Sub County. All the Extension workers were working in the LLG where they were deployed .The extension workers were , signing the staff attendance book	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 no evidence that Extension workers deployment was publicized and disseminated to Lower Local Governments	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	No evidence was provided for assessment.	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	No evidence was provided for assessment.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
---	--	--	----------------	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	Not applicable	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	Not applicable	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>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</p>	Not applicable	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
----	--	--	----------------	---

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
----	--	--	----------------	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
----	---	--	----------------	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
----	---	--	----------------	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0
----	---	--	----------------	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>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>	Not applicable	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>	Not applicable	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>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>	Not applicable	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>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	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>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not applicable	0

13	<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>	Not applicable	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>	Not applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	----------

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>	Not applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	----------

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

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	Not applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	---

14	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	Not applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	---

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	Not applicable	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>	Not applicable	0
----	---	--	----------------	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation Maximum score is 70	If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.	Mr Ziragabaa Hatega John Senior Agriculture Engineer was recruited on 12/7/2019 file No CR/D/10437 under District Service Commission Min No 119/2019	70
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. Maximum score is 30	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.	Not applicable	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. Maximum score is 30	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.	Not applicable	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Mberwa Cranmer Civil Engineer(Water File No CR/D/10345 was appointed on 17/5/2018 Under DSC Min 43/2018	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Mugisha Christopher Community Development Officer was assigned duties of Assistant Water Officer in charge of Community Mobilization as per the letter from CAO dated 17/11/2018	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Bonifura Deo Borehole Maintainace Technician File No CR/D/10269 was substantively appointed on 10/10/2005 under DSC Min No 158(b) 2005	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	Muganga Mwesigye Vicent Natural Resources Officer ;file No CR/D/10395 was substantially appointed on 3/8/2007 under DSC Min No 55/2007	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Akankwasa Eunice Wafura Environment Officer was appointed 5/3/2015 under DSC Min NO 14/2015	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mukundufile Crescent Forestry Officer File No CR/D/12023 was appointed on 20/09/2013 under DSC Min NO 124/2013	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 was carried out and this was evidenced by various screening forms of different water projects for instance a screening form of Nyarukaranka gravity flow scheme and that of Muyove gravity flow scheme signed and dated 08/09/2019.	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 LG had no projects under the water sector where ESIAs were prepared.	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 contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	There was no evidence availed to show that the contractors got the abstraction permits issued by the DWRM.	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Nsabiyumva Stephen District Health Officer File No CR/D/10446 was substantively recruited on 10/10/2011 Under DSC Min No 102/2011	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	Dusabe Annet File No CR/D/10427 was Substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Maternal Child Health and Nursing on 28/2/2017 under DSC Min No 19/2017	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	Muneza Nick File No CR/D/12021 was Substantively appointed as Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health on 4/3/2019 under DSC Min No 06/2019	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.	Birungi Dismas Principal Health Inspector File No CR/D/11959 was appointed on 12/7/2019	10

1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Senior Health Educator was not substantively filled	0
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	Irakunda Nathan Biostatistician File No CR/D/12800 was appointed on 17/10/2016 under DSC Min 148/2016	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	Chance Wycliffe Cold Chain Technician File No CR/D/12096 was appointed on 10/8/2006 under DSC Min No 72/2006	10
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		

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

Environment and Social Requirements

- 2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)
- Maximum score is 30
- If the LG carried out:
- a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.
- Environmental, social and climate change screening was done prior to the commencement of health sector projects. For instance, evidenced by the screening form of phased completion of a maternity ward at Gapfurizo Health Centre II signed and dated 02/05/2019.
- 15
- 2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)
- Maximum score is 30
- b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.
- There was no projects under the health sector that required preparation of ESIAs.
- 15

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 LG did not have any education project where ESIAs were required to be prepared.

The Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	According to the approved staff structure by MoPS dated 18th April 2017 Ref (ARC/135/306/1), the LG had a position of Chief Finance Officer. However this position was not substantively filled. Acting in it was a one Uzabakirho K Godfrey who had been substantively appointed as Senior Accountant on 10/5/2005 under District Service Commission Minute No 97(b) 2005. There was also no evidence that the District had formally requested for secondment of staff from MoPS.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The Planning department was headed by Mr Bainenama Francis. He was substantively appointed as a principal Planner on 10/5/2004 reference CR/D/10318 .There was no letter from CAO assigning the Principal planner duties of a District Planner. There was no evidence that the District had formally requested for Secondment	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Engineer was not substantively filled. The department was headed by Karamira James, substantively appointed as a Senior Engineer. He was appointed on 11/01/2016 under DSC Min No 03/2016. He was assigned duties of the District Engineer on 12/7/2018 under DSC Min No 92/2018	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Muganga Mwesigye Vicent was substantively recruited as a District Natural Resources Officer on 3/8/2007 under DSC Min 55/2007	3

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Production Officer was not substantively filled. Dr Ngabo Hebert Budasha substantively appointed as a Senior Veterinary Officer on 4/3/2019 under DSC MIN NO 03/2019. He was assigned duties of the head of Production department on 29/3/2019	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Niyonzima Sam was substantively recruited as a District Community Development Officer on 16/6/2015 under DSC Min 120/2015	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Commercial Officer was not substantively filled	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer) score 2 or else 0.	Nyiritunga Margret was substantively recruited as a Senior Procurement Officer on 6/6/2018 under DSC Min 76/2018.	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer), score 2 or else 0	Nyanzi Asharaf was substantively recruited as a Procurement Officer on 6/6/2018	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	Komushana Beatrice was substantively recruited as a Principal Human Resource Officer on 12/7/2019 under DSC Min 112/2019	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Muja Judith was substantively recruited as a Senior Environment Officer on 20/7/2013 under DSC Min 112/2013	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	Sekabanza Thomas was substantively recruited as a Senior Lands Management Officer on 19/3/2018 under DSC Min 06/2018	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	Uzabakiriho Godfrey was substantively recruited as Senior Accountant on 10/10/2005 under DSC Min 97 (b) 2005	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	Nkuriye Sebusogi Gabriel was substantively recruited as a Principal Internal Auditor on 11/11/2005 under DSC Min 167/2005	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Mugisha Francesca was substantively recruited as a Principal Human Resource Officer(Secretary DSC) on 10/10/2005 under DSC Min 87/2005	2
Maximum score is 37.				
2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:	11 out the 13 Senior Assistant Secretaries in the LLGs were substantively filled as indicated below;	0
Maximum score is 15		a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS,	1. Tumuheirwe Milan Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 5/3/2015 under DSC Min No 09/2015	
		score 5 or else 0	2. Tumwiringire Calvin Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 10/10/2005 under DSC Min No 79/2005	
			3. Mbarimo Grace Hererimana Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 18/12/2006 under DSC Min No 90/2006	
			4. Nsabamina Silver Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 12/12/2006 under DSC Min No 91/2006	
			5. Munyambabazi Dan Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 10/10/2005 under DSC Min No 78/2005	
			6. Sabagabo David Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 7/4/2009 under DSC Min No 41/2009	
			7. Thembo Stephenson Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 20/9/2013 under DSC Min No 118/2013	
			8. Ahishakyiye Johnson Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 18/5/2018 under DSC Min No 16/2018	
			9. Twambazimana Aaron Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 18/5/2018 under DSC Min No 65/2018	
			10. Mbonye Emmanuel Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 5/3/2015 under DSC Min No 10/2015	
			11. Mpaka Hebert Senior Assistant Secretary was appointed on 16/8/2017 under DSC Min No 67/2017	

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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

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

score 5 or else 0.

As per the approved staff structure by MoPS dated 18th April 2017 Ref (ARC/135/306/1), it was established that all the Community Development Officers were substantively recruited. They included.

1.Nsabimana Marlesian was substantively appointed on 13/7/2017 ref.CR/D/12035 under DSC Min No 91/2017

2.Uwamahoro Mallen was appointed on 31/10/2013 ref.CR/21214 under DSC Min No 133/2013

3.Mugisha Joseph was appointed on 31/10/2009 under DSC Min 133/2013

4.Mugisha Cristopher was appointed on 5/10/2009 under DSC Min No 91/200

5.Mbabazi Dianah was appointed on 18/3/2019 under DSC Min 04/2019

6.Tumwebaze Annet was appointed on 31/10/2013 ref.CR/212/4 under DSC Min No 133/2013

7.Kampire Beatrice was appointed on 31/10/2013

Ref.CR/212/4

8.Mahirwe Kellen was appointed on 31/10/2013 ref.CD/212/4 under DSC Min No 133/213

9.Mukarugero Jovia was appointed on 31/10/2013 ref. CR/212/4 under DSC 133/2013

10.Sawiya Ndikuyeze was appointed on 31/10/2013 ref.CR/156/1 under DSC Min No 04/2019

11.Nkurikiyimana Paul was appointed on 31/12/2013 ref.CR/156/3 under DSC 135/2013

12.Friday Godwin was appointed on 31/10/2013 ref.CR/212/4 under DSC 133/2013

13.Ndikumana Enoch was appointed on 17/5/2018 ref.CR/214/2 under DSC Min No 41/2018

2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of: c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	From the personnel files, it was established that 11 out of the 13 Senior Accounts Assistant were substantively recruited. The other 2 that weren't were; 1. Mukagwije Winnie Accounts Assistant appointed on 10/10/2005 under DSC MIN NO DSC/182/2005 ref.CR/D/10472 2. Nyiratunga Dorah Accounts Assistant appointed on 21/01/2013 under DSC MIN NO 86/2012	0
---	--	---	---	---

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	The final revised budget for the Natural Resources Department in the District was shs 338,217,515. The MOFPED Warrants totaled shs 252,282,515. The total amount released was shs 252,273,200. Since 99.996% (100%) of all funds warranted for spend were actually released to the Natural Resources Department, the Council complied with this requirement.	2
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY. Maximum score is 4	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to: b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	The final revised budget for the Community Based Services Department was shs 793,836,207. The MOFPED Warrants totaled shs 332,857,371. The total amount released to the department was shs 332,855,554. Therefore, not all funds as budgeted and also warranted was released to the department. Since 99.999% (100%) of all warranted funds for spend were actually released to the Community Based Services Department, Kisoro District Local Government complied with this requirement.	2
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. Maximum score is 12	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	There was evidence of environmental, social and climate change screening forms, for instance there was a screening form of the construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Chuho primary school signed and dated on 18/06/2019 and also a screening form of a completion of 2 class rooms at Gisozi SDA primary school signed by the environment officer on 5/06/2019. There also existed a screening form of phased completion of a maternity ward at Gapfurizo Health Centre II dated 08/09/2019.	4

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have a project where ESIAs were supposed to be prepared, for instance a completion of two classrooms at Gisozi SDA primary school was under C category.</p>	4
---	---	--	---	---

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of costed ESPMs for all DDEG projects implemented by Kisoro Local government in the previous years.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>Awaits OAG Report for FY 2019/2020 in January, 2021</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p>	<p>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>The CAO responded to the 20 queries that were raised by the Internal Auditor General in respect of FY 2018/2019 through a letter dated 10th January, 2020 under reference CR/251/1 to the PS/ST. The letter was copied to Chairperson of the District, OAG, IGG, Accountant General, IAG and District Internal Auditor. All the twenty queries were fully cleared. Examples of queries raised: (i) Unaccounted for funds of the District totaling shs 54,265,400 (ii) Failure to deduct Local Service Tax by the District amounting to shs 2,872,225.</p>	10
	<p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG also responded to all the thirteen queries raised by OAG in FY 2017/2018 vide letter dated 21st March, 2019 under reference CR/251/1. As for FY 2018/2019, fifteen queries were raised but none had been cleared at the time of the assessment.</p>	
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p>	<p>The LG submitted an Annual Performance Contract for FY 2020/2021 vide letter dated 17th August, 2020 under reference CR/103/1.</p>	4
	<p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>		
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>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>The LG submitted the Annual Performance Report for the FY 2019/2020 on 18th August, 2020 through the PBS before August 31, of the Financial Year 2020/2021.</p>	4
	<p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>		
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>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>Kisoro DLG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY 2019/2020 by August 31 of the Financial Year 2020/2021 through PBS on line as follows:</p>	4
	<p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>1st Quarter on 11/12/2019; 2nd Quarter on 31/01/2020; 3rd Quarter on 11/5/2020; 4th Quarter on 18/8/2020.</p>	