



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Buikwe District

(Vote Code: 582)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	71%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	80%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	70%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	72%
Educational Performance Measures	64%
Health Performance Measures	52%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	79%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	35%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the DDEG projects completed below were being used by the beneficiaries as per their profiles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buikwe health III (page 66 of Annual performance report APR) at a cost of Ugx 35m, it was started on 1/7/2019 and completed on 30/5/2020 was functional;</li> <li>Buikwe subcounty administration building (page 42 of APR) at a cost of Ugx 6.94m, it was started in 2014/15 financial year and completed in 2019/20; and</li> <li>A Soil block making machine that was procured at Ugx 6.5m was also functional.</li> </ol>	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o by more than 10%: Score 3</li> <li>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</li> <li>o Below 5 % Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the project planned to be implemented in the LG Annual Work Plan for the year 2019/20 (page 69), and were all completed 100%, quarter 4 Performance report page 66:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buikwe health III (page 66 of Annual performance report APR) at a cost of Ugx 35m, it was started on 1/7/2019 and completed on 30/5/2020;</li> <li>Buikwe subcounty administration building (page 42 of APR) at a cost of Ugx 6.94m, it was started in 2014/15 financial year and completed in 2019/20; and</li> <li>A Soil block making machine that was procured at Ugx 6.5m.</li> </ol> <p>Planned projects were 3 and all were completed;  <math>3/3 \times 100 = 100\%</math></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.	There was evidence that 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: The LG DDEG budgeted funds were Ugx 239,151,249(page 69 of AWP) and it was spent (page 66 of Annual performance report) as below:  1. Buikwe health III (page 66 of Annual performance report APR) at a cost of Ugx 35m;  2. Buikwe subcounty administration building (page 42 of APR) at a cost of Ugx 6.94m;  3. A Soil block making machine that was procured at Ugx 6.5m.  4. Transfers to LLGs Ugx 151.5m;  5. Natural Resources 12m;  6. Capacity Building 8.8m;  7.CBS- FAL, VSLA 12.2m ; and  8.Other costs at Ugx 6.3m.	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	Buikwe District LG did not execute any DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY. .	2
---	--	---	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,  score 2 or else score 0	The information on the positions filled in LLGs was compared with the approves staff structure and the staff establishment list and found to be accurate at the three sampled LLGs of Buikwe SC, Najja SC and Buikwe TC	2
---	--	--	---	---

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>There was evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG funds was in place as per LG Annual Performance report page 66:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Buikwe health III (page 66 of Annual performance report APR) at a cost of Ugx 35m;</li> <li>2. Buikwe subcounty administration building (page 42 of APR) at a cost of Ugx 6.94m;</li> <li>3. A Soil block making machine that was procured at Ugx 6.5m.</li> </ol> <p>They are all in place as per Annual Performance report, <math>3/3 \times 100\% = 100\%</math>.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>This Performance Measure was not applicable until LLGs are assessed.</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The district did not consolidate and submit staff requirements to the MoPS</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as per the attendance registers examined, for the period July to December 2019 and the "Staff Attendance Worksheet" depicting days present and absence, for each department.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The district had ten (10) Heads of Department, they were all appraised as per the appraisal reports examined. They were appraised on the following dates;</p> <p>CFO – 17th July 2020, 2. Assistant CAO – 18th August 2020, 3. District Planner – 17th July 2020, 4. District Engineer – 15th July 2020, 5. District Education Officer – 2nd July 2020, 6. District Community Development Officer – 18th August 2020, 7. District Natural Resources Officer – 15th July 2020, 8. District Production Officer – 14th July 2020, 9. District Trade and Industry Officer – 14th July 2020 and 10. District Health Officer – 23rd July 2020</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The district implemented the administrative sanctions as per the minutes of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee meeting held on 6th February 2020 and the resultant action taken as per the letters ADM/163/4 dated 18th February 2020</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Consultative Committee for staff grievance redress was established this FY as per the members' appointment letters examined - ADM/156/2 dated 11th November 2020. It was not functional during the previous FY</p>	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.	Forty three (43) new employees of various designations were appointed during the previous FY as per the authority to recruit letter DSC/214/2 dated 30th January 2020 minute number BDSC.10 2020. The nwe employees were appointed durinf the month of February as per the sampled appointment letters - ADM/156/3 dated 4th February. They accessed the pay roll on 28th April 2020, as per the IPPS pay roll of the same month.	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.	Nineteen (19) employees retired during the previous FY as per the district retirement list. The sampled names indicated that they all accessed the pension payroll within two months of their retirement as per the payment dates, invoice amounts and bank remission account numbers on the IPPS payroll.	1

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

10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that DDEG funds to LLGs were transferred in full as per the requirements in the budget for the year 2019/20. Copies of warrants submitted to MoFPED for the FY 2019/20 indicated that all DDEG funds were transferred in full to LLGs. A total of UGX 151,525,134 as budgeted in the 2019/20 AWP, was fully transferred in the 3 quarters to the LLGs as below:  Quarter 1 warrant of Ugx 50,508,378 was transferred on 26/7/2019;  Quarter 2 warrant of Ugx 50,508,378 was transferred on 15/10/2019; and  Quarter 3 warrant of Ugx 50,508,378 was transferred on 14/1/2020.	2
10	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:  Score: 2 or else score 0	The LG did not warrant in time to LLGs about DDEG releases:  Quarter 1 warrant was on 26/7/2019, release date was 9/7/2019, 10 days;  Quarter 2 warrant was on 15/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019, 13 days; and  Quarter 3 warrant was on 14/1/2020, release date was 8/1/2020, 13 days.	0

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not invoice nor communicate in time to LLGs about DDEG releases:</p> <p>Quarter 1 invoicing was on 26/7/2019, release date was 9/7/2019, 19 days;</p> <p>Quarter 2 invoicing was on 15/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019, 13 days; and</p> <p>Quarter 3 invoicing was on 21/1/2020, release date was 8/1/2020,13days.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG supervised and mentored all LLGs . The LLGs were mentored in TPC meetings that took place on 29/8/2019, 27/9/2019, 30/1/2020 and 28/11/2019.</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>There was evidence that the reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, as seen from the TPC minutes below:</p> <p>TPC of 29/8/2019 minute 5 ;</p> <p>TPC date 28/11/2019 minute 5;</p> <p>TPC of 30/1/2020 minute 6; and</p> <p>TPC of 22/8/2020 minute 5.</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><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>	<p>The LG maintained an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, Land etc. as per format in the accounting manual and was updated as of June 30, 2020.</p> <p>Assets breakdown were on page 49 of the Financial statements for the financial year 2019/20, Summary statement of stores and other assets (Physical assets) as at June 30, 2020:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land Ugx 0;</li> <li>2. Building and structures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Non Residential buildings Ugx 31,535,037,415 ;</li> <li>b) Residential buildings Ugx 5,787,296,083 ;</li> <li>c) Roads and bridges Ugx 0;</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Transport Equipment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Motor vehicles Ugx 17,000,000 ;</li> <li>b) Motorcycles Ugx 73,630,000</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. equipment Ugx 6,732,487,075 ; and</li> <li>5. Furniture and fittings Ugx 140,775,664 ;</li> <li>6. Cultivated assets Ugx 9,997,000; and</li> <li>7. Others Ugx 3,720,619,308,</li> </ol>	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 no evidence that the LG used the Board of Survey Report of the year 2018/19 to make Assets Management decisions.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG Physical Planning Committee was in place and functioning, but had only 2 sets of minutes and without evidence of submission to MoLHUD .</p>	0



12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects; Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG conducted desk appraisals and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the reports dated 20/5/2019. The following projects were appraised:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of Buikwe H/C III Maternity Ward, Buikwe Ward ;</li> <li>2. Phased completion of Buikwe Sub-county Administration Block; and</li> <li>3. Procurement of one soil block/brick making machine and procurement of 2000 assorted tree seedlings for distribution and planting in Ngogwe, Ssi, Buikwe and Najja S/counties .</li> </ol>	2
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: 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>The LG conducted field appraisals and scrutiny for technical feasibility environmental and socially acceptability and designs customized for the investment project was done as indicated in the feasibility report dated 20 March 2019).</p> <p>The following projects were sampled and found to have been appraised and scrutinized:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of Buikwe H/C III Maternity Ward, Buikwe Ward ;</li> <li>2. Phased completion of Buikwe Sub-county Administration Block; and</li> <li>3. Procurement of one soil block/brick making machine and procurement of 2000 assorted tree seedlings for distribution and planting in Ngogwe, Ssi, Buikwe and Najja S/counties .</li> </ol>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP. The 3 sampled projects below were reviewed in the TPC meeting of 31/10/2019 minute 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Periodic maintenance of 39kms of District Roads in Ngogwe, Ssi, Najja, and Buikwe;</li> <li>2.Rehabilitation of 10 hand pumps in Najja subcounty; and</li> <li>3. ompletion of Buikwe H/C III Maternity Ward, Buikwe Ward.</li> </ol>	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>The LG did not have any new DDEG projects for the previous FY. One DDEG project was procurement of a Block-making machine and this did not need Environmental Screening. The other two were started in past years and the previous FY was only used for completion but Environmental Screening had been done in earlier years. These two were:</p> <p>1) Completion of maternity Ward at Buikwe HC III; and</p> <p>2) Completion of Administration Block at Buikwe sub county Headquarters.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan . The projects include The procurement of street lights (page 2 of 6) of the procurement plan 2020-2021.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from Minutes from the meeting of the contracts committee dated August 3, 2020, under minute 4 to determine whether all DDEG infrastructure projects and the respective bidding documents were approved before commencement.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Buikwe LG did not have an infrastructure project implemented under DDEG. The works included Buikwe subcounty administration building; A Soil block making machine that was procured; transfers to lower Local Governments; Natural Resources; and Capacity Building</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO have supervised each project (site meetings with contractors) prior to verification and certification of works	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	There was evidence that the LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract. Sampled payments include:  1. The payment certificate no. 1 for the construction of an 3 in 1 classroom block , 3 in 1 staff house with a 5 stance latrine, renovation of 2no classroom blocks and kitchen at Nyenga Primary school, prepared on 6/10/2020, verified by the LG Engineer, the DEO and paid on 14/10/2020;  2. The payment certificate no. 1 for the construction of an 3 in 1 classroom block , 3 in 1 staff house with a 5 stance latrine, renovation of 2no classroom blocks and kitchen at St. Joseph Mbukiro Primary school, prepared on 6/10/2020, verified by the LG Engineer, the DEO and paid on 14/10/2020	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	There was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The projects contain the details of the procurement requests, the bidding, the award and the payments.  The sampled contracts was The renovation 3 in 1 Classroom block with office, a 3 in 1 staff house with s stance VIP latrine, Renovation of 2 No. Classroom blocks and kitchen at St. Joseph Mbikiro. The file number is BUK/582/wrks/19-20.0009-03. It has details of Procurement request confirmed on 16/5/2020, details of advertisement, evaluation details and awards of contract dated August 19, 2019 and agreement signature of 24/8/2019.	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>A letter dated 11th November 2020 appointed Ms. Sebyala Hadija as Chairperson of the Grievances Committee. The letter was signed by Musoke Kayizzi Charles, CAO.</p> <p>According to minutes of the Top Management meeting (TMM) held 7 September at Buikwe Council Hall, Minute 5 was Selection of District Grievance Committee. The committee was selected to compose of seven members, chaired by Sebyala Hadija PHRO.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG has a file when grievances are recorded, investigated and attended to. The complaints Log was not in place but the file was arranged in such a sequence that it literally constituted a Complaints log.</p> <p>A case in point was the complaint lodged by Nalunkuma Joanita Nalongo and Babirye Monic Nalongo against Appo Bar for the Noise, vulgar language and poor disposal of wastes at Appo bar and Guest House. The complaint was lodged at the District on 27th Feb. 2020. GRC took action and visited the place complained about and wrote a report dated 2nd march 2020. On 5th March 2020, GRC contacted the Appo Bar owners and ordered them to improve on the issues complained about in the Improvement Notice. A follow-up was made on 2nd March 2020 and the case forwarded to Environmental Police.</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties knew where to report and get redress. This was because:</p> <p>1) The District website has a slot for a complaints flow chart for Grievance Redress Mechanism; and</p> <p>2) Though many lacked the advert, some noticeboards had the Grievance Redress Mechanism advertised.</p>	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets. Page 9 of the Ugx 26,901,000 was budgeted for environment page 132 of the 2019/20 annual workplan.</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>There was evidence that the enhanced DDEG guidelines were disseminated to LLGs, they picked them from the planner in the TPC meeting of 31/10/2019.</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 have any new DDEG projects for the previous FY.</p>	3

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were other projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Those presented were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Supply and installation of solar to support lighting (22 bulbs), solar fridges 330 litres, ironing, 3 T.V of 21 inches in school staff houses, costed at UGX18,698,000/-;</li> <li>2) Coating for Lightening arrestors in the construction of a 3-in-one classroom block, and a series of other strictures at Ssesse Orthodox P/S in Nyenga, costed at UGX3,320,000/-; and</li> <li>3) Also for the same project above, there was section for water harvesting and hand-washing facility, costed at UGX800,000/-.</li> </ol>	3
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 evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access, and availability. Those sampled included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ssugu Secondary school on Plot 677, Block 236, Mukono District, Kyaggwe;</li> <li>2) Land Agreement where Namusanga primary School purchased land from three people namely; Makumbi David, Kiwanuka Wilber &amp; Teyise Hannington on 11/09/20;</li> <li>3) A Gift d Inter vivos granting Kisimba UMEA primary School land of two acres on 25th Sept 2010. The Deed was drawn by Baale, Lubega &amp; Co. Advocates.</li> <li>4) Buikwe Health Centre III on Plot 502, Block 339, Mukono District, Kyaggwe; and</li> <li>5) Ssi Health Centre III on Plot 63, Block 467, Buikwe District, Kyaggwe.</li> </ol>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports. Reports were prepared but this was done autonomously by the two departments. So, there was no liaison between the two departments to synchronize supervision of activities, and reports indicated different levels of involvement and interest by each department.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that E&amp;S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was NO evidence that E&amp;S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.</p> <p>Environment section is aware of their responsibility and wrote a letter dated 17th august 2020, written by the senior Environmental Officer to the DNRO, stressing certification of compliance with environmental regulations, but this is not yet followed by the District.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

### Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>All the bank accounts sampled had their monthly reconciliations done up to October 31, 2020. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MUWRP ;</li> <li>2. TSA; and</li> <li>3. General fund.</li> </ol>	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>The LG produced 4 quarterly internal audit reports in the FY 2019/20 as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 report was prepared on 4/3/20;</p> <p>Quarter 2 report was prepared on 20/8/20;</p> <p>Quarter 3 report was prepared 20/8/20; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 report was prepared on 20/8/20.</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 evidence that the LG provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings as below:</p> <p>Q1 report was submitted to LG PAC and the Council on 6/3/20;</p> <p>Q2 report was submitted to LG PAC and the Council on 28/8/2020 ;</p> <p>Q3 report was submitted to LG PAC and the Council on 28/8/2020 ; and</p> <p>Q4 report was submitted to LG PAC and the Council on 28/8/2020 .</p>	1

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Q1 report was reviewed by the LG PAC on 19/6/2020, MIN DPAC/23/2020;</p> <p>Q2 report was reviewed by the LG PAC on 27/10/2020, MIN DPAC/28/2020 ;</p> <p>Q3 report was reviewed by the LG PAC on 27/10/2020, MIN DPAC/28/2020 ; and</p> <p>Q4 report was reviewed by the LG PAC on 27/10/2020, MIN DPAC/28/2020.</p>	1
----	--	--	--	---

**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 actual/budget local revenue collection ratio for the FY 2018/19 was 65.9% (UGX760,261,196 /1,154,501,000). This was budget variance of -34.1% which is lower than than -10%. Therefore scoring 0.</p> <p>(Source: LG Final accounts for FY 2019/20 page 17 and Budget Estimates for 2019/20 page 2.)</p>	0
----	---	---	---	---

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG OSR increased by 18 % from UGX 644,966,900 in the FY 2018/19 to UGX 760,261,196 in the FY 2019/20. (Source: LG audited accounts for Financial Year (FY) 2018/19 page 12 and draft accounts for the year 2019/20 page 17.</p>	2
----	--	--	--	---



20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency  Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the mandatory share of sharable local revenues of Ugx 187,970,362 was remitted to LLGs at 65 % (Ugx 49,546,912) for the 4 sub counties (SC) and at 100% (Ugx 111,744,344) to 3 town councils (TC) as follows:  1.Najja SC disbursement of Ugx 9,665,500;  2.Buikwe SC disbursement of Ugx 10,436,236;  3.Ngogwe SC disbursement of Ugx 8,882,210;  4.Ssi SC disbursement of Ugx 20,562,966;  5.Nkokonjeru TC disbursement of Ugx 62,545,000;  6.Kiyindi TC disbursement of Ugx 28,138,094; and  7.Buikwe TC disbursement of Ugx 21,061,250.	2
----	---	---	---	---

### Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence of a notice board at the LG head quarter where all information on the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published. The notice board have the procurement plan for the current year 2020-21. The assessor was informed that the awarded contracts are displayed for a period of ten days thereafter the records are kept in a special file for record purposes. There is evidence of a file having recors for the awarded contracts for the previous year 2019-20.	2
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG performance assessment results for the year 2018/19 together with the implications were available on the LG notice board at the time of the assessment.	2
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG conducted discussions with the public on service delivery and got feed back. Evidence was radio talk pictures that was held in June 2020.	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>LG made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal on its notice board and website <a href="http://www.buikwe.go.ug">www.buikwe.go.ug</a>.</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>The report was prepared on 27/7/2020 for all the 3 cases that are still ongoing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complaint by Naliba Samuel headteacher of dismissal from teaching service;</li> <li>2. Complaint by Gudoi Asaf teacher of dismissal from teaching service; and</li> <li>3. Complaint against Senyonjo Noah teacher of dismissal from teaching service;</li> </ol>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes:            The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG PLE pass rate had declined by 4% between the previous school year but one and the previous year as shown below:</p> <p>2018: Div. one was 405, Div two was 1,727, and Div. three was 708. The total pass, therefore, was 2,540 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 3,856.</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2018 was, therefore, <math>2,540/3,856 \times 100 = 66\%</math>.</p> <p>2019: Div. one was 218, Div two was 1,806, and Div. three was 861. The total pass, therefore, was 2,885 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 4,644.</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was, therefore, <math>2,885/4,644 \times 100 = 62\%</math></p> <p>Therefore <math>66\% - 62\% = 4\%</math> percentage decline.</p>	0
1	<p>Learning Outcomes:            The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG UCE pass rate had improved by 2.2% between the previous school year but one and the previous year as shown below:</p> <p>2018: Div. one was 09, Div two was 58, and Div. three was 115. The total pass, therefore, was 182 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 583.</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2018 was, therefore, <math>182/583 \times 100 = 31.2\%</math></p> <p>2019: Div. one was 02, Div two was 73, and Div. three was 131. The total pass, therefore, was 206 while the total number of candidates that sat exams was 616</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2019 was, therefore, <math>206/616 \times 100 = 33.4\%</math></p> <p>Therefore <math>33.4\% - 31.2\% = 2.2\%</math> percentage improvement.</p>	2

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 1</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This performance measure was not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The LG received a sum of 1,272,729,000 UGX development grant which was on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines as shown below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a seed school at sugu SS at Buikwe sub-county.</li> <li>2. Construction of a two-classroom block with an office at Luwombo P/S in Buikwe Sub-county.</li> <li>3. Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Kiwungi P/S at SI sub-county.</li> <li>4. Renovation of 3 classroom block at malongwe R/C in Buikwe Town council.</li> <li>5. Procurement of 113 desks for Najja R/C and Buikwe C/U.</li> </ol>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the Chief finance officer, there was no evidence to show whether certification of works was done before the LG made payments to contractors by the DEO, Environmental officer, and CDO. Instead the CDO come up with an independent report for the construction of Luwombo P/S on 5/06/2020 and the DEO together with the environmental officer made a report on 16/09/2019 .</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that variations in the contract price were within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates. The sampled contacts were for:  1. Construction of Luwombo P.S where the estimate was Shs. 90,000,000 and the ward was 76,404,047 and hence the variation was 13.6%; 2. Construction of Ssesse Primary school P.S where the estimate was 274,000,000 and the ward was 302,337,253 and hence the variation was 10.3%; and 3. Construction of St. Joseph Mbukiro Primary school, where where the estimate was 225,000,000 and the ward was 258,837,310 and hence the variation was 15%.	2	
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY  • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	There was evidence that all the education projects were completed as per work plan in the previous FY were completed as per work plan. The projects included: .Construction of a seed school at Ssugu SS at Buikwe sub-county; Construction of a two-classroom block with an office at Luwombo P/S in Buikwe Sub-county; Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Kiwungi P/S at SI sub-county; and .Renovation of 3 classroom block at Malongwe R/C in Buikwe Town council.  The project were 3 out of 4 hence 75%	1
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines  • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0	There was evidence from the Human resource office, staffing structure, and teacher staff list that the LG had 580 (85%) recruited primary school teachers out of 680 teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines.	2
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,  • If above 70% score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0	From the list of registered UPE and USE schools; and the consolidated Schools Asset Register for both UPE and USE schools from the previous two FYs, it was evident that 64 (81%) schools out of 73 UPE and 6 USE meet prescribed minimum standards.	3
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure					

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed, the sampled schools had the same teachers as those on the deployment list as shown below:</p> <p>Buikwe C/U had 11 teachers; Kisimba UMEA P/S 07 teachers while St. Alophious demonstration school Nkonkonjeru had 11 teachers.</p>	2
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"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the LG education office and from the sampled schools; it was evident that LG had a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools as shown below:</p> <p>Buikwe C/U had 05 teachers' houses;215 desks;12 toilet stances and 10 classrooms. Kisimba UMEA P/S 06 teachers houses;07 classrooms;78 desks and 5 toilet stances while St. Alophious demonstration school Nkonkonjeru had 6teachers' houses;10 classrooms;146 desks;16 toilet stances.</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"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>All the sampled schools which were Kisimba UMEA P/S, St Alphonsus demonstration school Nkonkonjeru and Buikwe C/U <b>none</b> of them had complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines, and have submitted reports (signed by the headteacher 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: All had submitted their budgets to the DEO beyond the January deadline as shown below: Kisimba UMEA submitted on 5/06/2020, St Alphonsus demonstration nkonkonjeru submitted on 18/05/2019 while Buikwe C/U submitted on 21/07/2020.</p>	0

6	School compliance and performance improvement:  Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:  • If 50% score: 4  • Between 30– 49% score: 2  • Below 30% score 0	There was evidence that all UPE schools and from particularly the sampled schools: Kisimba UMEA, St Alphonsus demonstration nkonkonjeru, and Buikwe C/U all of them (100%) were supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations,	4
6	School compliance and performance improvement:  Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:  • If 100% score: 4:  • Between 90 – 99% score 2  • Below 90% score 0	The LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year with an enrolment of 28,802 pupils.	4

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:  Score 4 or else, score: 0	The LG had budgeted 4,311,808,348 UGX to cater for a headteacher 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.	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	From the three sampled schools: Kisimbi P/S had 7 teachers; Buikwe C/U had 11 teachers and St Alophunsus had 11 teachers just in line with the sector guideline/staffing norms .	3

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The teacher deployment data from sampled was disseminated or publicized on school notice board as shown below: Kisimbi P/S had 7 teachers; Buikwe C/U had 11 teachers and St Alophunsus had 11 teachers.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The district had seventy three (73) primary schools and therefore 73 Primary School Head Teachers. The sampled 10 appraisal reports indicated that they were all appraised on the following dates;  Buzaama CoU PS – 2nd December 2029, 2. St Jude Zzingz PS – 29th November 2019, 3. Busagazi PS – 29th November 2019, 4. Nkongge CoU PS – 1st December 2029, 5. Makonge Public PS – 29th November 2019, 6. Kyanja Public PS- 5th December 2019, 7. Namaseke Public PS – 29th November 2019, 8. Lobongo PS – 29th November 2019, 9. Buikwe Ssabawaali PS – 5th December 2019 and 10. Vuluga UMES PS – 27th November 2019</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The district had six (6) secondary schools and therefore 6 secondary school Head Teachers. Only three (3) were appraised on the following dated;  1. Secret Heart Najja SS – 6th December 2019, 2. St Peters SS Nkokonjeru – 10th December 2019 and 3. Ngogwe Baskerville – 12th December 2019</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>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The department had five (5) members of staff. They were all appraised on the following dates;</p> <p>1. Education Office – 2nd September 2020, 2. Sports Officer – 14th July 2020, 3. Inspector of Schools – 15th July 2020, 4. Inspector of Schools – 15th July 2020 and 5. Senior Education Officer – 15th July 2020</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG education department had a sector training plan under the Buikwe district education sector capacity building plan (2018-2021) dated June 2018. Where staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level were addressed. As a result 43 teachers were taken for grade three training at Nazigo primary teachers college.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) on 10/10/2019 before the december 15th annual deadline.</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>The LG made allocations of 45,560,000 UGX to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</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>The LG did not submit warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 warrant was on 26/7/2019, release date was 9/7/2019, 10 days;</p> <p>Quarter 2 warrant was on 15/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019, 13 days; and</p> <p>Quarter 3 warrant was on 14/1/2020, release date was 8/1/2020, 13 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>There was no evidence that the LG had invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED as shown below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 release date was 9/7/2019, but communication was 13 days later ; Quarter 2 release date was 2/10/2019, but communication was 16 days later ; and Quarter 3 release date was 8/1/2020, but communication was 16 days later.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department had prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections on 06/08/2020.</p>	2

10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:  • If 100% score: 2  • Between 80 – 99% score 1  • Below 80%: score 0	On average 78% of all the 73 registered UPE schools had been inspected at least once per term and reports produced as follows: Term 11(2019): 55 out of 73 (75%). Term 111(2019) :52 out of 73 (71%) were inspected. Term 1(2020): 64 out of 73 (88%).	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,  Score: 2 or else, score: 0	There was evidence from departmental meetings held on 2/09/2019;11/11/2019 and 8/05/2020 to show that inspection reports have been discussed and recommend corrective actions and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up for in kisimbi UMEA P/S the dilapidated classrooms are under renovation.	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	From the DES acknowledgments dated 10/1/2020 and 13/7/2020, it was evident that he DIS had 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).	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	There was evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings and performance assessment results as below:  1. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 1/10/2019, MIN 07/SSC/O1/10/2019 (7.1) ;  2. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 20/11/2019 , MIN 13/SSC/20/11/2019(13.4) ;  3. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 19/2/2020, MIN 19/SSC/19/02/2020 (9.2) ; and  4. Minutes of the social committee meeting dated 20/5/2020 MIN 23/SSC/20/05/2020 (23.2) .	2

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>	There was no evidence that the LG Education department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school.	0
----	--	--	---	---

## 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 evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, it was last updated in March 2020. The information from the selected schools matches with that from sampled schools as shown below:  1) Buikwe C/U in Buikwe town council had 05 teacher houses; 215 desks; 12 toilet stances; 10 classrooms and no laboratory.  2) Kisimbi UMEA in Najja Sub-county had 06 teacher houses; 78 desks; 5 toilet stances; 07 classrooms and no laboratory.  3) St. Alphonsus demonstration in Nkonkonjeru town council 06 teacher houses; 146 desks; 16 toilet stances; 10 classrooms and no laboratory.	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 LG conducted desk appraisals for education projects and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the undated appraisal for 2019/20 prioritized projects. Some of the education projects included:  1. Rehabilitation of 2 classrooms at Malongwe primary school;  2. Construction of a 2 in 1 classroom block with an office at Luwomba primary school; and  3. Construction of a 5 Stance pit latrine at Kiwungi primary school in Ssi subcounty.	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 conducted field appraisals for all education projects, evidenced from the undated appraisal for 2019/20 prioritized projects. Some of the education projects validated in the LG annual performance report include:  1. Rehabilitation of 2 classrooms at Malongwe primary school;  2. Construction of a 2 in 1 classroom block with an office at Luwomba primary school; and  3. Construction of a 5 Stance pit latrine at Kiwungi primary school in Ssi subcounty.	1

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>There was evidence that the education sector infrastructure have been incorporated in LG's procurement plan for the current FY. The projects include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 2 in 1 classroom block at Buinja Quran school</li> <li>2. Construction of 2 in 1 classroom block at Vuluga Islamic school;</li> <li>3. Renovation of primary school classrooms (76)</li> </ol>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the planned infrastructure projects were discussed and approved in the PDU meeting dated August 3, 2020.</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>There was no evidence of a formal establishment of a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the construction followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES. The sampled schools included: There was evidence that the MoES standard technical designs were followed in the implementation of the Seed Secondary School. The assessor visited SSugu, Matale S/C Seed Secondary School and the details of site visits are detailed below;</p>	1
			<p>Structures found on ground were: an administration block with a 2-stance pit latrine; 3 No 2 in 1 classrooms; 2 No. 5-stance pit latrines; 2 in 1 Science Laboratory; Multipurpose building; 3 staff house blocks with each having a kitchen; and a 2-stance pit latrine and ICT library. The structures had been laid as per designs;</p>	
			<p>The details are as per the laid out drawings. The Classroom blocks were laid as per classroom block drawing. Each block had 2 classrooms as specified in the drawings, The teacher's units were laid as per staff house block drawing. Each block had 2 staff houses each with a dining, 2 bedrooms, store and bathroom as specified on the drawings. In addition, each block had 2-unit staff kitchen and 2 stance pit latrine. The doors and windows type used were those specified in the drawings, with standard casement windows Sampled Measurements were for :</p>	
			<p><b>a) ICT-Library.</b></p>	
			<p>The measured dimension was 11400 X 8100, this augured well with the design size of 12000 x 8000mm. The room had 5 windows each of 1200x 1500mm. This was as per the drawings.</p>	
			<p><b>b) 5 stance pit latrine for girls:</b></p>	
			<p>The entire length of the toilet was 3100x7700mm whereas actual size on the 5 stance VIP drawing was 3020x7800mm, The circulation floor size of the 4 stances was 1200X6520mm whereas actual size was 1190X6500</p>	
			<p><b>Visual checks on the entire structures:</b></p>	
			<p>The roof used was corrugated iron roofing sheets as seen on the typical wall/roof detail for different structures laid on steel trusses The floor had been finished with cement screed as seen on the drawings; No cracks were seen in the walls or floor; Works are still ongoing</p>	
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The was no evidence of monthly site meetings as per guidelines.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of records/ reports from site supervision activities to ensure that this involved participation of engineers, environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that Education infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract as below:</p> <p>1. A Contract for the construction of a latrine at Kiwungi Primary school by Sonsole General contractos ltd worth Ugx 22,000,000 was properly executed:, a suppliers request of Ugx 22,000,000 and the certificate was approved by the Engineer and the DEO on 15/6/2020 and 22/6/2020 respectively, and was paid on 24/6/2020 as per contract.;</p> <p>2. A Contract for supply of 3 seater desks at Buikwe Primary school by Malope construction ltd worth Ugx 19,210,000 was properly executed:, a suppliers request of Ugx 19,210,000 and the certificate was approved by the Engineer and the DEO on 11/6/2020 and 15/6/2020 respectively, and was paid on 24/6/2020 as per contract; and</p> <p>2. A Contract for construction of office block at Luwombo Primary school by Pick brand ltd worth Ugx 39,333,845 was properly executed:, a suppliers request of Ugx 39,333,845 and the certificate was approved by the Engineer and the DEO on 10/6/2020 and 15/6/2020 respectively, and was paid on 24/6/2020 as per contract.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There is no evidence LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan to the PDU April 30th. The Education Plan was submitted, by the DEO on May 20, 2019.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law</p> <p><i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The sampled projects include:</p> <p>The Renovation of a 3 in 1 classroom block with office at at Malongwe (<b>Buik582/Wrks/19-20/00011</b>), The procurement request was received and approve on 19/8/2019, the advert was made, there are details of bid evaluation, letter of award was made on 6/1/2020 and contract signed on 10/1/2020.</p>	1
----	--	---	---	---

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>This was not done, and no evidence was produced to show that grievances had been recorded, investigated and responded to 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>There was no evidence from the sampled schools to show that LG had disseminated the education guidelines to provide for access to land without encumbrance, proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---



16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that LG had in place a costed ESMP and these were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents. Samples taken included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Renovation of classroom block A, B and Kikajja R/C P/S in Ssi Bukunja. The environmental Impact assessment was costed at UGX3,000,000/-, and tree Planting at UGX400,000;</li> <li>2) Construction of a 3-in-1 classroom block with office and 4-in-1 classroom block without office at Kikusa P/S, Ngogwe Sub County. The environmental Impact assessment was costed at UGX3,000,000/-, and tree Planting at UGX350,000; and</li> <li>3) Renovation of classroom block A and B at Kisimba UMEA P/S in Najja sub county Buikwe District. The environmental Impact assessment was costed at UGX3,000,000/-, and tree Planting at UGX1,000,000.</li> </ol>	2
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 and access for school construction projects. Those presented were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ssugu Secondary school on Plot 677, Block 236, Mukono District, Kyaggwe;</li> <li>2) Land Agreement where Namusanga primary School purchased land from three people namely; Makumbi David, Kiwanuka Wilber &amp; Teyise Hannington on 11/09/20;</li> <li>3) A Gift "Inter vivos" granting Kisimba UMEA primary School land of two acres on 25th Sept 2010. The Deed was drawn by Baale, Lubega &amp; Co. Advocates.</li> </ol>	1

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was 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</p> <p>Monitoring Reports seen written by the Environment Officer for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Construction of a 3-in-one classroom block including office, computer room and store, 1 kitchen and 2-stance latrine and washrooms at Najja R/C primary school, dated 11/05/2020;</li> <li>2) Construction of Seed Secondary School, dated 4th August 2020;</li> <li>3) Renovation of a 2-in-one classroom block and office at Bbogo primary school dated 14th Nov. 2019;</li> <li>4) Construction of one classroom block and a 2-stance toilet and bathroom at St. Jude Zinga Primary School, dated 14th Nov. 2019; and</li> <li>5) Renovation of a 2-in-one classroom block and office at Banga Primary School dated 14th Nov. 2019.</li> </ol>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was NO evidence that E&amp;S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.</p> <p>Environment section was aware of their responsibility and wrote a letter dated 17th august 2020, written by the Senior Environmental Officer to the DNRO, stressing certification of compliance with environmental regulations, but this is not yet followed by the District.</p>	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p><b>None of the sampled health facilities registered an increase of 20% of more in OPD and Deliveries between 2018/19 to 2019/20. The percentage increases were as below:</b></p> <p>1. Ngogwe HC3 - Deliveries: 2018/19 – 549; 2019/20 – 545: 0.7% decrease; OPD: 2018/19 – 14509; 2019/20 – 16075 – 11%;</p> <p>2. Kasubi HC3 -Deliveries: 2018/19 – 234; 2019/20 – 275 – 17.5%; OPD: 2018/19 – 15233; 2019/20 – 19498 – 28%; and</p> <p>3. Makindu HC3 - Deliveries: 2018/19 – 334; 2019/20 – 412 – 23.4 %; OPD: 2018/19 – 12813; 2019/20 – 15024 – 17.3%.</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%; score 2</li> <li>• 50 – 69% score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This performance measure was not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.</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>b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC Ills and IVs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 75%; score 2</li> <li>• 65 – 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65% ; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The average RBF score for the 11 participating HC3 was 91%. The individual scores were:</p> <p>1. Ssi HC3 – 86.2% ; 2. Ngogwe HC3 – 88.0%; 3. Makindu HC3 – 88.4%; 4. Makongwe HC3 – 96.5%; 5. Buikwe HC3 – 87.8%; 6. Kasubi HC3 – 93.5%; 7. Najjembe HC3 – 90.7; 8. Busabaga HC3 – 96.8%; 9. Njeru TC HC3 – 95.2%; 10. Wakisi HC3 – 88.4%; 11. St. Francis Health Care Services – 91.6%; and 11. Buwagajjo HC3 – 89.1%.</p>	2

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.	There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant Ugx 763,162,000 for the year 2019/20 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines. The projects included were :  1. Lower local government health facilities Ugx 368,523,000;  2. LG Health office Ugx 28,900,000; and  3. Promotion and disease control Ugx 365,739,000 .	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified work on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors. A certification dated 13/5/2020 by the CDO and Environmental officer listed and approved all health sector projects before payments were made. These included renovation Ssi health Centre III in Ssi subcounty and Buikwe health Centre III.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimate. The sampled project was the Phased Construction of Maternity ward at Buikwe health centre II The estimate was Shs,39,943,00 and the contract awards was Shs. 33,311,194 hence the variation was <b>16.6%</b>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There was evidence from the Contracts register file (Page 3) files that the for Phased Construction of Maternity ward at Buikwe health centre II awarded on 23/8/2019 were completed on 7/3/2020	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>		

4	<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"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The average proportion of positions filled at HC3 is 55.9%. The individual proportions are as follows:</p> <p>1. Ssenyi HC2 – 5/9 (56%) ; 2. Bubiho HC2 – 6/9 (67%); 3. Nkonkonjeru HC2 – 4/9 (44%); 4. Namulesa HC2 – 3/9 (33%);</p> <p>5. Ddungi HC2 – 5/9 (67%); 6. Kikwayi HC2 – 4/9 (44%); 7. Buikwe HC3 – 14/19 (74%) ; 8. Ngogwe HC3 – 12/19 (63%);</p> <p>9. Ssi HC3 – 11/19 (63%); 10. Makindu HC3 – 14/19 (74%); and 11. Kasubi HC3 – 14/19 (74%).</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Buikwe District LG did not have a project for upgrading Health centre II to Health Centre III.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The health worker staff list on the noticeboard matched that at DHO at the sampled health facilities - 1. Ngogwe HC3 2. Makindu HC3 3. Kasubi HC3 . These staff had also documented their presence in the daily attendance register and were included in the duty rosters.</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>No HC2 were upgraded during 2019/20.</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>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>By March 31st 2020, not all of the sampled HC had submitted their annual work-plans and budgets to the DHO although all work-plans complied to the prescribed format. The dates for submission were as follows: 1. Ngogwe HC3 – 14/8/2020; 2. Makindu HC3 – 14/08/2020; and 3. Kasubi HC3 – 14/08/2020.</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>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Annual budget performance reports were not available for the sampled health facilities: 1. Ngogwe HC3; 2. Makindu HC3; and 3. Kasubi HC3.</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>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There were health facility improvement plans on file at the DHO office. These plans did not incorporate issues identified during monitoring and assessment at the following sampled facilities: 1. Ngogwe HC3; 2. Makindu HC3; and 3. Kasubi HC3.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</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.

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

None of the sampled health facilities had submitted all HMIS 105 (monthly) and 106a (quarterly) in a timely manner:

1. Ngogwe HC3: HMIS 105: All HMIS 105 reports were submitted on or before the 7th of the subsequent month except the February report that was submitted on 10/02/2020. HMIS 106a (Quarterly): Q1 – 08/10/2019; Q2: 07/01/2020 Q3 – 12/05/2020; Q4: 8/7/2020;

2. Makindu HC3: All HMIS 105 monthly reports were submitted on or before the 7th September of the subsequent month except the one of January which was submitted on 12/01/2019. HMIS 106a (Quarterly): Q1 -8/10/2020; Q2 – 15/1/2020; Q3 – 07/05/2020; Q4 – 09/7/2020; and

3. Kasubi HC3: HMIS monthly reports were all submitted on or before the 7th of the subsequent month except the January report submitted on the 12/02/2020; February report submitted on the 9/03/2020; March report submitted on 09/04/2020 and the April report (10/05/2020). HMIS 106a (Quarterly): HMIS 106a (Quarterly): Q1 -10/10/2020; Q2 – 9/1/2020; Q3 – 8/04/2020; Q4 – 10/7/2020.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

All the sampled health facilities had submitted their invoices in a timely manner to the DHO as follows: 1. Ngogwe HC3 – 06/10/2020 ; 2. Makindu HC3 – 10/10/2020; and 3. Kasubi HC3 – 14/10/2020.

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>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>Submissions of all invoices in 2019/20 were late as follows: Q1: 03/12/2019 (late); Q2: 03/03/2020 (late); Q3: 10/06/2020 (late); and Q4: 14/09/2020 (late).</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 Health Department Submitted all the 4 Quarterly Budget Performance reports to the planner for consolidation within a month after the end of the quarter as below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 was submitted on 10/10/2019 ;</p> <p>Quarter 2 was submitted on 13/1/2020 ;</p> <p>Quarter 3 was submitted on 7/4/2020 ; and</p> <p>Quarter 4 was submitted on 4/7/20 .</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>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>There was no performance improvement plan at the DHO office.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			



6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no performance improvement plan at the DHO office.</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 Buikwe LG budget for health workers is – 3,297,085,000 caters for the 258/345 (75%) existing staff. This budget is included in the PBS contract of the current FY.</p>	2
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The average proportion of positions filled is only 58.2%. The average position at each of the facilities is as follows: 1. Ssenyi HC2 – 5/9 (56%); 2. Bubiuro HC2 – 6/9 (67%); 3. Nkonkonjeru HC2 – 4/9 (44%); 4. Namulesa HC2 – 3/9 (33%); 5. Ddungu HC2 – 5/9 (67%); 6. Kikwayi HC2 – 4/9 (44%); 7. Buikwe HC3 – 14/19 (74%); 8. Ngogwe HC3 – 12/19 (63%); 9. Ssi HC3 – 11/19 (63%); 10. Makindu HC3 – 14/19 (74%); 11. Kasubi HC3 – 14/19 (74%); and 12. Kawolo General Hospital 155/184 (84%).</p>	0

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health workers at the following health facilities matched the staff list at two of the sampled health facilities 1. Ngogwe HC3 and 3. Kasubi HC3. This staff was also documented on the duty roster, the attendance register. At the third health facility - Makindu HC3 – some staff signing in the register are not on the staff list .</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>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>The list of deployed health workers at two out of the three sampled health facilities Ngogwe HC3 and Kasubi HC3 was up to date and matched the one from the District Health Office. The list at the third facility - Makindu HC3 was not updated and had names of staff who had been transferred.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The district had twenty six (26) .health facilities and therefore 26 Officers in Charge. The 10 sampled and examined appraisal reports indicated that they were appraised on the following dates; 1. Ssi HC III – 25th August 2020, 2. Buikwe HC III – 25th August 2020, 3. Ngogwe HC III – 18th August 2020, 4. Makindu HC III – 25th August 2020, 5. Kasubi HC III – 11th August 2020, 6. Bubi HC II – 21st September 2020. 7. Ddungu HC II – 25th August 2020, 8. Kikwayi HC II – 18th August 2020, 9. Namulesa HC II – 21st September 2020 and 10. Nkokonjeru HC II – 18th August 2020</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The appraisal reports for health workers were not availed for verification of the dates of their appraisal</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DHO took corrective actions based on the appraisal reports as per the performance review for the FY 2019/20 updates. 04/DHMT – July September 2020 and 04/DHMT for January to March held on 24th February 2020, minute number 06/DHMT January to March 2020</p>	2
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There is a training plan and data base at the DHO office for the previous FY. The activity reports are also on file.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is a training plan and data base at the DHO office for the previous FY. The activity reports are also on file.</p>	1

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is a letter from the CAO confirming the list of health facilities dated 02/09/2020 ref ADM 353/1. This letter was received by the MoH on the 12/09/2020.</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

9

0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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.

There was no evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of Municipal health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines , only Ugx 28,900,000 (3.8%) out of the grant of Ugx 763,162,000 was made to the health office.

9

0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG did not warrant to all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the FY 2019/20 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release:

Quarter 1 warrant was on 26/7/2019 , release date was 9/7/2019, 17 days;

Quarter 2 warrant was on 15/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019, 13 days;

Quarter 3 warrant was on 14/1/2020, release date was 8/1/2020, 6 days; and

Quarter 4 warrant was on 29/4/2020, release date was 28/4/2020,1 day.

9

0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG did not invoice not communicate all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the FY 2019/20 to health facilities within the required 5 working days from the day of funds release:

Quarter 1 warrant was on 26/7/2019 , release date was 9/7/2019, 17 days;

Quarter 2 warrant was on 15/10/2019, release date was 2/10/2019, 13 days;

Quarter 3 warrant was on 14/1/2020, release date was 8/1/2020, 6 days; and

Quarter 4 warrant was on 29/4/2020, release date was 28/4/2020,1 day.

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>Quarterly financial releases were not displayed on any of the public noticeboards at the time of assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>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>Quarterly performance review meetings were held on the following dates: Q1: 01/07/2019; Q2: 29/03/2020; Q3: 14/04/2020; and Q4: 01/7/2020. There are no implementation reports to support evidence on the level of implementation of the quarterly performance recommendations.</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>There were no attendance lists for Q1 and Q2. The Quarterly DHMT performance review meeting was attended by the following: Q3: In charges (4/16); Implementing partners – World Vision; CDO; CFO; Secretary Health; ACAO Health). Q4 was attended by only 6/16 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>All the general hospitals were supervised at least once in a quarter as follows: 1. Kawolo Hospital - Q1 – 19th September 2020, Q2: 9th December, Q3: 19/03/2020, Q4 19th June 2020; 2. Nkokonjeru Hospital - Q1: 9th September 2019, Q2: 12th January 2020, Q3: 20/03/2020, Q4 – 17th June 2020; 3. Nyenga Hospital - Q1: 10th September 2019, Q2: 6th-10th January 2020, Q3: 25/03/2020, Q4 – 23rd June 2020; 4. St. Charles Lwanga Hospital - Q1: 2nd September 2019, Q2: 6th-10th January 2020, Q3: 11/12/2019, Q4 – 11th June 2020; and 5. Mehta Hospital - Q1: 11th September 2019, Q2: 10th January 2020, Q3: 26/03/2020, Q4 – 24th June 2020.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The sampled health facilities were supervised by the DHMT/HSD as follows: 1. Makindu HC3 Q1: 15/08/2019; Q3: 13/02/2020 Q4: 10/06/2020; 2. Ngogwe HC3 - Q1 – 2/07/2019 Q2: 06/11/2019; and 3. Kasubi HC3 Q1: 08/08/2019 Q3: 23/01/2020</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>		
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The recommendations and actions at the sampled health facilities is as follows:</p> <p>1. Makindu HC3 During the Q1 supervision it was recommended that girls are followed up for HPV and that HPV should be integrated into the routine schedules; Q3 it was recommended that the HMIS tools are used; Q4: 10/06/2020 – HepB testing should be made routine in pregnant mothers; continue to engage district about PPE, temperature gun</p> <p>- One of the weaknesses identified in the PIP was a poor use of primary tools but there was no activity to support this or the other recommendations</p> <p>2. Ngogwe HC3 support supervision recommendations included: Q1 – 2/07/2019 – EPI focal person to ensure that child register is filled at every immunization (new register to implement that recommendation was started in Feb 2020); 19/09/19 – active search of vaccine-preventable diseases to be put in effect immediately; Q2: 06/11/2019 – RBF to have inpatient records for all cases (started new one May 2020)</p> <p>3. Kasubi HC3: the recommendations included - Q1: 08/08/2019 – all MN notifications notified and audited on time; 4/09/2019 – surveillance FP to be appointed immediately (effected); Red chart to be updated Q3: 23/01/2020 – Stock cards to be filled with AMC;</p> <p>This shows that a few but not all recommendations are being followed up.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>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>There is a medicines management supervisors report for all health facilities during the previous FY. Support was provided on a quarterly basis to all health facilities.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>			

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG allocated Ugx 10 million (36%) out of the Ugx 28 million Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, which was beyond the minimum 30%.</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>There is no documented evidence of DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization.</p>	0
----	---	--	---	---

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There is no documented evidence of DHT led health promotion, disease prevention, and social mobilization.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

**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>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>There are electronic asset registers for all 12 GoU health facilities. These are continuously updated and the last update was made on the 19/11/2020. The registers make reference to the basic standards.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)); score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the 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. The minutes from the TPC meeting number 9 on 31/10/2019 indicated that investments for health were derived from LGDP, desk appraisals done and the expenditures were eligible under health guidelines. These projects included renovation Ssi health Centre III in Ssi subcounty and Buikwe health Centre III.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted field appraisals to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions from the undated report of prioritized 2019/19 projects. These included renovation Ssi health Centre III in Ssi subcounty and Buikwe health Centre</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			



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 were no projects for screening in the health sector.</p> <p>Two projects were started in past years and the previous FY was only used for completion but Environmental Screening had been done in earlier years. These two were:</p> <p>1) Completion of maternity Ward at Buikwe HC III; and</p> <p>2) Completion of Administration Block at Buikwe sub county Headquarters.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG Health department submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests on June 22, 2020. The projects included: Phase I of OPD at Kikwayi H/C II; Staff House for Ssi H/C III; Placenta Construction; and OPD Renovation at Bubiuro.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU on July 5,2020.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Minutes of the Contracts Committee dated 8/7/2019 under minute to approve the health infrastructure investments.</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>There was no evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed</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>Buikwe District LG did not have a project for upgrade of a Health centre II to Health Centre III.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Clerk of Works maintained daily records that were to be consolidated weekly reports to the District Engineer</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>There was no evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects by requisite technical officers.</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>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframe as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Works by Trefoil Ltd worth Ugx 3,856,075 for construction of a maternity ward at Buikwe health centre III requested on 11/6/2020 was certified by the DHO on 18/6/20, (7 days ) and payment was done on 24/6/2020;</li> <li>2. Works by Kanoh Ltd worth Ugx 31,523,904 for construction of a patient waiting ward at Buikwe health centre III requested on 11/6/2020 was certified by the DHO on 16/6/20, (5 days ) and payment was done on 24/6/2020; and</li> <li>3. Works by Mantra motors Ltd worth Ugx 8,960,000 for supply of motorcycles requested on 17/6/2020 was certified by the DHO on 17/6/20, (1 day) and payment was done on 24/6/2020.</li> </ol>	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>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>There was evidence of a file for the Construction of a maternity ward at Buikwe health centre III ( BUK/582/wrks/19-20/0009/00010 (Pg 3 of contract register). The file has records of the confirmed procurement request, the details of the advertisement, the evaluation, contract award and signature, and all the payments.</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>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>This was not done, and no evidence was produced to show that grievances had been recorded, investigated and responded to in line with the grievance redress framework.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>			
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Buikwe LG disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities. Forms where recipients signed-off acknowledging receipt of the Guidelines were presented for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Guidelines on implementing of ICHDS Oct 2020;</li> <li>2) Acknowledgement Sheet for Circular on Health Workers' Deployment at the Health facilities for the F/Y 2020/2021;</li> <li>3) There was a dissemination list for the distribution of Infection Control Guidelines to Health centres. This had columns for items distributed. These were: Infection Control Guidelines, Waste Disposal SOP and Hand Washing SOP. Distribution was made to ten Health Facilities in the District, and those who received the items appended their signatures on the Distribution Form that had the date at the top written as " 10/3/2018/2019".</li> </ol>	2
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>			
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</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>There was evidence that the LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste. This was seen from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Green Label Services Ltd was contracted to manage medical waste at the Health Centres. District Waste Collection Forms were presented for June, November and December 2019, and May, June-July 2020; and</li> <li>2) There was an incinerator at Nyenga HC and one was under construction at Buikwe Health Centre.</li> </ol>	2
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>			

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no specific trainings on waste management. Due to the covid-19 pandemic, such sensitizations were not possible due to Standard Operating Procedures that did not allow large gatherings.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no projects for screening in the health sector.</p> <p>Two projects were started in past years and the previous FY was only used for completion but Environmental Screening had been done in earlier years. These two were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Completion of maternity Ward at Buikwe HC III; and</li> <li>2) Completion of Administration Block at Buikwe sub county Headquarters.</li> </ol>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability. Those sampled included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Buikwe Health Centre III on Plot 502, Block 339, Mukono District, Kyaggwe;</li> <li>2) Ssi Health Centre III on Plot 63, Block 467, Buikwe District, Kyaggwe;</li> <li>3) Nkokonjeru Health Centre II on Plot 148, Block 243, Buikwe District, Kyaggwe</li> </ol>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports. Reports were prepared but this was done autonomously by the two departments. So, there was no liaison between the two departments to synchronize supervision of activities, and reports indicated different levels of involvement and interest by each department.</p>	0

<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was NO evidence that E&amp;S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.</p> <p>Environment section is aware of their responsibility and wrote a letter dated 17th august 2020, written by the Senior Environmental Officer to the DNRO, stressing certification of compliance with environmental regulations, but this is not yet followed by the District.</p>
--	---	---

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the MIS (data summary 2019-2020), the rural water sources that are functional are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 886 out of 887 protected springs,</li> <li>• 190 out of 197 shallow wells,</li> <li>• 233 out of 245 deep boreholes,</li> <li>• 75 out of 75 rain water tanks,</li> <li>• 0 out of 1 dams,</li> <li>• And 146 out of 146 Piped water kiosks.</li> </ul> <p>This therefore implies 1529 water sources out of a total 1551 sources are functional which translates to 99%.</p>	2
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the MIS (water and sanitation committees 2019-2020), there are a total of 1555 sources under analysis and only 875 out of those have functional water and sanitation committees and that translates to 56%</p>	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY.</p> <p>If LG average scores is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Above 80% score 2</li> <li>b. 60 -80%: 1</li> <li>c. Below 60: 0</li> </ul> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>This Performance Measure is not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.</p>	0

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

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

Buikwe District has an average water  
coverage of 60%. The average rural access  
is 79% while urban access is 18%. This is  
because two town councils of Lugazi and  
Njeru are under NWSC. The remaining  
sub-counties appear to be above the  
District average, but only because the  
average is lowered by presence of NWSC  
in the two town councils.

Only three sub-counties of Kawolo (61%),  
Nyenga (65%) and Wakisi (73%) have  
averages below the rural coverage of 79%.  
However, the three are neighbouring the  
two town councils and supplied by NWSC.  
They are therefore not considered by the  
District in the allocation of resources.

The District can therefore allocate  
resources to the remaining sub-counties  
whose average is higher than both the rural  
and overall averages.

From the annual progress reports of FY  
2019-2020 which are;

- 1st quarter dated 30/10/2019,
- 2nd quarter dated 23/01/2020,
- 3rd quarter dated 10/04/2020,
- and 4th quarter dated 06/07/2020.

There are two projects that were planned  
and implemented in the FY 2019/2020 and  
they are listed below including the  
beneficiary sub counties each with the %  
coverage:

1. Drilling and installation of boreholes Ssi-  
bukunja (81%), Najja (86%) and Ngogwe  
(95%).

2. Ssi-Bukunja Piped water supply system  
phase 3.

This implies that all the budgeted projects  
for the FY 2019-2020 were implemented.



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 AWP 2019-2020, the engineer's  
estimates, and contracts for the  
implemented projects were reviewed and  
the following established:

1. Construction of a piped water system at  
Ssi-Bukunja Trading Centre phase 3 in Ssi-  
Bukunja S/C by M/S Radhe Construction  
Company, contract ref. Buik582/Wrks/19-  
20/00005 signed 03/03/2020

- Contract price: UGX157,646,643
- Engineer's estimate:  
UGX157,833,738
- Variation : 0.12%

2. Siting and Drilling of 4 boreholes and 1  
production well by M/S East Africa  
Boreholes LTD, contract ref.  
Buik582/Wrks/19-20/00004

- Contract price: UGX143,606,220
- Engineer's estimate:  
UGX147,730,100
- Variation: 2.79%

Only two projects were implemented and  
the contract variations are within the +-  
20%.

2

2

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

*Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

o If 100% projects completed: score 2

o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1

o If projects completed are below 80%:  
0

From the contracts of the respective  
projects, AWP for FY 2019-2020, and the  
annual performance report for FY 2019-  
2020, all the planned projects of the year  
were completed in the planned period as  
stated below;

1. Siting and drilling of boreholes and the  
production well was supposed to be  
completed on 12/06/2020 and was actually  
completed on 05/06/2020.

2. Construction a piped water system was  
slated to end by 03/07/2020 and was  
actually completed by 25/05/2929 as seen  
from the payment request from the  
contractor submitted on the same date.

All the two projects were completed as  
planned

2

Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning

o If there is an increase: score 2

o If no increase: score 0.

From the MIS data (data summary of FY 2018/2019 and 2019/2020), the functional sources in 2018/2019 are as follows;

- 857 out of 887 protected springs,
- 148 out of 194 shallow wells,
- 193 out of 237 deep boreholes,
- 71 out of 75 rain water tanks,
- 1 out of 1 dams, and
- 107 out of 108 Piped water kiosks.

This therefore implies 1337 water sources out of a total 1502 sources were functional representing 92%.

Whereas for 2019/2020;

- 886 out of 887 protected springs,
- 190 out of 197 shallow wells,
- 233 out of 245 deep boreholes,
- 75 out of 75 rain water tanks,
- 0 out of 1 dams,
- And 146 out of 146 Piped water kiosks.

This therefore implies 1529 water sources out of a total 1551 sources are functional representing 99%.

Therefore, there was an increase of 6% in the functional water sources

Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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).

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.

From the MIS (water and sanitation committees for FY 2018/2019 and 2019/2020);

For the FY 2018/2019, there are a total of 1518 sources under analysis and only 808 out of those have functional water and sanitation committees which represents 53.23%.

For the FY 2019/2020, there are a total of 1555 sources under analysis and only 875 out of those have functional water and sanitation committees and that represents 56.27%

Therefore, there was an increase of 3.04% in the number of sources with functional WSCs.

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>From the quarterly reports and the facilities sampled which include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ssi-Bukunja piped water supply system in Nakawali Village in Ssi-Bukunja S/C,</li> <li>2. Borehole labelled DWD-70593 in Kitala Village, Ngogwe S/C completed on 02/06/2020, and</li> <li>3. Borehole labelled DWD-70602 in Kanonko Village, Najja S/C completed on 1/06/2020,</li> </ol> <p>the DWO accurately reported on the WSS facilities constructed in the FY 2019-2020</p>	3
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>From the quarterly reports of FY 2019-2020, that include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st quarter dated 30/10/2019,</li> <li>• 2nd quarter dated 23/01/2020,</li> <li>• 3rd quarter dated 10/04/2020,</li> <li>• and 4th quarter dated 06/07/2020,</li> </ul> <p>there are filled data collection forms from the Rural Water Supply Database formulated by the MoWE that include Form 1 that reports new facilities and Form 4 that reports sources per sub county. Within these quarterly reports that are stamped by Central Registry, Directorate of Water Development, there are updated forms for all sources in each sub county and the data is collected through visits, advocacy meetings and extension staff.</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>From the quarterly progress reports and software reports therein, the DWO updates the District MIS from the data collection form from the Rural Water Supply Database formulated by the MoWE that include Form 1 that reports new facilities and Form 4 that reports sources per sub county. Within these quarterly reports that are stamped by Central Registry, Directorate of Water Development, there are updated forms for all sources in each sub county and the data is collected through visits, advocacy meetings and extension staff.</p>	3

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

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO budgeted for the Water and Sanitation staff as per the Budget Framework Paper YY 2019/20 first and second quarters – staff list and wage performance</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Natural Resources Officer budgeted for the Water and Sanitation staff as per the Budget Framework Paper FY 2019/20 first and second quarters – staff list and wage performance</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 were two staff member in the water department. The Civil Engineer - Water, who was appraised on 30th June 2020 as per the appraisal report examined and the Assistant Engineering Officer; who was not appraised.</p>	0

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

The DWO has carried out capacity needs assessment through the District Engineer as seen from the appraisal forms submitted to the Human Resource which included the training carried out by the district Engineer on 30/06/2020 and 25/08/2015. However, there was no documented training database.

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

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

Buikwe District has an average water coverage of 60%. The average rural access is 79% while urban access is 18%. This is because two town councils of Lugazi and Njeru are under NWSC. The remaining sub-counties appear to be above the District average, but only because the average is lowered by presence of NWSC in the two town councils.

Only three sub-counties of Kawolo (61%), Nyenga (65%) and Wakisi (73%) have averages below the rural coverage of 79%. However, the three are neighbouring the two town councils and supplied by NWSC. They are therefore not considered by the District in the allocation of resources.

The District can therefore allocate resources to the remaining sub-counties whose average is higher than both the rural and overall averages.

From the AWP 2020-2021, the DWO has allocated as follows to the targeted sub counties;

1. Drilling of 2 new boreholes and 1 production well in Ssi-Bukunja S/C which amounts to UGX89,960,502
2. 1 piped water system in Ssi-bukunja S/C that amounts to UGX245,000,000
3. Rehabilitation of 15 boreholes in the sub counties of;
  - Buikwe Rural (95%): UGX10,400,000 (4 boreholes),
  - Najja(86%): UGX10,400,000 (4 boreholes),
  - Ngogwe(95%): UGX10,400,000 (4 boreholes),
  - and Ssi-bukunja (81%): UGX7,800,000 (3 boreholes).

All the above sub counties have % access above the district average (79%) like all sub-counties in the District with Ssi-Bukunja having the lowest and taking the biggest portion of the budget for development.

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>The DWO communicated to the LLG about their allocations through advocacy meetings. The district quarterly reports, particularly the 1st quarter report of the FY 2020-2021, include minutes of the advocacy meetings that took place in the following sub counties;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Najja -17/09/2020</li> <li>• Buikwe Rural -13/09/2020</li> <li>• Ngogwe-30/09/2020</li> <li>• Ssi-Bukunja 24/09/2020</li> </ul>	3
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"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DWO has monitored each of the WSS facilities at least quarterly as seen from the quarterly progress reports and software reports therein. The DWO updates the District MIS from the data collection form from the Rural Water Supply Database formulated by the MoWE that include Form 1 that reports new facilities and Form 4 that reports sources per sub county. Within these quarterly reports that are stamped by Central Registry, Directorate of Water Development, there are updated forms for all sources in each sub county and the data is collected through visits, advocacy meetings and extension staff.</p> <p>The DWO collects data on functionality of the facilities, WCSs and environmental concerns.</p>	4
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 conducted DWSCC meeting from the documented minutes in the quarterly reports of 2019/2020.</p> <p>From the 1st quarter report of 2019-2020, the meeting was carried out on 18/10/2019. Under issue 7 in the action plan, the DWO reported that there is local revenue allocation towards O&amp;M of the office vehicle. This was incorporated in the 2020/2021 AWP and UGX4,000,000 was allocated.</p> <p>The other meetings were held on the dates of 18/12/2019 in the 2nd quarter, 12/03/2020 in the 3rd quarter and 30/06/2020 in the 4th quarter.</p>	2

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>From the file copies of the documents pinned on the noticeboard, the DWO publicised the allocations for the budgeted water projects and in the respective sub counties that were going to benefit.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the AWP 2019-2020, the DWO allocated UGX12,941,363 towards mobilisation activities out of total NWR rural water sanitation budget of UGX29,791,363. This implies 43.4% of the budget was allocated towards mobilisation which includes extension staff meetings, and sensitisation of the communities among others.</p>	3
----	---	--	---	---

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>From the field visits to some of the water facilities and quarterly reports of FY 2019-2020, that include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st quarter dated 30/10/2019,</li> <li>• 2nd quarter dated 23/01/2020,</li> <li>• 3rd quarter dated 10/04/2020,</li> <li>• and 4th quarter dated 06/07/2020,</li> </ul> <p>there are reports that confirm that the DWO and the CDO established the WSCs and trained them on key roles that include protection of the source and sanitation.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	---

**Investment Management**

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>From the quarterly reports availed, the DWO updates the list of water supply and sanitation facilities by location using data collection forms from the Rural Water Supply Database formulated by the MoWE. The forms include Form 1 that reports new facilities and Form 4 that reports all sources per sub county. Within the quarterly reports that are stamped by Central Registry, Directorate of Water Development, there are updated forms for all sources in each sub county and the data is collected through visits, advocacy meetings and extension staff.</p> <p>The DWO collects data on functionality of the facilities, WCSs and environmental concerns.</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:</p>	<p>The LG conducted desk appraisals for all water sector projects and the investments were derived from the LG Development Plan as indicated in the undated appraisal report for the 2019/20 prioritized projects. These included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling of water works in Najja subcounty;</li> <li>2. Construction of a water toilet in Najja subcounty; and</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of 10 hand pumps.</li> </ol>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>All the ongoing projects implemented have community application files from the beneficiary communities and they include that of Ssi-Bukunja S/C dated 12/10/2020 applying for the borehole in Namakuma and that dated 15/10/2020 for Lugoba. The other new facilities were discussed in the subsequent advocacy meetings.</p>	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>The LG conducted field appraisals for all water sector projects to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects. These included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling of water works in Najja subcounty;</li> <li>2. Construction of a water toilet in Najja subcounty; and</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of 10 hand pumps.</li> </ol>	2

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</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 that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS Infrastructure projects. Reports availed included those written by the District Water Officer to the District Engineer on the following dates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 30th October 2019, that was received by the District Engineer on same day</li> <li>2) 2nd January 2020, that was received by the District Engineer on 30/01/2020;</li> <li>3) 30 August 2019, that was received by the District Engineer on the same day;</li> <li>4) 30th Sept. 2019; that was received by the District Engineer on that was received by the District Engineer on on same day;</li> <li>29th November 2019, that was received by the District Engineer on the same day; and</li> <li>5) 31 December 2019, that was received by the District Engineer on 08 January 2020.</li> </ol>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that the water and sanitation infrastructure projects were incorporated in the procurement plan. The projects are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4 deep bore holes &amp; production well drilling, siting and supervision</li> <li>2. Construction of pipes water system in Mopgo Najja S/C</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of boreholes/hand pumps</li> </ol>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There is evidence of minutes of the contracts committee to determine whether water supply and public sanitation infrastructure projects for the previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement . The meeting took place on July 12, 2019.</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><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There no evidence that established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</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>The WSS were implemented as per the technical standard design provided by the DWO which also contracted consultants to provide the design according to its specifications. This is from the design reports and drawings, quarterly reports, completion reports as well as from the field study.</p> <p>For the Ssi-bukunja piped water project, the design on behalf of the DWO was prepared by International Project Management Systems Ltd in June 2019.</p> <p>For drilling of the new boreholes, the DWO followed by the Augered Well option 1 provided by the Ministry and the sitting was carried by Aquatech Enterprises (U) Ltd as from the Final report of April 2019, by the same company and the same company was contracted to do the drilling and from the reports, the design was followed in implementation.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>As seen from the minutes of the DWSCC meetings documented in the quarterly reports, the attendance recorded shows that the meetings were attended by All heads of department, District Engineer, the CDO, DHO and the Education officers.</p> <p>sampled were the site meeting minutes for the Ssi-bukunja piped water system in the 2nd quarter that were attended by the Asst. DW Engineer, CDO, LC1 and the contractor representative and one of the issues discussed was the even allocation of the public stand pipes and the kiosks in the community. The other was carried out on 16/04/2020</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>The DWO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframe as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Works by Japer Ltd worth Ugx 14,896,180 for supply of assorted items to the supplier requested for payment on 24/5/2020 was certified by the DHO on 4/6/20, (10 days) and payment was done on 20/6/2020;</li> <li>2. Works by IPMS Ltd worth Ugx 11,000,000 for drilling and supervision of water works in Najja subcounty, the contractor requested for payment on 17/6/2020 was certified by the DHO on 17/6/20, (1 day) and payment was done on 24/6/2020; and</li> <li>3. Works by Real Engineers Ltd worth Ugx 24,844,903 for construction of a water toilet in Najja subcounty, the contractor requested for payment on 11/6/2020 was certified by the DHO on 16/6/20, (5 days) and payment was done on 24/6/2020.</li> </ol>	2
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that each procurement file has all relevant records as per the PPDA law. The sample file is <b>Buik/Wrks/19-20/00005</b> for Construction of the SSi trading centre pipes water system. The procurement request was submitted and confirmed on 26/7/2019, evaluation concluded on 1/3/2019, the letter of award was made on 2/3/2019 and contract signed on 3/3/2019. The files also have details of payment</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>The DLG did not have a grievance redress framework and grievances log. Therefore, no grievances were recorded investigated or responded to in the water and environment sector.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer had disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs. The dissemination is done through CDOs located at the LLGs and extensions assistants. This was seen from minutes of meetings where the Environment Officer and DWO meet CDOs and one of the agenda items is dissemination of guidelines. This is Agenda item 4.9. The minutes included sittings held on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 12th December 2019;</li> <li>2) 18th December 2019; and</li> <li>3) a follow-up meeting held 29th June 2020.</li> </ol>	<b>3</b>
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There were no such plans drawn and followed-up.</p>	<b>0</b>
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>The WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG has evidence of ownership and it includes land consent agreements that are listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For the production well in Najja, agreement dated 05/05/2020 handed over freely by Nangobi Harriet and Irine kwagala</li> <li>2. Ngogwe borehole, agreement dated 28/04/2020 and donated by Ssebenga Dickens</li> <li>3. Water reservoir for Ssi-bukunja piped water; agreement signed on 18/01/2029 and donated by Kabagambe Nicholas and many others.</li> </ol>	<b>3</b>

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO certified work on water projects before the LG made payments to the contractors. A certification dated 13/5/2020 by the CDO and Environmental officer listed and approved all water sector projects before payments were made. These included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drilling of water works in Najja subcounty;</li> <li>2. Construction of a water toilet in Najja subcounty; and</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of 10 hand pumps</li> </ol>	2
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs. Monitoring Reports were availed dated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 24 July 2020;</li> <li>2) 14th July 2020; and</li> <li>3) 20th May 2020.</li> </ol>	2

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>LG has data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 0 Ha for micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries;</li> <li>2. 352 acres of irrigated land in FY 2018/2019;</li> <li>3. 340 acres in FY 2019/2020.</li> </ol>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land by 2.3% in the previous 2019/2018 as compared to previous 2018/2019</p>	1
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%; score 4</li> <li>• 60 – 69%; score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%; score 0</li> </ul> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>This Performance Measure was not applicable until the LLGs are assessed.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY • If 100% score 2  • Between 80 – 99% score 1  • Below 80% score 0	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment not yet done.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  • If 100% score 2  • If 75 – 99% score 1  • If below 75% score 0	LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure with 100% at LLGs.	2
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  • If 100% score 2 or else score 0	micro-scale irrigation equipment have not been procured and installed.	0



4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional  • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY 2019.2020 for non beneficiaries are functional. The assessor visited a lead farmer in Nogwe Sub county farming passion fruits on 2 acres each using a rain gun sprinkler systems with ponds fed by a perennial river as a water water source.	2
---	---	---	---	---

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	At the three sampled LLGs of Buikwe SC, Najja SC and Buikwe TC, the information on the filled positions of extension workers the in LLGs was compared with the approves staff structure and the staff establishment list of extension workers and found to be accurate	2
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-scale irrigation systems under the Micro-scale irrigation grant have not been installed yet.  However, Micro-scale irrigation systems for non-beneficiaries farmers are accurate and functioning. Two rain gun sprinkler irrigation systems installed for 1 acre each passion fruits were visited in Ngongwe Subcounty.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest. Three quarterly reports were accessed for third quarter dated 30.03.2020, 4th Quarter dated 19.07.2020 and first quarter dated 23.10.2020.	2
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Although there was no evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS management centrally by MAAIF. However, Information in Irritrack is up to date. The date of last update is 18.11.2020	1

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence of an approved consolidated Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms as evidence by performance contract for current FY 2020/2021.	1
---	--	---	--	---

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	LG has deployed extension workers as per guidelines as evidenced by staffing list with 90% positions filled.	1
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	The staff attendance registers and minutes of the TPC meetings were examined and it was ascertained that the extension workers were working where they were deployed at the sampled LLGs of Buikwe SC, Buyikwe TC and Najja SC. Th	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	The extension workers deployment lists were displayed at all the three sampled LLGs' notice boards	2
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	The district had thirty seven (37) extension workers. Ten (10) appraisal reports were sampled and examined, they indicated that they were appraised on the following dates;  1. Agricultural Officer (Buikwe SC) – 23rd September 2020, 2. Assistant Fisheries Officer (Buikwe SC) - 11th August 2020, 3. Community Development Officer (Buikwe TC) – 7th September 2020, 4. Agricultural Officer (Najja SC) 11th August 2020, 5. Assistant Fisheries Officer (Najja SC) – 27th October 2020, 6. Agricultural Officer (Ngogwe SC) – 7th July 2020. 7. Assistant Veterinary Officer (Ngogwe SC) – 27th October 2020, 8. Veterinary Officer (Nkokonjeru SC) – 27th October 2020, 9. Community Development Officer (Ssi SC) 12th November 2020, and 10. Fisheries Officer (Ssi SC) – 11th August 2020	1

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The District Production Coordinator did not take any corrective actions</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that training activities were conducted as evidenced by attendance list of training conducted on 17.11.2020 and 20.10.2020.</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a training database</p>	1

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The micro-scale irrigation programme has not been rolled out in the district. LG undertaking preparatory activities.</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>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>	<p>The micro-scale irrigation programme has not been rolled out in the district. LG undertaking preparatory activities.</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>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The micro-scale irrigation programme has not been rolled out in the district. LG undertaking preparatory activities.</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>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The micro-scale irrigation programme has not been rolled out in the district. LG undertaking preparatory activities.</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>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding as evidenced by minutes of meeting on sensitization on micro irrigation dated 20.10.2020.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Micro-scale irrigation equipment have not been installed.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There are no approved farmers yet.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>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>	<p>LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services as evidenced by minutes of meeting for training of agricultural staff on micro scale irrigation projects dated 17.11.2020</p>	2
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>	<p>Farmer fields schools have not been established.</p>	0

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as evidenced by attendance sheets for mobilization activities in Kikwaya S/C on 24.09.2020, Buikwe TC-Lweru on 22.09.2020 and Buyomba S/C on 15.10.2020.	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

Maximum score 4

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels as evidenced by attendance lists for micro irrigation sensitization at SSI-Bukunja S/C on 16.11.2020 and Buikwe TC-Lweru on 17.11.2020	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

Maximum score 4

**Investment Management**

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	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	Procurement of micro scale irrigation equipment not yet done.	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

Maximum score 8

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications as seen from Irritrack app. Date of last update is 18.11.2020.	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

Maximum score 8

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	Farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI) on going. One farmer so far visited on 18.11.2020. Other farmers already mibilised through phone calls.	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

Maximum score 8

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>	<p>There are no approved farmers yet.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current 2020/2021</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Procurement of irrigation equipment has not been conducted.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Procurement of irrigation equipment has not been conducted.</p>	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	Procurement of irrigation equipment has not been conducted.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Procurement and installation of irrigation equipment has not been conducted.	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	Micro irrigation Grant Project is still in initial stages of implementation. District Agricultural Engineer has conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects for non beneficiaries as evidenced by technical report dated 20.09.2020	2
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	Micro scale irrigation equipment not yet installed.	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	Micro scale irrigation equipment not yet procured and installed.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Micro scale irrigation equipment not yet procured and installed.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 18			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	Micro scale irrigation equipment not yet procured and installed.	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 18			

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	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	There was no evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

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

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"> <li>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</li> <li>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</li> <li>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of any grievances investigated.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

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"> <li>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</li> <li>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of any grievances responded to.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

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"> <li>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of any grievances reported.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

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	No costed ESMP were available. Nothing had so far been done.	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 done and there was no plan in place for it.	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	The project has not gone that far. It is only starting and no payments have been made so far.	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	The project has not gone that far. It is only starting and no payments have been made so far.	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation  Maximum score is 70	If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.	The Senior Agriculture Engineer was NOT substantively appointed, duties were performed by the Agricultural Engineer as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 17th April 2018	0
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.  Maximum score is 30	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.	The project has just started and is only at the stage of screening farmers that will join. Environmental screening has therefore not yet been done. And there was no evidence showing any intentions of doing this, neither a request for funds to have this done in the future, nor verbal intentions communicated in this regard.	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 yet done, and no intentions were shown of doing it.	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The Civil Engineer (Water) was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 8th January 2015	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The Assistant Water Officer for mobilization was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter PER/12285 dated 16th December 2005	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Borehole Maintenance Technician position was vacant	0
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.	The Natural Resources Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/161/1 dated 15th December 2010	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Environment Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 25th June 2018	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Forestry Officer position was vacant	0

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

If the LG:

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

There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment. Screening was done for the five projects on 17th September 2019 and those sampled as follows:

1) Drilling and construction of a deep well/borehole in Najja sub county, Kisimba parish, Kanonko village;

2) Construction of a deep well I Ngogwe sub county, Lubongo parish, Kisimba village;

3) Construction of a VIP latrine in Najja Town Council, Kisimba parish, Najja Sub County.

There was also one done on a different day. That was:

4) Construction of phase II water system at Lugala village in Ssi sub county on 20/08/2019.

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.

There Screening reports showed that there was no need for detailed Environmental Impact assessments.

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

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

There was evidence that the contractor got a Drilling permit issued by DWRM.

Permit No: DP6/209/DW 2019 issued to EAST AFRICA BOREHOLES Ltd of P.O.Box32017 Kampala, was availed.

But there were no abstraction permits produced.



No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
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.	The District Health Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/156/1 dated 30th September 2013	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	The Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 12th May 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.	The Assistant District Health Officer - Environmental Health (U2 position) was NOT substantively appointed, duties were performed by the Senior Environment Health Officer (U3 position) as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2/PER/10024 dated 12th August 2020	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	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.	The Principal Health Inspector was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/160/1 dated 27th December 2019	10

1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The Senior Health Educator was NOT substantively appointed	0
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	The Biostatistician was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 30th May 2017	10
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	The District Cold Chain Technician was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 7th May 2018	10
	Applicable to Districts only.			
	Maximum score is 70			
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	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.		
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

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

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Screening was done for the two health projects for the previous FY. The projects were both screened on same day and a report dated 13th May 2020 was produced, signed by Musoke Solomon, DNRO, Buikwe District. The projects were:</p> <p>1) Renovation of Ssi HC III in Ssi sub county; and</p> <p>2) Construction of a waiting Shed at Ngogwe HC III.</p>	<b>15</b>
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There Screening reports showed that there was no need for detailed Environmental Impact assessments.</p>	<b>15</b>

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District Education Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 3rd February 2020</p>	<b>30</b>
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District Inspector of Schools was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 31 7th April 2018</p>	<b>40</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>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)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of filled Environmental and Social Screening Form for all four Education projects for the previous FY. Those sampled were all screened on 17th Sept 2019. They were:</p> <p>1) Construction of a VIP latrine at Kiwungi primary school, Ssi sub county;</p> <p>2) Construction of classroom block, office and store at Ssugu Seed School, Buikwe sub county; and</p> <p>3) Renovation of classroom block at Malongwe primary school.</p>	<b>15</b>

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 Screening Reports showed no need for Environmental Impact Assessment.

The Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The CFO was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 7th May 2018	<b>3</b>
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The District Planner was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 8th January 2015	<b>3</b>
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The District Engineer was substantively appointed. However the personal file was not availed for verification of appointment details	<b>0</b>
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District Natural Resources Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/161/2 dated 15th December 2010	<b>3</b>
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District Production officer was substantively appointed. However the personal file was not availed for verification of appointment details	<b>0</b>

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO,  score 3 or else 0	The District Community Development Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 7th May 2018	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 District Commercial Officer was NOT substantively appointed, duties were performed by the Principal Commercial Officer as per the appointment letter DM/156/2/PER/10018 dated 13th July 2020	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff  h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer)  score 2 or else 0.	The Senior Procurement Officer was substantively appointed. However the personal file was not availed for verification of appointment details	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.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer),  score 2 or else 0	The Procurement Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 3rd May 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	The Principal Human Resource Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter CR/156/1 dated 8th January 2015	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.  Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer,  score 2 or else 0	The Senior Environment Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/225th June 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.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Environment Officer was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/225th June 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	The Senior Accountant was NOT substantively appointed, duties were performed by the Principal Finance Officer as per the appointment letter EDM/156/2 dated 24th December 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.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	Principal Internal Auditor was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2 dated 7th May 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.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was NOT substantively appointed, duties were performed by the Senior Assistant Secretary as per the appointment letter ADM/156/2. PER/10019 dated 9th May 2018	0
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:  a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0	The district had four (4) LLGs. All the four Senior Assistant Secretaries were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters examined;  1. ADM/156/2 dated 30th May 2016, 2. CR/159/1 dated 4th August 2014, 3. ADM/156/2 dated 2nd July 2018 and 4. ADM/156/2 dated 4th July 2019	5



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:  b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS  score 5 or else 0.	The district had four (4) LLGs. All the four Community Development Officers were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters examined;  1. ADM/156/2 dated 4th February 2020, 2. ADM/156/2 dated 24th December 2018, 3. ADM/156/2 dated 30th May 2017 and 4. ADM 156/2 dated 24th December 2018	5
---	--	---	--	---

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.	The district had four (4) LLGs. All the four Senior Accounts Assistants were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters examined; 1, CR/156/2 dated 6th July 2011, 2. CR/156/2 dated 4th November 2011, 3. CR/156/2 dated 6th July 2011 and 4. CR/156/2 dated 6th July 2011	5
---	--	---	---	---

**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	There was no evidence that the LG released 100% of funds allocated in the year 2019/20 to Natural Resources department. The LG budgeted for Ugx 310,034,000 (LG Budget Estimates 2019/20 page 156 ) and only Ugx 67,526,156 (22%) was spent ( LG Financial statements for the year 2019/20 page 18).	0
---	---	--	--	---

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.	There was evidence that the LG released 100% of funds allocated in the year 2019/20 to Community Based Services department. The LG budgeted for Ugx 741,189,000 (LG Budget Estimates 2019/20 page 156) and only Ugx 105,666,458 (14%) was spent ( LG Financial statements for the year 2019/20 page 18).	0
---	---	--	--	---

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have any new DDEG projects for the previous FY. One DDEG project was procurement of a Block-making machine and this did not need Environmental Screening. The other two were started in past years and the previous FY was only used for completion but Environmental Screening had been done in earlier years. These two were:</p> <p>1) Completion of maternity Ward at Buikwe HC III; and</p> <p>2) Completion of Administration Block at Buikwe sub county Headquarters.</p>	4
---	---	---	--	---

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Screening Reports indicated that there was no need for this.</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);; score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was no need for this since there were no current DDEG projects.</p>	4
---	---	--	--	---

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The LG will be scored in January 2021 when the Auditor General report for the year 2019/20 is issued.</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 LG submitted status of implementation of Internal Auditor General issues for the year 2018/19 on 5 December 2019 and Auditor General audit issues for the year 2018/19 on 30 January 2020 to PS/ST, before the February 2020 deadline. Audit issues included:</p>	10
	<p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Non remittance of local 3.7 billion local revenue by Ngongwe Subcounty; unaccounted for funds of 19.6m; loss of laptop; and uncollected arrears.</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 of 2020/21 on 12 June 2020 before the deadline of August 31st, 2020.</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 year 2019/20 on 12/8/2020 before the deadline of August 2020. However, a resubmission was requested later by the system on 7/9/2020.</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>The LG did not submit all the quarterly budget Performance Reports for the year 2019/20 by the deadline of August 2020 as below:</p>	4
	<p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>Q1 was submitted on 27/11/2019 ; Q2 was submitted on 4/2/2020 ; Q3 was submitted on 11/5/2020 ; and Q4 was submitted on 12/8/2020.</p>	