



LGMSD 2021/22

Masindi District

(Vote Code: 534)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	76%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	70%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	65%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	75%
Educational Performance Measures	76%
Health Performance Measures	69%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	57%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	9%

Crosscutting
Performance
Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>There were essentially two categories of DDEG projects undertaken during FY 2021/2022 as follows:</p> <p>(i) Rehabilitation of boreholes in various 12 locations budgeted at shs 120,000,000; as per pages 62,63,64 and 65 of the approved district budget. On site visit to the bore holes, they were found in use as the community was drawing water from them.</p> <p>(ii) Rehabilitation of roads: Bokwe-Kaborogota roads and bridges costed at shs 138,600,000: Balyejukira-Kyandangi-Kikungura roads and bridges costed at shs 120,000,000 as reflected on page 57 of the approved district budget for FY 2021/2022. The roads were used to transport goods and services within communities, encourage trade..</p> <p>The infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized per the purpose intended after being completed during the financial under review.</p>	4

2

Service Delivery
Performance

Maximum 6 points on
this performance
measure

a. If the average
score in the overall
LLG performance
assessment
increased from
previous
assessment :

o by more than
10%: Score 3

o 5-10% increase:
Score 2

o Below 5 % Score
0

Awaits results of the overall LLG
performance assessment results
verification.

0

Service Delivery
Performance

Maximum 6 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

There were essentially two categories of DDEG projects undertaken during FY 2021/2022 as follows:

(i) Rehabilitation of boreholes in various 12 locations budgeted at shs 120,000,000; as per pages 62,63,64 and 65 of the approved district budget.

(ii) Rehabilitation of roads: Bokwe-Kaborogota roads and bridges costed at shs 138,600,000: Balyejukira-Kyandangi-Kikungura roads and bridges costed at shs 120,000,000 as reflected on page 57 of the approved district budget for FY 2021/2022

The infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized per the purpose intended after being completed during the financial under review.

The infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized per the purpose intended after being completed during the financial under review. All the sites were visited by the Project Execution Officer within the assessment team. Communities were drawing water from the boreholes as supervised by the water user committees

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 were essentially two categories of DDEG projects undertaken during FY 2021/2022 as follows:

(i) Rehabilitation of boreholes in various 12 locations budgeted at shs 120,000,000; as per pages 62,63,64 and 65 of the approved district budget under Water and Sanitation.

(ii) Rehabilitation of roads: Bokwe-Kaborogota roads and bridges costed at shs 138,600,000: Balyejukira-Kyandangiri-Kikungura roads and bridges costed at shs 120,000,000 as reflected on page 57 of the approved district budget for FY 2021/2022. Under Engineering Services.

The infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized per the purpose intended after being completed during the financial under review.

The roads had a budget of shs 260,000,000 and all was spent as reflected on page 20 of the Annual Performance Report. As for the boreholes, total amount of shs 120,000,000 was spent as reflected on page on 22 of the Annual Performance Report

The infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized per the purpose intended after being completed during the financial under review. All the sites were visited by the Project Execution Officer within the assessment team.

All funds were utilised as budgeted.

Investment
Performance

Maximum 4 points on
this performance
measure

b. If the variations
in the contract price
for sample of
DDEG funded
infrastructure
investments for the
previous FY are
within +/-20% of
the LG Engineers
estimates,

score 2 or else
score 0

The AWP and Budget for the FY
2021/22 indicated a number of projects
funded under the DDEG and of those,
the implemented infrastructure projects
had contract amounts according to
contract documents as follows:

1) Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD
Ceiling & facelifting -
MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00138. The
Engineers Estimates (A) was UGX
54,000,000/=; the contract Sum/Price
(B) was UGX 52,043,775/=. **The
Variation was at 3.62%** $\{[(A - B)/A]$
 $*100\}$

2) Construction of 2 Stance Latrine with
bath-shelters at Budongo HC II, and
Construction of 4 Stance lined latrine at
Kimengo HC III -
MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00025. The
Engineers Estimates (A) was UGX
31,000,000/=; the contract Sum/Price
(B) was UGX 30,986,547/=. **The
Variation was at 0.04%**

3) Rehabilitation of Kikingura -
Kyandangji - Kyakaiteera - Road
(9.8Km); (using Force Account
methodology). The Engineers
Estimates (A) at UGX 129,000,000/=.
The the contract Sum/Price (B) -
expenditure was UGX 120,000,000/=.
The Variation was at 6.98%

The Variations; $[(A - B)/A] *100\%$ were
thus within +/-20% of the LG Engineers
estimates

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

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

score 2 or else score 0

A review of the LLG staff lists for the current FY in sampled LLGs during the assessment showed that the staffing was not in place as per minimum standards and staff list. The sampled LLG were Kyatiri Town Council which happens to be one of the four newly created Town Councils. Just like in all the other new LLGs, the staffing was found to be still rudimentary and they were relying on staff from the mother LLGs who continued to serve in the newly created LLGs. At assessment the team found that the following staff from Pakanyi Sub County (the second LLG sampled) were working in more than one LLG. Ms. Kamulegeya Edidah (Agricultural Officer) works in Pakanyi and Labongo Sub Counties; Mr. Kyomya Fred (Assistant Veterinary Officer) works in Pakanyi, Kiruli, and Labongo Sub Counties; Ms. Biira Yazeri (Assistant Forestry Officer) works in Pakanyi, Labongo, Kiruli Sub Counties and Kyatiri Town Council; Mr. Kwikiriza Jibril (Assistant Agricultural Officer) works in Pakanyi and Kiruli Sub Counties; Mr. Mugisha William (CDO) works in Pakanyi, Kiruli, and Labongo Sub Counties, and Kyatiri TC. Ms. Tuhaise Jolly worked with Pakanyi Sub County and Kyatiri Town Council.

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:

- If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.

Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0

There were essentially two categories of DDEG projects undertaken during FY 2021/2022 as follows:

(i) Rehabilitation of boreholes in various 12 locations budgeted at shs 120,000,000; as per pages 62,63,64 and 65 of the approved district budget.

(ii) Rehabilitation of roads: Bokwe-Kaborogota roads and bridges costed at shs 138,600,000: Balyejukira-Kyandangiri-Kikungura roads and bridges costed at shs 120,000,000 as reflected on page 57 of the approved district budget for FY 2021/2022

The infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding were functional and utilized per the purpose intended after being completed during the financial under review.

All the projects appeared in the Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022 and Quarterly Budget Performance Reports

Quarter One Report was produced on 26th November, 2021

Quarter two was produced on 7th February, 2022

Quarter three was produced on 16th May, 2022

Quarter four was produced on 7th September, 2022.

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>HRM availed to the Assessment Team a letter ref.: CR/156/3 dated November 16, 2021, addressed to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Public Service, and stamped received on November 22, 2021, submitting the consolidated staffing requirements for Masindi DLG for the coming FY 2022/2023 to the MoPS with copies to the Ministry of Local Government and the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. This submission did not comply with the requirement for submission before September 31, 2021.</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>During assessment, HRM availed to the Assessment Team evidence of tracking attendance daily using Attendance Registers and then summarising the attendance monthly using an Excel spreadsheet and submitting the report to CAO. There was no evidence adduced of analysis of the attendance.</p>	0

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:

HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous

FY: Score 1 or else 0

HRM availed the Assessment Team files of all HODs with duly endorsed Performance Agreements and Performance Reports for the FY 2021/2022, evidence that the CAO had appraised HODs during the previous FY 2021/2022. Some files reviewed include:

1. Mr. Baguma David, Chief Finance Officer, was appraised by the CAO on 08/10/2022.
2. Mr. Magezi B. Godfrey Abwooli, District Planner, was appraised by the CAO on 08/10/2022.
3. Mr. Atugonza Rameck, District Engineer, was appraised by the CAO on 08/10/2022.
4. Mr. Akwetaireho Simon, District Natural Resources Officer, was appraised by the CAO on 08/10/2022.
5. Mr. Seubguzi Fred, Ag. District Production Officer, was appraised by the CAO on 08/10/2022.
6. Mr. Bahemuka Godfrey, District Community Development Officer, was appraised by the CAO on 08/10/2022.
7. Mr. Kalyegira Moses, Ag. District Commercial Officer, was appraised by the CAO on 08/10/2022.
8. Mr. Byarugaba Godfrey, Senior Procurement Officer, was appraised by the CAO on 09/07/2022.
9. Mr. Kyomuhendo Francis, District Education Officer, was appraised by the CAO on 08/01/2010.
10. Mr. Okise Patrick, Principal Internal Auditor, was appraised by the CAO on 08/07/2022.
11. Dr. Abirigo Jino, Ag. District Health Officer, was appraised by the CAO on 07/07/2022.

The appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timeline of 30 June as provided for in the Uganda Public Service Standing Orders.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

During the assessment, HRM availed to the team documentary evidence containing minutes of the meetings of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee including minutes of the meetings of April 06, 2022; December 20, 2021; November 23, 2021; May 18, 2021, where the Committee considered cases for administrative rewards and sanctions. The Rewards and Sanctions Committee was comprised of Mr. Magezi B. Abwooli (District Planner) as Chairperson; Mr. Opigo Cyrus (PHRO) as Secretary; Ms. Asaba Irene (SAS) as Member; Mr. Kato Adolf (AG. DEO) as Member; and Ms. Nabukenya Olivia (Wetlands Officer) as Member; Ms. Muhindo Zainab (CDO); and Mr. Mugisha Brian (ADHO-Maternal) as Member. HRM presented reports on disciplinary cases handled for the four quarters of 2021/2022 FY submitted to the Ministry of Public Service in letters ref.:CR 157/1 dated October 13, 2022; and July 12, 2022, but there was no evidence adduced at the time of assessment that the rewards and sanctions were actually implemented.

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>At the time of assessment, the HRM availed documentary evidence including a letter ref.: CR/154/1 dated July 27, 2021 from the CAO to various officers making up the Grievance Handling Committee. The Committee was Chaired by Mr. Abia Owili Robert (DCAO) with Mr. Bahemuka Godfrey (DCDO); Mr. Opigo Cyrus (PHRO); Mr. Baguma Patrick (Ag. DHO); Ms. Assimwe Olive (Education Officer); and Mr. Andama Fidel Obia (UNATU Chairperson) as Members. HRM also presented a set of minutes of the meeting of the Consultative Committee sitting on October 02, 2022 in the office of the DCAO. There was however no evidence adduced of any particular cases that were handled by the Grievance Handling Committee.</p>	0
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>A review of the recruited staff lists indicated the DLG recruited various categories of staff including teachers, a HRO, and porters with effect from July 01, 2021. A look at their payslips indicated for example that Ms. Asiimwe Mary (Education Assistant) accessed salary payroll on August 28, 2021 within the two months stipulated in the guidelines.</p>	1

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.

A review of the pension payroll and retired staff lists showed that the District complied with the requirement to access retired staff onto the pension payroll within two months of retirement. Mr. Kusemerwa Moses (Head teacher) retired on October 08, 2021 and accessed the pension payroll in October 2021; Ms. Babiha Susan (Head teacher) retired on October 14, 2021 and accessed the pension payroll in November 2021; Mr. Oliko Stephen Chandiga (Education Assistant) retired on December 20, 2021 and accessed the pension payroll in January 2022.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

Effective Planning,
Budgeting and
Transfer of Funds for
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on
this Performance
Measure

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

Score 2 or else
score 0

Direct transfers of the DDEG to LLGs
was done during FY 2021/2022 totaling
shs 626,705,859 in accordance with the
requirements of the budget as detailed
below:

In quarter one, a total of shs
208,901,953 was transferred to the
LLGs. The same amount was
transferred to LLGs during quarter two
whereas shs 208,901,953 was
transferred to the LLGs during the third
quarter.

Examples of transfers to LLGs:

(i) Shs 51,955,395 was transferred to
Bwijanga sub county on voucher
number 39857099 dated 18th
November, 2021 in quarter two. The
amount of shs 51,955,395 was
transferred and also received on 18th
November, 2021

(ii) Shs 51,888,978 was transferred to
Budongo sub county on voucher
number 39857098 dated 18th
November, 2021 in quarter two. The
amount of shs 51,888,978 was
transferred and also received on 18th
November, 2021.

(iii) Shs 26,584,301 was transferred to
Miirya sub county on voucher number
41427714 dated 28th January, 2022 in
quarter three. The amount of shs
26,584,301 was transferred and also
received on 28th January, 2022.

(iv) Shs 21,603,065 was transferred to
Kimengo sub county on voucher
number 414427712 dated 28th
January, 2022 in quarter three. The
amount of shs 21,603,065 was
transferred and also received on 28th
January 2022.

Effective Planning,
Budgeting and
Transfer of Funds for
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on
this Performance
Measure

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

Score: 2 or else
score 0

In quarter one, DDEG cash limits were received by the DLG on 9th July, 2021 from PS/ST under reference BPD 86/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 13th July, 2021. Warranting was done on 14th July, 2021, approved on 16th July, 2021 and transfers effected accordingly as per CAO's instructions. Cash limits were loaded on 14th July, 2021

In quarter two, DDEG cash limits were received by the DLG on 30th September, 2021 from PS/ST under reference MET 50/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 4th October, 2021. Warranting was done on 6th October, 2021 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions. Approval of warrant was done on 8th October, 2021. In quarter two, cash limit was loaded on 6th October, 2021.

In quarter three, DDEG cash limits were received by the DLG on 22nd December, 2021 from PS/ST under reference MET.50/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 27th December, 2021. Warranting was done on 3rd January, 2022 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions on 27th January, 2020. In quarter three, cash limit was loaded on 3rd January, 2022.

There were no delays of more than five days from the time of receipt of cash limits from MOFPED to warranting and release of funds to LLGs.

Effective Planning,
Budgeting and
Transfer of Funds for
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on
this Performance
Measure

c. If the LG
invoiced and
communicated all
DDEG transfers for
the previous FY to
LLGs within 5
working days from
the date of receipt
of the funds
release in each
quarter:

Score 2 or else
score 0

Invoicing and communication was done
as follows:

Quarter One on 19th July, 2021 and
communication by DLG to LLGs was
done on 13th July, 2021

Quarter Two on 12th October, 2021
and communication by DLG to LLGs
was done on 4th October, 2021

Quarter Three on 6th January,
2022. and communication by DLG to
LLGs was done on 27th December,
2021

Invoicing was done within five working
days from the date of receipt of the
funds release in each quarter

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0

The district carried out supervision and mentoring of LLGs as per examples provided in the reports sampled below:

In quarter one, the supervision and mentoring report was produced on 28th September, 2021 for the supervision conducted between 14th to 21st September, 2021 in the sub counties of Pakanyi, Kiruli, Labongo and Budongo. The report contained discussion on production of quality reports by LLGs. The need for efficient monitoring of Government projects.

Quarter three report was produced on 26th April, 2022 that indicated supervision of LLGs; Kimengo, Miirya, Bwijanga and Kyatiri Town Council. Discussion centered on Work Plans for sub counties, draft budgets for FY 2022/2023 and Revenue Projections.

Quarter four report was produced on 19th July, 2022 indicated supervision of Kyatiri T/C, plus sub counties of Budongo, Miirya, Pakanyi and discussion centered on Final Budgets for FY 2022/2023, Revenue Projections and physical progress reports.

Not all LLGs were mentored in a particular quarter and this was attributed to lack of supervision fund.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:

Score 2 or else score 0

Supervision and monitoring reports were discussed by TPC and corrective action taken on recommendations as provided below:

TPC meeting held on 30th November, 2021 discussed quarter one monitoring report under minute reference 9/30/11/2021

TPC meeting held on 27th January, 2022 discussed the quarter two monitoring report under minute reference 07/27/01/2022.

TPC meeting held on 31st May, 2022 discussed quarter three monitoring report under minute reference 10/31/05/2022

TPC meeting held on 29th July, 2022 discussed quarter four monitoring report under minute reference 08/29/JULY/2022

There was no evidence of follow up of recommendations for corrective actions.

Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an updated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:

The district had in place a computerized Assets Register in FY 2021/2022 through the IFMS system. The update of the Assets Register was up to 30th June, 2022. The register categorized land and buildings, furniture and fixtures, motor vehicles, computers and office equipment and all assets of MDLG.

Example of categorized building was under reference Masi 534/WRKS/2021/00360.

Score 2 or else score 0

Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:

Score 1 or else 0

There was a Board of Survey Report for FY 2021/2022 in place by the CAO a copy of which was submitted to the Accountant General on 11th August, 2022. The report was acknowledged by the Accountant General on 15th August, 2022. The report was copied to PS/MOFPED, PS MOLG, Chairperson of Council, CFO, Principal Internal Auditor and it captured the assets status of the DLG. Recommendations by the Board of Survey report included renovation of office block and all staff quarters, Handling of broken DLG assets like furniture and fittings and their disposal and renovation of the district piggery farm. Engraving of the DLG assets.

At the time of the assessment, furniture was found engraved as per the recommendations arising from Board of Survey Report dated 11th August, 2022.

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

There was a Physical Planning Committee in place with 13 appointed members by the CAO through letter dated 27th February, 2019. The members were; Catherine. Musiita; James. Babinge; Rameka. Atugonza; Francis. Kyomubando; Job. Byaruhanga, Alfred. Ocan, Geoffrey. Byenkya; Dr Jojn. Turyagaruka; Frank. Kigenyi; Sasina. Baryekanasa, Ibrahim. Nasur., William.Nsimire and Simon. Biryataga. The committee was functional during the previous fy as reflected in meetings that were held.

The Physical Planning Committee held meeting during quarter one on 26th August, 2021 for which minutes were submitted to MLHUD on 13th October, 2021.

The Committee met on 23rd December, 2021 during the second quarter and minutes were submitted to MLHUD on 20th January, 2022.

During quarter three, the Committee held meeting on 29th March, 2022 and minutes were submitted to MLHUD on 28th April, 2022.

In quarter four of FY 2021/2022, the Committee held two meetings on 10th and 29th June, 2022 and both sets of minutes were submitted to MLHUD on 6th July, 2022.

There was no approved District Physical Development Plan approved by Council hence there was no submission of the plan to the National Physical Planning Board as required.

The Building Plan Registration Book was in place and updated.

12	2	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were two projects financed by the DDEG during FY 2021/2022:</p> <p>(i) Rehabilitation of boreholes in 12 locations and (ii) Rehabilitation of two roads namely Bokwe - Kaborogote Road and Balyejukira Kyandang Kikingura Road as per District Development Plan III page 43. Examples: Rubrenga location for the bore hole. Kisogote borehole in Kinyanshi sub county; Perechu bore hole in Pichu sub county' Busole borehole in Kinyoli sub county</p> <p>A Desk Appraisal Report dated 30th March, 2022 was produced covering the projects as indicated above.</p>
12	2	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were two projects financed by the DDEG during FY 2021/2022:</p> <p>(i) Rehabilitation of boreholes in 12 locations and (ii) Rehabilitation of two roads namely Bokwe - Kaborogote Road and Balyejukira Kyandang Kikingura Road</p> <p>Two Field Appraisal Reports dated 4th April, 2022 and 5th May, 2022 were produced covering the projects as indicated above.</p>

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>The TPC meeting held on 31st May, 2022 under minute reference 9/31/05/2022 discussed the project profiles with costing as captured in the DDP, Budgets and Annual Work Plan.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG had screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists during the FY 2022/2023</p> <p>At the time of the assessment the LG didn't have a new project in health, therefore no environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures were carried out.</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 to deduce that infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan,</p> <p>The Routine Mechanized Maintenance of Walyoba - Kihonda (7.2 Km), Estimated (Budget) at UGX 67,000,000/=</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	The Contracts Committee had not sat to consider the said Projects since No Submissions by the user Department had been received by the PDU by the time of Assessment at Masindi DLG	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	There was NO evidence that LG had properly established the Project Implementation team(s) as per guidelines	0

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else score 0

Infrastructure projects under DDEG Funding were found to be Complaint with the standard designs and specifications as provided by the LG Engineer

For example;

- The Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & facelifting– with Ceiling works repairs, Spalsh Aprons works and general facelifting especially with Painting works. All Works were satisfactory, and Structure was intact at the time of Assessment
- Renovation of Kikingura HC II OPD and Installation of Water Tank was also Implemented accordingly as per set out LG Engineers instructions
- The Rehabilitation of Kikingura - Kyandangi - Kyakaiteera - Road (9.8Km) was undertaken following the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Works done included; Bush Clearing grading including back-sloping to a width of Seven (7) meters for the whole road length; Spot gravelling, and then the drainage works to majorly open Side drains and Mitre drains

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

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

There was NO evidence that the LG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers for infrastructure projects prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY

Some supervision Reports by the DE. and his works team were seen by the Assessor, including the “Annual Report for the Engineering and Roads Sector Masindi FY 2021-2022” dated 27th July, 2022. However, No evidence of the other Technical Officers especially the Environmental Officer and DCDO among others

The following projects among others were sampled

- a) Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & facelifting.
- b) Renovation of Kikingura HC II OPD and Installation of Water Tank
- c) Rehabilitation of Kikingura - Kyandangji - Kyakaiteera - Road (9.8Km)

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Masindi DLG verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors timely; for example;</p> <p>Payments for Works on the Rehabilitation of Bokwe - Kigunia - Kaborogota Road (7.5Km) - FORCE ACCOUNT were done timely, for example requisitions for Drainage Materials were made on the 14/1/2022 were verified by 17/1/2022, and LPO No., 1866 with materials worth UGX 18,080,000/= was Approved/ Issued to service Provider (Approved under Framework Contract – M/S Akabibamba Enterprises) dated 19/1/2022</p> <p>Also requisitions for Fuel and Lubricants (Rehabilitation of Bokwe - Kigunia - Kaborogota Road (7.5Km) - FORCE ACCOUNT) were made on the 19/10/2021 were verified by 21/10/2021, and LPO No., 1703 with materials worth UGX 41,426,550/= was Approved/ Issued to service Provider (Approved under Framework Contract – M/S Baikare Gapco Service Station – Masindi) dated 5/11/2021</p>
---	---	---

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Complete procurement files in place for the all projects/contracts; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals and/or minutes. These included</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & face-lifting - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00138; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. Min125/DCC/2021-22 in a meeting held 7/3/2022 after evaluation. The contract document was signed on 11/4/2022 2. Construction of 2 Stance Latrine with bath-shelters at Budongo HC II, and Construction of 4 Stance lined latrine at Kimengo HC III - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00025; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. Min55/DCC/2021-22 in a meeting held on 15/9/2021, in a meeting held on 15/9/2021 3. Renovation of Kikingura HC II OPD and Installation of Water Tank - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00031; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. Min59/DCC/2021-22 in a meeting held on 15/9/2021, in a meeting held on 15/9/2021
---	--	--

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	2	<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>There was evidence for the 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 the public display of information at district showing structure of the grievance management system</p> <p>- The grievance log book was in place with sub titles capturing the information of the person with complaint, with 6 headings, its captures action taken and details of the grievance, on the notice board of the district the structure of the grievance management system was displayed.</p>
14	1	<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 for the aggrieved parties to know where to report and get redress</p> <p>In file of reference number CR/214/49 for grievance, a letter dated 28/July/2021, Ref CR/154/2, addressed to all heads of department and sections, members of the public, were informed about complaint handling procedure by highlighting 9 key thematic areas, its displayed on the district notice board</p>

15	1	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	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>There was evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets;</p> <p>1. In the DDP III for (2020/21-2024/25), dated 1th/July/2020, signed by district planner and executive director for planning authority, Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were captured on page 36, and 37 sub section 2.4.6.</p> <p>2. In the approved budget of vote 534 Masindi district for the FY 2021/22 the Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated at tune of Ugx3,994,000,</p> <p>3. there was evidence in the annual work plans for the integration of Social and Climate change interventions, at tune of Ugx15,000,000.</p>
15	1	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	<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 LG 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>In a letter dated 12/2/2021 addressed to sub county chiefs, sub county community officers and sub county accountants, the CAO invited members for a dissemination meeting that was held on 24/2/2022 and started from 8;30am, minutes were reviewed, dated 3/3/2022 stamped and signed by DCDO.</p>

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):

c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:

score 3 or else
score 0

There was evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated in the BoQs, and contract/bidding documents and examples of costing of additional costs of addressing climate change adaptation,

1. Kona company Ltd, was contracted to rehabilitate Bwijanga health center IV, dated 10th/4/2022, masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00138 ESMP was prepared, incorporated in BoQ and costed Ugx762,500 quoted from BoQ. The total budget for the project was Ugx52,043,775, additional costs for addressing climate change totaling too Ugx237,500

2. Kona company Ltd, was contracted to construct 2-stance latrine at Bwijanga health center IV, dated 08th/12/2021, masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00022/00027/00028 and ESMP was prepared, incorporated in BoQ and Ugx895,000 quoted from BoQ item number from L,M and N. The total budget for the project was Ugx11,800,824, additional costs for addressing climate change totaling to Ugx155,000.

3. Cindy general contractors, was contracted to construct 5-stance latrine at Nyabyeya P/S, dated 10th/12/2021, masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00062 and ESMP was prepared, incorporated in BoQ and costed Ugx1,050,000 quoted from BoQ, the total budget for the project was Ugx23,962,484, additional costs for addressing climate change totaling too Ugx140,000

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	there was evidence for additional costing to address climate change adaptation; Evidence 1. E&S safeguards management plan for rehabilitation of four roads (Biraizi-kilanyi (7.6Km, Kyatiri-Kitanyata (10.5Km,) Kasongoire (9.3Km), Murujeje-Mburabuzo (9.5km), dated on 18/2/2022 and signed by DE, tree planting report dated 20/10/2022 and sensitisation of the community on sound waste management practices and climate change costing 8,000,000	3
----	--	---	---	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the DDEG projects are implemented on land which has proof of ownership Evidence 1. The consent for borehole voluntary land contribution at Kitooka village signed between Mr Alinda Edson (0775758897) and Alituha Nelson (0784808643) land owners and community to transfer land without conditions, dated 10/03/2022, stamped by LC 1 chairman of Kitooka village 2. The consent for borehole voluntary land contribution at Ibaralibi village signed between Mr Ovoya Donasiano land owners and community to transfer land without conditions, dated 27/June/2022, stamped by LC 1 chairman of Ibaralibi village 3. The consent for borehole voluntary land contribution at Kyabikule village signed between Mr Nsisireki Sarah land owners and community to transfer land without conditions, dated 28/8/2022, stamped by LC 1 chairman of Kyabikule village	1
----	--	---	--	---

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; monthly reports were reviewed

Evidence

1. There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs, ESMP prepared and costed for construction of 4-stance pit latrine with a urinal at Kimengo health center III, FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP 575,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen. however no monthly reports were available.

2. There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs, the ESMP prepared and costed for renovation of Bwijanga health center IV OPD FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP 980,000, dated 10/June/2021 monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen. however no monthly reports were available.

3. There was evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducted supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs, the ESMP prepared and costed for Kikingura health center II OPD FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP 980,000 dated 10/June/2021, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen. however no monthly reports were available.

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:

Score 1 or else score 0

There is evidence that Environmental and Social compliance certificates were signed by both EO's and CDO's

1. Highbury General Associates Ltd, was contracted to renovate OPD at Kikingura health centre II, P/S, both the EO and DCDO signed on the environmental and social certification for local government projects after certification that mitigation measures were addressed on 10/June/2022, payment was made on 30/June/2022.

2. Bunyoro Services United Technical Ltd, was contracted to construct 5-stance lined pit latrine with Wash room at Kitwetwe P/S, both the EO and DCDO signed on the environmental and social certification for local government projects after certification that mitigation measures were addressed on 10/June/2022, payment was made on 30/June/2022.

3. ASFA Investments Ltd was contracted to construct 4 classroom block at Kijunjubwa P/s, both the EO and DCDO signed on the environmental and social certification for local government projects after certification that mitigation measures were addressed on 31/3/2022, payment was made on 1/July/2022.

Financial management

LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:

Score 2 or else score 0

The district had in place the IFMS system that was utilized to reconcile bank accounts. The district had all the bank reconciliation statements prepared on a monthly basis up to 30th September, 2022. Examples of reconciliation statements:

(i) Ministry of Local Government General Fund account number 6003205957 with Absa Bank Masindi branch had been reconciled to 30th September, 2022 with a balance of shs 102,369,592.

(ii) MDLG YLP Recovery account number 9030010983362 with Stanbic Bank, Masindi branch had a reconciled bank balance of shs 12,601 as on 30th September, 2022.

(iii) Reconciliation of the TSA account of the DLG was taken over by MOFPED. No reconciliation statements were in place.

(iv) MDLG WEP Recovery bank account number 3100044198 with Centenary bank Masindi branch was reconciled up to 30th September, 2022 with a balance of shs 13,362,965.

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.

Score 2 or else score 0

All the quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2021/2022 were produced and accordingly submitted as required. The reports were addressed to the District Speaker.

Quarter One report was produced on 29th October, 2021. The report was acknowledged by IAG on 10th/11/2021 and MOLG on 10th/11/2021. (5 queries were raised);

Quarter Two report was produced on 28th January, 2022 (5 queries were raised).

Quarter Three report was produced on 28th April, 2022 (07 queries were raised)

Quarter Four report was produced on 29th July, 2022 (05 queries).

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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.

Score 1 or else score 0

The Internal Auditor submitted all the quarterly reports through the District Speaker for consideration by LGPAC and CAO as Accounting Officer for the district. The Accounting Officer (CAO) acknowledged receipt of all the audit reports as submitted by the Internal Auditor.

Evidence of provision of information in respect of issues raised by the Internal Auditor was seen through letter dated 15th September, 2021 referenced EDUC/112/01 from the DEO to CAO in respect of internal audit queries raised. Out of the twenty two queries raised in FY 2021/2022 by the Internal Auditor, twenty queries had been acted on and two queries were still outstanding at the time of the assessment.

Letter dated 14th February, 2022 referenced MSD/HOP/2222/2 from Health Department/Inspector to the CAO in response to queries raised by the Internal Auditor.

Letter dated 28th July, 2021 referenced CR/251/1 from CFO to the LGPAC Chairperson among others.

The Council meeting held on 30th October 2021 reviewed the LGPAC reports under minute reference COU/15/2020/2021. The LGPAC reports that were reviewed by Council covered quarter one, two and three of the internal audit reports for FY 2021/2022.

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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:

Score 1 or else score 0

The LGPAC held meetings to review the internal audit reports as follows:

The LGPAC quarter one report was dated 13th February, 2022 under reference CR/COU/214/4 and it was submitted to LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC on 31st December, 2021.

The second LGPAC report was dated 24th June, 2022 referenced COU/214/4 and it was submitted to LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC on 31st May, 2022.

The third quarter report by the LGPAC was dated 8th September, 2022 referenced COU/214/4 and was submitted to LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC on 31st August, 2022.

The fourth quarter report by the LGPAC was dated 29th October, 2022 referenced COU/214/4 It was submitted to LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC on 15th September, 2022.

The Council meeting held on 30th May, 2022 under minute 74/05/2022/COU/MDLG reviewed reports by the LGPAC.

Local Revenues

18

0

LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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.

The DLG originally budgeted shs 1,263,517,388 for local revenue for FY 2021/2022 as per financial statements of the district for FY 2021/2022 page 29. It however realized revenue collection amounting to shs 943,457,214 during the financial year as provided on page 29 DLG financial statements for FY 2021/2022. This was equivalent to 75% performance. The performance was below expectations. Poor performance of local revenue collection was essentially attributed to effects of COVID 19 pandemic as well as foot and mouth disease that covered the entire district during the year under review.

19

2

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)

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.

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

• If more than 10 %: score 2.

• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.

• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.

Local revenue collection amounting to shs 943,457,214 was realized during financial year 2021/2022 as detailed on page 29 of the financial statements for FY 2021/2022. In FY 2020/2021, the district collected shs 646,637,427 as per the audited financial statements for FY 2020/2021 resulting in an increment of 46%

$$\frac{\text{New (943,457,214)} - \text{Old (646,637,427)}}{X100}$$

$$\frac{943,457,214 - 646,637,427}{646,637,427} \times 100$$

$$= 46\%$$

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

The DLG realized a total of shs 943,457,214 and remitted shs 630,445,190 as the mandatory 65% share of local revenue to LLGs for FY 2021/2022 as detailed in the financial statements for FY 2021/2022 page 29. Computation:

$$\frac{615,445,190}{943,457,214} \times 100 = 65\%$$

943,457,214

Examples:

(i) Shs 11,404,112 was transferred to Pakanyi sub county per payment voucher 43210904 dated 05/05/2022.

(ii) Shs 21,219,122 was transferred to Kimogo sub county as per payment voucher number 43210903 dated 05/05/2022.

(iii) Shs 11,367,066 was transferred to Bwijaga sub county as per payment voucher number 43210843 dated 05/05/2022.

(iv) Shs 3,495,031 was transferred to Miira Sub county as per payment voucher number 43210905 dated 05/05/2022

(v) Shs 4,077,316 was transferred to Budongo Sub county as per payment voucher number 40283584 dated 05/05/2022

Transparency and Accountability

LG shares information with citizens

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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

The Procurement Plan and the Awarded Contracts were duly published/displayed on the Masindi DLG Procurement Notice board for Public View.

Examples of Projects – List of Best Evaluated Bidders under Open Bidding;

1. M/S Jochom Investments Ltd; for the Construction of OPD at Nyantonzi HCIII with an amount of - UGX 239,360,415 /=-;

2. M/S Ssekago F. Construction Co. Ltd; for the Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Walyoba P/S; - Proc. Ref. No. MASI889/WRKS/2022-23/00088; with a Sum - UGX 96,302,850 /=-; signed for display on the 19/10/2022, and date of removal was 1/11/2022

Also List of Approved Providers (Best Evaluated Bidders) for Frame Work Contracts for FY 2022/2023 was displayed with the following included among others

3. Supply of Fuel, Lubricants and Servicing of Motor Vehicles and Cycles to M/S Baikare Gapco Service Station – Masindi, and Mukyaro General Traders Ltd;

4. Supply and Installation of Culverts, Building, Plumbing and Electrical Materials to M/S Adonai Consulting Group Ltd, Masindi Trade Links Ltd, Akabibamba Enterprises, and Others

The above projects among others were as found on the Procurement Notice Board as signed by the CAO

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Publicity of the DLG performance assessment results was done as required as per CAO'S circular letter under reference CR/210/30 dated 29th July, 2022 in respect of FY 2020/2021 assessment results. Circular letter was distributed to the chairperson of Council, RDC, all heads of department, notice boards, Town Clerks, Sub County Chiefs, Executive Members, Standing Committee chairpersons, website www.Masindi.go.ug, Whatsup and all LLGs.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Barazas were held in the district as detailed in the CAO's circular letter dated 17th June, 2022 copied to Chairperson of the district, RDC, Health department LC III Chairpersons. In particular matters on health of people was of much concern Bararazas were held on 23rd March, 2022; 16th November, 2021 and 18th July, 2021. at the following venues: Kigotorogota sub county, Puchini sub county and Bihene sub county. Recommendations included b publicity of district programmes at all levels</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for publicized information regarding tax rates, revenue collection procedures etc as reflected in CAO's dated 1st January, 2022 in respect of taxes. Another publicity was done through CAO's circular letter dated 30th December, 2021. The district used Revenue collection staff to circulate publicity of information to the rightful users.</p>	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure

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

The DLG had one case in place during FY 2021/2022 in respect of irregular receipting of shs 4,390,050 by the Assistant Fisheries Officer. The programme for which the Assistant Fisheries Officer worked was funded under NUSAF 3. The irregular receipting was done during FY 2019/2020 but follow up by IGG was instituted in FY 2021/2022. The IGG requested for refund of the amount of money irregularly receipted (by Mr Tobias Busobozi) as detailed in IGG's letter dated 21th March, 2022 referenced HMA/08/11/2020.

Perusal of minutes of Council revealed that the case under reference was not reported for review/attention by Council Committee as required.

In FY 2022/2023, two cases emerged and raised by the IGG specifically regarding salary payments to teachers who had abandoned duty in various schools in the district. Another case was about Mt Vincent Tumwesigye who misappropriated funds in the works department where he worked as supervisor of works. (Reference: CAO's letter dated 22nd August, 2022 ref. CR/251/1)

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The PLE results indicated improvement of 2.8% in the previous year but one and the previous year as calculated below:</p> <p>2019 (DIV 1: 202, DIV 2: 1689, DIV 3: 727, TOTAL PASS: 2618, NEVER SAT: 75, TOTAL REGISTERED CANDIDATES: 3238).</p> <p>$202+1689+727=2618$</p> <p>$3238-75=3163$</p> <p>2020 (DIV 1:140, DIV 2: 1691, DIV3: 745, TOTAL PASS: 2576, NEVER SAT: 51 TOTAL REGISTERED CANDIDATES: 3062).</p> <p>$140+1691+745=2576$</p> <p>$3062-51=3011$</p> <p>Therefore, the calculated percentage for 2019 was $2618/3163 \times 100 = 82.8\%$ while</p> <p>The calculated percentage for 2020 was $2576/3011 \times 100 = 85.6\%$</p> <p>Therefore $85.6\% - 82.8\% = 2.8\%$ Improvement.</p>	2

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

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

The UCE results indicated an
improvement of 3.8% in the previous
year but one and the previous year as
calculated below:

2019 (DIV 1: 32, DIV 2:103, DIV 3:145,
TOTAL PASS: 280, NEVER SAT: 03,
TOTAL REGISTERD CANDIDATES:
489)

$$32+103+145=280$$

$$489-03=486$$

2020(DIV 1: 57, DIV 2: 134, DIV3: 142,
TOTAL PASS: 333, NEVER SAT: 03,
TOTAL REGISTRED CANDIDATES:
545)

$$57+134+142=333$$

$$545-03=542$$

The calculated percentage for 2019 was
 $280/486 \times 100 = 57.6\%$ While

The calculated percentage for 2020
was: $333/542 \times 100 = 61.4\%$

Therefore $61.4\% - 57.6\% = 3.8\%$
Improvement

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

Maximum 2 points

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

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

There was no LLGs performance
assessment for previous FY but one
and therefore no base data for
comparison.

<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 Budget performance report for 4th Quarter dated 7th September 2022 on page 69 and 70 showed that the Education Development Grant was used on the following eligible activities: 07/09/2022</p> <p>1-Rehabilitation of a 4 classroom block at Kijunjumbwa PS Amount 47,822,088UGX.</p> <p>2-Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kilanyi Muslim PS amount 65,184,970UGX.</p> <p>2-Construction of a 2 classroom block at Nyabubaale PS amount 62,251,997UGX.</p> <p>3-Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrines at Kikuube PS at 23,972,996UGX and Ntooma PS at 23,972,996.</p> <p>4-Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrines at Kitanyata PS at 23,610,620UGX and Kitanyata PS at 23,962,484UGX.</p> <p>5-Supply of Desks to Kijunjubwa PS (18), Kasongoire PS (18), Kayera PS (36), Nyabyeya PS (36), Kimengo PS (18), Kitanyata PS (36), Miramura PS (18), Kijogoro PS (18), Kilanyi PS (36) and Kichandi PS (18) at 58,736,000UGX.</p>
--	--	---

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The district implemented projects under the Education Department that included construction contracts during FY 2021/2022. Perusal of all the vouchers for construction contracts indicated that the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO all certified payments to contractors. Examples:

(i) Payment to Quality Farm Supply Masindi Ltd shs 22,796,632 on payment voucher number 43646148 dated 26th May, 2022. Service rendered was in respect of construction of 5 stance pit latrines at Ntooma P/S. DEO certified payment on 28th April, 2022; CDO and Environment Officer both signed on 9th May, 2022.

(ii) Payment to Highbury General Associates Ltd was paid for construction of 2 classroom blocks at Nyabibaare P/S on payment voucher number 42861674 dated 26th April, 2022 for shs 27,390,164 The DEO certified payment on 5th April, 2022 whereas the CDO and Environment Officer signed on 2nd June, 2022.

(iii) Payment to Ssekago F. Construction Ltd was paid shs 70,408,490 on payment voucher number 44585244 dated 29th June, 2022 for construction of two classroom blocks at Kitonozi P/S. DEO certified on 10th June, 2022 and CDO with Environment Officer signed on 10th June, 2022

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

From the DE and DEO's offices, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineers estimates (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Prices are as listed with the corresponding **Variation percentages; $[(A - B)/A] * 100\%$:**

1. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block with office and Store at Kitonozi P/S - MAS1534/WRKS/2021-22/00456. The Engineers Estimates (A) was UGX 75,000,000/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 74,936,085 /=. **The Variation was at 0.09%**

2. Construction of a 2-Classroom Block Kilanyi Muslim P/S - MAS1534/WRKS/2021-22/00067. The Engineers Estimates (A) was UGX 69,000,000/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 65,184,970 /=. **The Variation was at 5.53%**

3. Budongo Seed Sec School - Budongo S/County - MoES/UgIFTWRKS/2018-19/00119/LOT 5 with MoES (Engineers) Estimates (budget amount) at UGX 2,100,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 2,190,885,010 /=. **The Variation was at -4.33%**

The variations, $[(A - B)/A] * 100\%$ were thus within +/-20% of the MoES/LG Engineers estimates

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY

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

The Contract for Construction of Budongo Seed Sec. School, in Keihangara S/County expired with a number of requests for Extension of Time that had been granted, latest was up to 15/6/2022 (Under Min145/DCC/2021-22 (II), of the Contracts Committee held on 25/3/2022. By the time of the Assessment the work had been fully finished.

The Construction of Budongo Seed Sec. School, in Budongo S/County (Rolled over project - MoES/UgIFTWRKS/2018-19/00119/LOT 5) was completed as per workplan for the FY 2021/2022, and School was fully being utilised.

This indicator as per the LGMSD 2021 manual reviews calls for Ref. Seed Sec. School.

However, the following Education/School infrastructure development were also completed as per Work Plan as evidenced by the project Completion reports from the DE and DEO

- Construction of a 2-Classroom Block with office and Store at Kitonozi P/S, and Kilanyi Muslim P/S

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>A review of the staffing structure for schools, and the teachers' staff lists from HRM titled \"Masindi District Local Government Staff List Analysis 2021\" signed by Ms. Asimwe Oliver for the DEO showed that the then approved staff establishment ceiling was 952 and staff in post were 803. Enrolment stood at 43,347. At the teacher to pupil ratio of 1:53, the ideal establishment ceiling would be 818 teachers meaning at the LG still had leeway to recruit more teachers. Their capacity was 84.3%.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>A review of the asset registers FY2021/22 for both UPE and USE schools showed 67 out of 69 (registered UPE schools met DES guidelines and 6 out of 6(100%) USE schools met DES guidelines.</p> <p>UPE asset registers 67 out of 69(97.1%)</p> <p>UCE asset registers 6 out of 6(100%)</p> <p>Thus $97.1 + 100 = 98.6\%$</p> <p>Therefore above 70%</p>	3
---	---	---	--	---

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>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of 	<p>The LG had accurately (100%) reported on teachers and where they were deployed. From the sampled schools the teachers are in schools where they were deployed and the staff list for schools, deployment and staff attendance registers were verified and</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

below were the findings:

St. Mary's Kyatiri PS. Twenty one teachers including the headteacher were deployed as per staff list at the DEO's office corresponded with deployment in the school. The teachers were: Busingye Eulelia, Abigaba Moreen, Klatushabe Byakagaba Brendah, Otiti Bernadette, Nibyobarora Pacific, Kiiza Kabyanga Alice, Kaijua Juliet, Atuhaire Christine, Onzima Victor, Nyakiirya Annet, Mbabazi Alikadi, Kaahwa Dorcus, Kwesiga Geoffrey, Atugonza Christine, Odeya Awaned Emmanuel, Akulla Simon, Tibananuka Jennifer, Odongo James, Kandole James, Mwesigwa Bashir and Kabajenje Emmyline.

Walyoba PS. Sixteen teachers including the headteacher were deployed as per staff list at the DEO's office corresponded with deployment in the school that was also sixteen: They included: Ntairaho E. Byoona, Bisangabasaija Expeditor, Kiiza Nicholas, Bantebya Phillo, Kabikiuru Dorcus, Kahumuza Lawrence, Musiimenta Joseline, Latigo Emmanuel, Birungi Joy, Bagonza Moses, Asiimwe Ismail, Ijokole Rebecca, Kiseka Godfrey, Mbabazi Kennedy, Kasumkba Flavia and Odaga Moses.

St. Paul's Pakanyi PS. Ten teachers that included a headteacher were deployed as per staff list at the DEO's office corresponded with deployment in the school. These included :Odongo Betty, Anewa Yik Christopher, Asiimwe Deborah, Bagonza Brian, Kusemererwa Sarah, Katushabe Robinah, Babirye Gertrude, Mugisa Beatrice, Marachan Francis and Nyangoma Harriet.

The information given by the LG was accurate.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

The review of asset register in the DEOs office indicated the following:

Kyatiri PS (Urban-Kyatiri Town Council)

Number of Classrooms: 12, Number of Latrines: 15 Stances, Number of Desks:162 , Number of Teachers Houses: 0.

Walyoba PS (Semi Urban-Pakanyi Sub County)

Number of Classrooms: 10, Number of Latrines: 15 stances, Number of Desks: 187, and Number of Teachers Houses: 2.

St. Paul's Pakanyi PS (Rural-Miirya Sub County)

Number of Classrooms: 08, Number of Latrines: 15 stances, Number of Desks: 97, and Number of Teachers Houses: 1.

During the verification, all the three sampled schools asset registers on infrastructure and equipment, were in place but were not tallying with data from DEOs office.

Therefore not accurate information at 100%.

Thus LG not compliant.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

- If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4
- Between 80 – 99% score: 2
- Below 80% score 0

The LG evidence provided showed that all the 69 out of 69 (100%) UPE registered schools had submitted their annual school reports and budgets for school academic year 2021 duly signed by the respective Head teachers, and Chairman SMC.

A review of the annual school and budget reports of the three sampled schools that included St. Mary's Kyatiri PS, Walyoba PS and St. Paul's Pakanyi PS had submitted their reports to the DEOs office however these reports didnt include: i) Highlights of school performance; ii) a reconciled cash flow statement; iii) an Asset register; and iv) an expenditure report as required, and the dates when these reports were submitted to DEOS office were not provided.

6	4	School compliance and performance improvement:	b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:	A review of the head teachers induction meeting minutes about the SIPS which was held on 11th May 2022 and all the head teachers were guided on the steps to be followed while making school improvement plan.
Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30–49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	From the Sampled Schools this was 100% implementation, more than 50% as indicated below:	St Mary’s Kyatiri PS: It lacked assigning teaching roles and responsibilities to all teachers which was done and roles and responsibilities of teachers displayed.	
			Walyoba PS: Implemented continuous and monthly assessment that improved pupil’s performance in reading, spelling and writing especially English.	
			St Paul’s Pakanyi PS: Completed a classroom block that was under construction, fenced the school and a talking compound.	
			These were verified and confirmed during my visit to the above named schools.	
6	4	School compliance and performance improvement:	c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:	The LG had collected and compiled EMIS (OTIMS) return forms for all the 69 UPE registered primary schools. For example the list of 69 UPE primary schools indicated in Masindi DLG Performance contract FY 2021/22 with total enrollment of 39430 was consistent with the number of 69 UPE schools in excel data sheet (OTIMS) that was signed by the CAO on 5th January 2021 and submitted to MoES on 5th March ,2021.
Maximum 12 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	This was 100% Submission.		

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

Masindi DLG had budgeted for a minimum of 7 Teachers including Headteacher for a P7 school and one teacher per class and a Head teacher for schools with less than P7. A total of 827 Teachers including Headteachers were all budgeted for FY 2022/23 with a total of 549,571,000UGX as general staff salaries for primary education services for the 69 UPE schools as per LG approved budget estimates FY 2022/23.

7

3

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

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

The LG had deployed Teachers according to MoES sector guidelines/staffing norms; which prescribe that a P7 school should have a minimum of seven teachers and a head teacher and all the 69 schools had a minimum of nine teachers and a head teacher.

Score 3 else score: 0

The Sampled Schools deployment was as follows:

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

St. Marys Kyatiri PS.

20 Teachers were deployed and a head teacher, as per staff list at the DEO's office corresponded with deployment in the school.

Walyoba PS.

09 Teachers and a head teacher were deployed as per staff list and Actual staff list and staff attendance register at school was also 10:

St. Pauls Pakanyi PS.

09 Teachers and a head teacher were deployed as per staff list and Actual staff list and staff attendance register at School was also 10

7

1

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

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

Teacher deployment list was found displayed on LG notice board and on the walls of the head teacher's offices in all the three sampled schools which were St. Mary's Kyatiri PS, Walyoba PS. and St. Paul's Pakanyi PS.

score: 1 else, score: 0

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

8

2

Performance management:

a) If all primary school head

A review of the schools list availed by HRM showed that there were 69

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

primary schools. The Assessment Team also reviewed a letter from the DEO to the CAO ref.: CR/213/2 titled "Submission of Staff Appraisals for Primary and Secondary School, 2021"; and a table titled "Performance Analysis for Primary School Head Teachers" summarizing the assessment results for Headteachers and duly endorsed by the PHRO and CAO. Some of the files reviewed showed the following:

1. Kunihira Monica the headteacher Kitonozi Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 21/02/2022
2. Kabanyoro Grace the headteacher Siiba Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 30/03/2022
3. Kabanyoro Kwebiiha Jennifer the headteacher Kimanya Upper Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 30/03/2022
4. Kaija Eseri the headteacher Bulima Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
5. Kajunjube Lilian the headteacher Bulyango Public Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 08/02/2022
6. Katwesige Beatrice the headteacher Kitanyata Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 02/02/2022
7. Geria Sabino the headteacher Kihoole Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 29/03/2022
8. Adongo Betty the headteacher Pakanyi Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 08/02/2022
9. Abitekaniza Andrew the headteacher Isagara Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
10. Musoke Ibrahim the headteacher Budongo SM Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 22/03/2022
11. Musinguzi Edward the headteacher Nyabyeya Primary

- School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 21/03/2022
12. Bikanga Edward the headteacher Kimanya Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
 13. Nyendwoha Harriet the headteacher Kinuuma Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 11/03/2022
 14. Mbabazi Janepher the headteacher Nyantonzi Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 07/04/2022
 15. Manyire Johnson the headteacher Kisalizi Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
 16. Balaba Moses the headteacher Miramura Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
 17. Owechi Christine the headteacher Kahaara Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 11/03/2022
 18. Tamale Edward the headteacher Kinumi Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 14/02/2022
 19. Mukoda Monica the headteacher Kikingura Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
 20. Obonyo Jimmy the headteacher Bokwe Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
 21. Isingoma Peter the headteacher Kitamba Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 30/03/2022
 22. Mugabe Sylvester the headteacher Kibamba Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 04/04/2022
 23. Kasaija David the headteacher Kitwetwe Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
 24. Monday Naboth the headteacher Kyabaswa Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022

25. Kikabi David Peterson the headteacher Kasongoire Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 30/03/2022
26. Kanyamwenge Jonathan the headteacher Mihembero Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 10/02/2022
27. Asiimwe Moses the headteacher Kinyara SW Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 07/04/2022
28. Asiimwe Placid the headteacher Kayera Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 25/03/2022
29. Kuruhiira A. Dinah the headteacher Kigezi Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 11/03/2022
30. Obiya Andama Fidel the headteacher Rwempisi Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 30/03/2022
31. Odeya Awacnedi Emmanuel the headteacher St. Mary's Kyatiri Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 07/02/2022
32. Tibenda Edward the headteacher Kiina Primary School was appraised by Mr. Kato Adolf on 23/03/2022

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

A review of the school list availed from HRM showed that there were six secondary schools. The Assessment Team were availed the Secondary School Head teacher\'s appraisals by Chairpersons of the School Board.

1. Mr. Karuima Edward, Headteacher Bwijanga Secondary School was appraised by the Chairperson of the Board on 31/12/2021 .
2. Mr. Tusiime Allan, Headteacher Budongo Secondary School was appraised by the Chairperson of the Board on 11/01/2021
3. Ms. Rukundo Joseph Mary, Headteacher Kiyuya Seed Secondary School was appraised by the Chairperson of the Board on 30/12/2021
4. Ms. Rugongeza Ruth, Headteacher Ikoba Girls SS was appraised by the Chairperson of the Board on 15/01/2021
5. Mr. Asimwe Yasin, Headteacher Kinyara Secondary School was appraised by the Chairperson of the Board on 30/12/2021
6. Mr. Byarugaba Barnabas, Headteacher St. Paul Secondary School was appraised by the Chairperson of the Board on 30/12/2022

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>No evidence was adduced to show that the school inspectors and education management staff were appraised.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 had prepared a Capacity Building plan for FY 2021/22 dated 2nd July 2021 that was prepared by the DEO and copied to Principal Human Resource Officer.</p> <p>The Activities included the following:</p> <p>1: Training of teachers in pedagogical aspects especially in lesson planning and scheming and assessment.</p> <p>2: Induction of new staff recruited especially teachers, head teachers about management and professional code of conduct.</p> <p>3: Training of head teachers in development of school improvement planning.</p>	2

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 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG did not have any issue concerning correcting the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in PBS thus there was no correction to be made hence no need for the letter from Town Clerk correcting the list.

Thus the LG was compliant.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines. According to the LG approved budget FY 2021/22 page 33 generated on 30th June, 2021 UGX49,400,000 was allocated for inspection and monitoring. This was 100% compliant as indicated below:

DEO Monitoring = 45,000,000 fixed rate.

Inspection = 4,000,000 fixed rate.

Monitoring = 100,000x
69=6,900,000+4,500,000=11,400,000

Inspection
=112,000x69=7,728,000+
4,000,000=11,728,000

Thus:
11,400,000+11,728,000=23,128,000

Therefore allocations for inspection and monitoring was in line with sector guidelines.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters

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

In quarter one cash limits were received by the DLG on 9th July, 2021 from PS/ST under reference BPD 86/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 13th July, 2021. Warranting was done on 14th July, 2021, approved on 16th July, 2021 and transfers effected accordingly as per CAO's instructions. Cash limits were loaded on 14th July, 2021

In quarter two, cash limits were received by the DLG on 30th September, 2021 from PS/ST under reference MET 50/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 4th October, 2021. Warranting was done on 6th October, 2021 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions. Approval of warrant was done on 8th October, 2021. In quarter two, cash limit was loaded on 6th October, 2021.

In quarter three, cash limits were received by the DLG on 22nd December, 2021 from PS/ST under reference MET.50/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 27th December, 2021. Warranting was done on 3rd January, 2022 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions on 27th January, 2020. In quarter three, cash limit was loaded on 3rd January, 2022.

There were no delays of more than five days from the time of receipt of cash limits from MOFPED to warranting and release of funds to LLGs.

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 evidence that the LG invoiced and the DEO communicated/publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release of from MOFPED as detailed below:</p> <p>For quarter one, Invoicing was done on 19th July, 2021 and release of funds was done on 16th July, 2021</p> <p>For quarter two, invoicing was done on 12th October, 2021 and release of funds was done on 5th October, 2021</p> <p>For quarter three, invoicing was done on 6th January, 2022 and release of funds was done on 4th January, 2022</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG prepared an inspection plan for FY2021/2022 dated 16th July 2021. It was prepared by the Inspector of schools and verified by the DEO, with the following activities and schedule.</p> <p>The main objective was improving pupil, teacher and head teachers attendance at schools and improved continuous assessment of pupils.</p> <p>The Plan was to be implemented in all terms 1, 2 & 3, effective September 2021 to August 2022.</p> <p>Inspection preparatory meeting was held on 7th October 2021 for Term 3 under minute No. Min.05/2021 inspection materials were distributed. Meeting held on 20th June 2022 for Term 2 under minute No. 04/2022 school inspection program was drawn.</p>	2

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG carried out inspections in the previous three school terms on the following dates:

1: 27/10/2021 64 UPE out of 69 UPE =64 (UPE 92.8%)

2: 01/04/2022 69 UPE out of 69 UPE = 69 (UPE 100%)

3: 18/08/2022 69 UPE out of 69 UPE = 69 (UPE 100%)

Thus the overall percentage of UPE Schools inspected and monitored from the previous three school terms was 97.6%.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The Departmental inspection follow up meeting held at DIS Office on 10th April 2022, under Minute No. Min 4/22 DIS presented the inspection report findings for term one of 2022 and under Minute No.5/2022 DIS discussed the inspection report results.

Meeting that was held on 19th November 2021, in the DISs office under Minute No. 3/2021 inspection report was presented and under minute No. Min 4/2021 DIS discussed the inspection report.

From the three sampled schools, these were the findings which were discussed and used to recommend for corrective action.

St Mary's Kyatiri PS.

Inspected on 23rd August 2021, 23rd February 2022 and 24th March 2022.

The following were the issues:

Need to put more focus on literacy skills, and the head teacher to improve teacher's supervision.

Walyoba PS.

Inspected on 22nd December 2021, 22nd February 2022 and 18th July 2022

Provision of furniture desks, need for at least two classrooms and need to procure more temperature guns.

St. Paul's Pakanyi PS.

Three inspections were carried out on 23rd August 2021, 22nd February 2022 and 18th July 2022

The issues raised in both inspections were:

Lobby for staff quarters, Request for one more teacher and ensure school budgets are made and funds displayed.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Copies of the inspection reports were left behind as evidenced from the three sampled Schools mentioned below:

St. Mary's Kyatiri PS dated 23rd August 2021, 24th March 2022 and 23rd February 2021.

Walyoba PS dated 22nd December 2021, 22nd February 2022 and 18th July 2022.

St. Paul's Pakanyi PS dated 23rd August 2021, 22nd February 2022 and 18th July 2022.

The Inspection Reports were also submitted to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the MoES on the following dates:

Term 3 on 1st November 2021, Term 1 on 11th April 2022 and Term 2 on 24th August 2022.

10	2	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Council Committee responsible for education was in place and functional during FY 2021/2022, convened meetings and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. The committee covered three sectors namely Education, Health and Community Based Services.</p> <p>Examples: Meeting was held on 30th August, 2021 discussed the AWP's for the sectors of the district for FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Meeting held on 23rd October, 2021 discussed 1st quarter departmental reports and field reports.</p> <p>Meeting held on 22nd February, 2022 discussed Annual Sector Work Plans for FY 2022/2023 and grant aiding of primary schools.</p> <p>Meeting held on 14th December, 2021 discussed second quarter progress reports and third quarter work plans.</p> <p>Meeting held on 12th and 13th of May, 2022 discussed sector budget estimates for FY 2022/2023.</p>
11	2	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG Education Department conducted activities to mobilize and attract and retain children at school as highlighted in the following activities below:</p> <p>Radio talk show report dated 2nd May 2022 indicated that the DEO held a radio talk show at radio Kitara from 6:00pm to 7:00pm and radio Kings at 8:00pm to 9:00pm. The DEO addressed teachers on pertinent issues to be undertaken in order to effectively prepare schools for safe opening.</p>

<p>12 Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG maintained schools asset register in a format prescribed by MoES ,a review of the asset register from DEOs office indicated the following:</p> <p>St. Mary's Kyatiri PS. (Urban).</p> <p>Number of Classrooms: 12, Number of Latrines:15</p> <p>Number of Desks:162,Number of Teachers Houses: 0.</p> <p>Walyoba PS. (Rural)</p> <p>Number of Classrooms :10, Number of Latrines:15, Number of Desks: 183, Number of Teachers Houses: 2.</p> <p>St. Paul's Pakanyi PS. (Sem Urban)</p> <p>Number of Classrooms: 8, Number of Latrines: 15, Number of Desks: 97, Number of Teachers Houses: 1.</p> <p>From the sampled schools the findings were as follows:</p> <p>St. Mary's Kyatiri PS. (Urban).</p> <p>Number of Classrooms: 12, Number of Latrines:10</p> <p>Number of Desks:192,Number of Teachers Houses: 4.</p> <p>Walyoba PS. (Rural)</p> <p>Number of Classrooms :10, Number of Latrines:25, Number of Desks: 256, Number of Teachers Houses: 6.</p> <p>St. Paul's Pakanyi PS. (Sem Urban)</p> <p>Number of Classrooms: 8, Number of Latrines: 14, Number of Desks: 161, Number of Teachers Houses: 1.</p> <p>Thus: Asset registers observed from the 3 sampled schools did not rhyme with the asset registers reviewed from the DEO's office.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, *score: 1 or else, score: 0*

The Education Department had three projects implemented in FY 2021//2022.

(i) Supply of desks to various schools budgeted at shs 836,105,000 per page 42 of the Annual Approved Budget, page 34 of the DDP III and page 23 of the AWP.

(ii) Emptying of pit latrines for various schools for shs213,800,000 per page 43 of the approved budget, page 67 of the DDP III and page 56 of the AWP.

(iii) Construction of class room blocks for various schools budgeted at shs 213,800,000 per page 44 of the approved budget page 76 of the DDP III and page 24 of the AWP.

All the projects as listed above were captured in the District AWP and DDP.

Desk appraisal of the projects was conducted and were captured in the approved budget, AWP and the DDP. Desk appraisal report was dated 29th March, 2022

Field Appraisal Reports were dated 4th April, 2022, 5th April, 2022 and 7th April, 2022

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0

The Education Department had three projects implemented in FY 2021//2022.

(i) Supply of desks to various schools budgeted at shs 836,105,000 per page 42 of the Annual Approved Budget. This was covered under the field report dated 4th April, 2022

(ii) Emptying of pit latrines for various schools for shs213,800,000 per page 43 of the approved budget.

This was covered under the field report dated 5th April, 2022

(iii) Construction of class room blocks for various schools budgeted at shs 213,800,000 per page 44 of the approved budget. This was covered under the field report dated 7th April, 2022

In summary, Field Reports were in place dated 4th April, 5th April and 7th April, 2022.

13	1	<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>As per the Approved Budget Estimates, the following projects were incorporated in the AWP and Procurement Plans for the current FY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of School Facilities for Kijunjubwa Seed SS; Budgeted at UGX 913,432,000/=. 2) Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Walyoba P/S; Estimated at UGX 99,900,000/= . The Contract - MASI889/WRKS/2022-23/00088 is to be awarded at a Cost of UGX 96,302,850/= to M/S Ssekago F. Construction Co. Ltd 3) Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Latrine at Masindi Center for the Handicapped P/S; Estimated at UGX 28,332,000 /=. The Contract - MASI889/WRKS/2022-23/00096 is to be awarded at a Cost of UGX 28,328,732 /= to M/S Kahembe Builders Centre Ltd
13	1	<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>School infrastructure Projects were approved by the Contracts Committee (C.C) before commencement of Works. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Min145/DCC/2021-22 (II) in a C.C meeting held on 25/3/2022, the extension of time to allow for Construction completion of Budongo Seed Sec School - Budongo S/County up to 15/6/2022, • Under Min143/DCC/2021-22 (II) in a meeting held on 30/3/2022, the Construction of a 2-Classroom Block with office and Store at Kitonozi P/S, and • Under Min43/DCC/2021-22 in a C.C meeting held on 24/8/2021, the Construction of a 2-Classroom Block with an Office at Kilanyi Muslim P/S were approved

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. *score: 1, else score: 0*

There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the PITS for the school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines

Copies of joint appointment of the DEO (Contract Manager), Assistant Engineering Officer, Senior Environment Officer, DCDO among others as members of the PIT for Construction Works under Education Department; unfortunately the team (PIT) was not sufficiently established as NO Project manager (DE), and Labour officer were appointed. The letters were dated 7th December, 2021. The following Projects were considered'

a) Construction of a 2-Classroom Block Kilanyi Muslim P/S

b) Construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Nyabyeya P/S

c) Construction works at Kijunjubwa P/S

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES

Score: 1, else, score: 0

The sampled projects as per the physical checks during the site visits were implemented following MoES technical designs.

1) The 2-Classroom Block with an office and Store at Kitonozi P/S was implemented following Standard technical designs with the Classroom Block, each class measuring 7800x6400mm on the interior, the Office and Store in Masonry brick walls of 230mm. The structure was roofed in Ordinary/Corrugated Maroon-colored Iron Sheets on treated timber trusses with fascia boards. The floor. The enclosures (steel casements), ie Doors (3No. each 900x2400mm) and glazed Windows – 1500mmx1200mm, The inner office/store door was a wooden timber door with a vent - 900x2400mm, then the general finishing works in Plastering, floor works in cement – sand screeding with dividing strips to mitigate cracking, Chalk Boards (4500mmm wide by 1200mm high) and painting; all done as per the BoQs. The lightening arrestor was installed as well

2) The Budongo Seed School (Functional) however had a lot of Workmanship Issues that affect the general Quality of the Works –

The number of Blocks (Classrooms, Sci. Lab, ICT/Library Block, Main Hall, the twin Staff houses including the corresponding Kitchen and latrine Blocks) at Project were done – with all the structural elements in beams and Columns. However much of the Gutter Works were poorly fixed and leaking, spillages that became also stagnant on some of the Verandah Flows. By the Time of Assessment, the Football Pich was being re-done (under construction – Planting Grass, etc) as part of the Snags that need to be fully communicated and handled/rectified

13	0	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was NO evidence that monthly Site Meetings were conducted for School infrastructure projects during the previous FY (2021/2022)</p>
13	1	<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>Monthly Joint Technical supervisions of the construction of planned sector infrastructure projects were regular (w.r.t Critical stages).</p> <p>The Participation of the environment officer and CDO among other officers was evidenced in the Joint inspections/supervision, and the reports seen by the Assessor included 10/6/2022, 17/5/2022, 18/4/2022, 2/3/2022, 15/2/2022 among other dates,</p> <p>The DE. and team also provided supervision of works as per Inspection and Supervision/Monitoring reports dated 20/5/2022, 10/6/2022, among others</p> <p>The following projects were sampled;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 2-Classroom Block with office and Store at Kitonozi P/S; • Construction of a 2-Classroom Block Kilanyi Muslim P/S; • Construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Nyabyeya P/S

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The CFO availed the following;

(1). Payment claim from Kambugu. R. construction co. ltd. dated 20/05/2022 for construction of 2 classroom block at Kilanyi Muslim Primary school. this was accompanied with Interim Payment certificate No.2, approved by CAO on 16/6/2022 and a Payment voucher No.4458236 dated 30-June-2022. Payment was initiated on 12th June, 2022 hence payment was done within the specified timeframe.

(2).Request for payment of roof structure, windows, doors, plastering and verander at Nyabubale primary school, by Highbury general Associates Limited, dated 23/03/2022 accompanied with Interim Payment certificate No.2, approved by CAO on 4/4/2022 and a Payment voucher No.42861674, dated 1-July-2022. Payment was initiated on 14th June, 2022 hence payment was done within the specified timeframe.

(3). Request for Payment from Senketo. F. Construction Limited dated 8-june-2022, for Construction of two classroom block at kitonozi P/S, accompanied with Interim Payment certificate No.114/6/2022, approved by CAO on 16/6/2022 and a Payment voucher No.44585244 dated 30-June-2022. Payment was initiated on 12th June, 2022 hence payment was done within the specified timeframe.

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

From the PDU, it was evidenced that the LG Education Department **did not timely** submit a Procurement Plan for the FY 2022/23. The Plan was submitted/received by the PDU on **27/6/2022** as per Memo endorsed by the DEO (Kato Adolf) on 22/6/2022. The following projects were included among other Works/Supplies;

- Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Walyoba P/S
- Construction of a 5-Stance Lined Latrine at Masindi Center for the Handicapped P/S
- Construction of School Facilities for Kijunjubwa (Seed) S.S

Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	<p>From the Procurement Plan and procurement Files; there were complete procurement file for all the school infrastructure projects; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals. The project Files sampled included the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 2-Classroom Block with office and Store at Kitonozi P/S - MAS1534/WRKS/2021-22/00456. Approved by the CC under Min143/DCC/2021-22 (II) in a meeting held on 30/3/2022. The Contract Document was signed 10/4/2022 • Construction of a 2-Classroom Block Kilanyi Muslim P/S - MAS1534/WRKS/2021-22/00067. Approved by the CC under Min43/DCC/2021-22 in a meeting held on 24/8/2021. The Contract Document was signed 14/1/2022 <p>The above files were complete with, evaluation reports and approvals/minutes of the Contracts Committee meeting.</p>
---	--	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

3

Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0

There was evidence at LG to show that education grievances were recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework,

1. In a letter dated 14/3/2022 addressed to the church and copied to CAO and other heads of department, written by the land owners, to address the disputes between the church and the school, the letter was received by DEO, the district team lead by CAO, school and church members held a meeting to clearly show the demarcations of the land for school and church in the minute dated 1/6/2022 and a log of complaints seen

15

0

Safeguards for service delivery.

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 3, or else score: 0

There was no evidence provided to the assessor at the time of assessment regarding dissemination of Education guidelines to provide for access to land, proper siting of schools, green schools, and energy and water conservation.

Also verification in all the 3 sampled schools which were St. Mary's Kyatiri PS located in Kyatiri town council, Walyoba PS located in Pakanyi sub-county, St Paul's Pakanyi PS located in Miirya Sub-county, guidelines incorporating E&S were not in place.

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 the LG had a costed ESMP and was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents</p> <p>Cindy general contractors, was contracted to construct 5-stance latrine at Nyabyeya P/S, dated 10th/12/2021, masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00062, ESMP was prepared, incorporated in BoQ and costed Ugx635,000 quoted from BoQ, section 6, item number from 6.1 to 6.7 the total budget for the project was Ugx23,962,484, additional costs for addressing climate change totaling too Ugx140,000</p>	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 evidence that the schools are constructed on land with proof of land ownership, for example Kitonzi P/S has land ownership consent with Masindi Kitara Diocese signed by both parties and stamped by diocesan secretary dated 17/May/2021,</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>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>3.Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for borehole drilling at Budongo Seed School sector water, dated 16/June/2022, signed by both the CDO and DEO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx240,000, monitoring was done to ascertain compliance of the ESMP and monitoring checklist seen dated,10/May/2022 and 7/June/2022</p>	2

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 1, else score:0

There was evidence that the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments

For example the construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine block at Kitwetwe P/s both environmental officer and CDO signed substantial completion certificate, dated 10/5/2022, contract sum Ugx23,500,000, payment effected on 30/6/2022

Health Performance
Measures

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By 20% or more, score 2• Less than 20%, score 0	<p>From the sampled facilities of Bwijanga HC IV ,Pakanyi HC iii and Kimengo HC III ,there was evidence that there was no increase in utilization of health services as shown from the calculation below:</p> <p>New-Old/Old x 100.</p> <p>$(1,763-1,832/1,832 \times 100) = -3.76\%$</p> <p>There was reduction in total number of deliveries between financial years 2020/2021 & 2021/2022.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The District had in place an approved budget for the health development grant totaling shs 161,961,000 out of which shs 164,514,000 was released to the district inclusive of the supplementary budget by MOFPED. Details of the approved budget for the district as well as the total expenditure under this item were captured on page 16 of the Annual Budget Performance Report for quarter four of FY 2021/2022 and AWP in the same financial year.

Examples of development grant activities under taken during FY 2021/2022 included the following:

(i) Construction of 2 VIP bath shelters at Budongo HC III budgeted at shs 11,000,000 and spent shs 4,618,000 during the financial year as reflected on page 117 of the ABPR.

(ii) Construction of 3 VIP bath shelters at BwiJanga HC IIII budgeted at sjhs 11,000,000 and spent shs 19,237,000 during the financial year as indicated on page 125 of the ABPR.

(iii) Construction of placenta pit at Kwenga budgeted at shs 7,000,000 and all of it was spent as indicated on page 131 of the ABPR.

(iv) Renovation of Kikingura OPD budgeted at shs 45,000,000 and spent the total amount as indicated on page 126 of the ABPR.

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

Review of payment vouchers for contracts in the health department revealed

That all payments to contractors

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers score 2 or else score 0

were certified by the DHO, D/E, CDO and Environment Officer as required. Examples:

(i) Payment to Munaku Contractors Ltd for construction of all fence at Masindi Hospital for shs 17,076,977 on voucher number 43840417 dated 10th June, 2022.

DHO signed on 02/06/2022, LG Engineer on 01/06/2022, CDO on 02/06/2022 and Environment Officer on 02/06/2022.

(ii) Payment to Kona Company Ltd in respect of rehabilitation of Bwinjaga HC IV OPD for shs 49,103,125 on payment voucher number 43840421 dated 10th June, 2022.

DHO signed on 02/06/2022, LG Engineer on 02/06/2022, CDO on 01/06/2022 and Environment Officer on 01/06/2022

(iii) Payment to Highbury General Associates for rehabilitation of OPD block at Kikingura HC II for shs 44,957,724 on payment voucher number 42759389 dated 20th April, 2022.

DHO signed on 04/03/2022, LG Engineer on 01/03/2022, CDO on 03/03/2022 and Environment Officer on 03/03/2022.

(iv) Payment to Akabibamba Enterprises Masindi for construction of two stance pit latrine at BUudongo HC II for shs 10,428,220 on payment voucher number 43840420 dated 10th June, 2022 rehabilitation of OPD block at Kikingura HC II for shs 44,957,724 on payment voucher number 42759389 dated 20th April, 2022.

DHO signed on 20/05/2022, LG Engineer on 20/05/2022, CDO on 05/05/2022 and Environment Officer on 05/05/2022.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

From the DE and DHO, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineers estimates (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Prices are as listed with the corresponding **Variation percentages; $[(A - B)/A] * 100\%$** :

1. Construction of 2 Stance Latrine with bath-shelters at Budongo HC II, and Construction of 4 Stance lined latrine at Kimengo HC III - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00025. The Engineers Estimates (A) was UGX 31,000,000/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 30,986,547/=. **The Variation was at 0.04%**

2. Renovation of Kikingura HC II OPD and Installation of Water Tank - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00031. The Engineers Estimates (A) was UGX 50,000,000/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 49,954,424/=. **The Variation was at 0.09%**

3. Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & facelifting - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00138. The Engineers Estimates (A) was UGX 54,000,000/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 52,043,775/=. **The Variation was at 3.62%**

The variations, $[(A - B)/A] * 100\%$ were thus within +/-20% of the MoWT/LG Engineers estimates

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>No HC II to HC III upgrade for Masindi DLG</p> <p>Other infrastructures were implemented (like the Construction of 2 Stance Latrine with bath-shelters at Budongo HC II, Construction of 4 Stance lined latrine at Kimengo HC III, and Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & facelifting, all complete), but call to this indicator as per the LGMSD manual reviews call for Ref. HC II to HC III Upgrade</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>A review of the staffing structure for the Health Department showed approval of 1 HC IV (Bwijanga HC IV) with 37 staff out of a norm of 48; and 6 HC III (Ikoba with 17 staff, Kamengo with 15, Kyatiri with 17, Nyamutungu with 14, Pakanyi with 18, and Kyonjubwa with 14 out of a staffing norm of 19 each) The total staffing for HC III and HC IV comes to 162 with 132 filled indicating an 81.48% capacity.</p>	1
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>No HC II to HC III upgrade for Masindi DLG</p> <p>Other infrastructures were implemented, but call to this indicator as per the LGMSD manual reviews call for Ref. HC II to HC III Upgrade</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>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the staff list at the respective health facilities conformed to the staff list provided by the DHO's office. For example: Bwijanga has 36 staff positions filled out of 48, Kimengo HC III has 15 (hand written, not signed) on the facility notice board and Pakanyi HC III has a staff list of 18 both at the facility and DHO's office</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>Not applicable because there were no constructions of facilities in FY 2021/2022.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that the Health Facility annual budgets conformed to the prescribed formats in the planning guidelines, however, they were submitted late.</p> <p>1. Bwijanga HC IV. The annual work plan and budget prepared by the in charge and submitted to DHO's office on prepared by the in charge and submitted on 7/7/2022 by Dr Mbabazi (in charge and endorsed by the HUMC Chairperson Kasaija (late).</p> <p>2. Kimengo HC III.: Annual work plan prepared by in charge and submitted on 14/5/2022 (late)</p> <p>3. Pakanyi HC III was submitted on 1/7/2022 by in charge (late)</p>	2

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

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

• Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the health facility annual Budget performance reports for the FY 2021/2022 conformed to the budget and grants Guidelines and were submitted timely i.e

1. Bwijanga HC Iv: The annual budget performance was prepared by Dr Mbabazi Moses (Facility In charge), approved by the HUMC chairperson kasaija on 7/7/2022.

2. Kimengo HC III was prepared by Kumakech Charles in charge and endorsed by HUMC chairperson on 1/7/ 2022

3. Pakanyi HC III: The Annual budget performance report was prepared by kirungi John the HUMC chairperson.

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

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

- Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the sampled Health facilities improvement plans for the FY 2021/2022 incorporated performance issues identified in DHMT monitoring assessment reports.

The DHMT report on the verification and assessment exercise for RBF financing quarter one by FY2021/2022 was prepared by Mugisha Brian (Biostatistician) for the nine facilities on 9/5/2022 for quarter four and quarter 3 and was submitted on 9/5/2022. Evidence that these performance issues were incorporated into the Health Facility PIPs for.;

1. Bwijanga IV: The plan was prepared by Dr.Mbabazi the In-charge and endorsed by the HUMC chairperson on 9/7/2022. The activities included; Low ANC attendance ,poor documentation ,need to conduct Health education talks at the facility..

2. Kimengo HC III: The PIP was generated by Komaketch Charles (Facility in-charge) and was endorsed by HUMC chairperson and forwarded to the DHO on 17/6/2021.

3. Pakanyi HC III: The PIP was generated by Acio Leslie (in-charge) on 1/7/2022 and was endorsed by HUMC Chairperson on 1/7/2022 and was forward to DHO on the same date.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that all health facilities (100%) submitted up to date and timely of the monthly and quarterly reports for the FY 2021/2022. The assessment team reviewed the 3 sampled facilities and results are shown here below:

1. Bwijanga HC IV

During FY 2021/2022 (June 2021-July 2022,) the facility submitted HMIS reports by 7th of the following month of reporting i.e.100% timely.

2. Kimengo HC III

- During FY 2021-July 2022, the facility submitted HMIS reports by 7th for the following month of reporting i.e.100% timely.

• 3. Pakanyi HC III

During FY 2021/2022 (June 2021-July 2022), the facility submitted HMIS reports by 7th for the following month of reporting i.e.100% timely.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence of submission of RBF invoices by the respective facilities in the last quarter thus the indicator not applicable to the LG.Facilities received RBF funds for only two quarters in FY 2021/2022.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Quarter one :July -Sept 2021) invoices were submitted on 19/10/2021 -Timely

quarter 2 (Oct-Dec) invoices were submitted on 3/2/2022-Timely

Quarter 3 (Jan- March 2022) invoices were submitted on 9/5/2022 -late

Quarter 4 (April-June 2022) invoices were submitted on 29/7/2022- late .The LG therefore submitted their invoices late .

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0

The DLG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY 2021/2022 as follows:

1st Quarter on 17/11/2021;

2nd Quarter on 26/01/2022;

3rd Quarter on 29/04/2022;

4th Quarter on 17/08/2022.

Compilation of the quarterly reports was done through joint meetings of all heads of department including the health department at the district headquarters.

Submission of quarterly reports was done outside the set timelines.

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department developed and approved Performance improvement plan for the lowest performing health facilities. The plan was developed for Pakanyi HC III dated 1/7/2022 prepared by Acio leslie (In charge .key areas identified were: low deliveries at the facility, mothers still delivering at TBAs,late reporting of mothers for ANC 1 ,understaffing, absenteeism, inadequate water supply, incomplete delivery kits, poor lighting system, inadequate transport (page 2,3,4 of the PIP).</p>	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department developed and implemented Performance improvement plan for the lowest performing health facilities. The plan was developed for Pakanyi HC III dated 1/7/2022 prepared by AcioLeslie (In- charge .key areas identified were: low deliveries at the facility, mothers still delivering at Traditional Birth Attendants ,late reporting of mothers for ANC 1 ,understaffing,absentiism,inadequate water supply, incomplete delivery kits,poor lighting system, inadequate transport (page 2,3,4 of the PIP)..As observed during the field visit,a bore hole was drilled at the facility to provide water and some equipments were procured using RBF Funds .</p>	1

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</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>According to the LG approved staffing structure availed by the DHO's office, the total number of health workers is supposed to be 543. However, the staff list shows that only 495 staff (91.2%) are deployed. According the Approved budget for FY 2022/2023, the DLG budgeted UGX 6,762.044,000 towards the health workers' wage for the cadres in post.</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 (at least 75% of the staff required).</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>There was evidence the health department deployed health workers as per guidelines/staffing levels and norms in the FY 2022/2023.HFs are at deployment.</p> <p>Bwijanga HC IV :staff list shows 36 staff out of 48 required which 75%</p> <p>Kimengo HC III: staff list both at the district and Health Center notice board has 15 out 19 per staffing norms (78.95%)</p> <p>Pakanyi 18 out of 19 thus 94.7% Overall staffing for sampled facilities is at $(69/86)*100=80.23\%$</p>	2

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0

There was evidence that the health staff in sampled health facilities are working where they were deployed.

The assessment team reviewed staff list at all sampled health facilities shown below:

1. Nyangoma Catherine, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kigezi HC II was at her duty station at the assessment time.
2. Kyamanywa Brian, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kyamaiso HC II was at his duty station at the assessment time.
3. Wanyange Stephen, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Mihembero HC II was at his duty station at the assessment time.
4. Kasalima Nicholas, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Ntooma HC II was at his duty station at the assessment time.
5. Alioni Philiam, Clinical Officer posted as Facility In-Charge for Kijunjubwa HC III was at his duty station at the assessment time.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The assessment team was able to see all staff lists for the Health facilities listed below posted on the respective notice boards on 8th July 2022.

Aioni Philiam, Clinical Officer and staff names were found posted at Kijunjubwa HC III, Kirungi John, Senior Clinical Officer plus other staff names were found posted at Ikoba HC III .

Acidri Geoffrey, Assistant Nursing Officer names plus other staff were found posted at Nyantonzi HC III and Dr. Byamukama Solomon, a Medical Officer the name was found together with other staff posted at the facility of Bwijanga HC IV.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

A review of the personal files of the health facility in charges, Performance Plans, and Appraisal Reports showed that they had all been appraised by their immediate supervisor in the previous FY 2021/2022. Some files reviewed included:

1. Nyangoma Catherine, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kigezi HC II was appraised on 30/06/2022 by Canongom Frances, Senior Assistant Nursing Officer.
2. Kyamanywa Brian, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kyamaiso HC II was appraised on 24/06/2022 by Nyambubi Kevin, Nursing Officer.
3. Wanyange Stephen, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Mihembero HC II was appraised on 13/06/2022 by Ambayo Matthew, Assistant Nursing Officer.
4. Kasalima Nicholas, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Ntooma HC II was appraised on 15/07/2022 by

- Nyambubi Kevin, Nursing Officer.
5. Alioni Philiam, Clinical Officer posted as Facility In-Charge for Kijunjubwa HC III was appraised on 22/07/2022 by Dr. Twinomugisha Felix, Principal Medical Officer.
 6. Kirungi John, Senior Clinical Officer posted as Facility In-Charge for Ikoba HC III was appraised on 01/07/2022 by Kyamiza Musa, Senior Assistant Secretary.
 7. Acidri Geoffrey, Assistant Nursing Officer posted as Facility In-Charge for Nyantonzi HC III was appraised on 30/06/2022 by Nyambubi Kevin, Nursing Officer.
 8. Dr. Byamukama Solomon, Medical Officer posted as Facility In-Charge for Bwijanga HC IV was appraised on 28/06/2022 by Dr. Mbabazi Moses, Senior Medical Officer.
 9. Kabatooro Sandra, Enrolled Midwife posted as Facility In-Charge for Alimugonza HC II was appraised on 30/07/2022 by Vumuria William, Enrolled Nurse.
 10. Biira Geoffrey, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kasenene HC II was appraised on 29/06/2022 by Kahuma Geoffrey, Clinical Officer.
 11. Aheebwa Angella, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kasongoire HC II was appraised on 04/07/2022 by Kugonza Sunny, Nursing Officer.
 12. Adiru Gloria, Enrolled Midwife posted as Facility In-Charge for Nyabyeya HC II was appraised on 28/06/2022 by Nyambubi Kevin, Nursing Officer.
 13. Talemwa Jovia, Enrolled Midwife posted as Facility In-Charge for Kikingura HC II was appraised on 20/06/2022 by Baleke Lawrence, Clinical

- Officer.
14. Kiiza Ronnet, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kilanyi HC II was appraised on 22/06/2022 by Canongom Frances, Senior Assistant Nursing Officer.
 15. Afema Innocent, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kijenga HC II was appraised on 06/07/2022 by Acidri Geoffrey, Assistant Nursing Officer.
 16. Baleeke Lawrence, Clinical Officer posted as Facility In-Charge for Kyatiri HC III was appraised on 30/06/2022 by Dr. Mbabazi Moses, Senior Medical Officer.
 17. Kumakech Charles, Senior Clinical Officer posted as Facility In-Charge for Kimengo HC III was appraised on 07/07/2022 by Kitembo Patrick, Senior Assistant Secretary.
 18. Leslie Norgivt, Clinical Officer posted as Facility In-Charge for Pakanyi HC III was appraised on 30/06/2022 by Dr. Kayemba Denis, Medical Officer.
 19. Kabahanguzi Juliet, Enrolled Nurse posted as Facility In-Charge for Kichandi HC II was appraised on 30/06/2022 by Ambayo Matthew, Assistant Nursing Officer.

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

A review of personal files for a random sample of 10 health workers showed that they were appraised by their health facility in-charges during the previous FY. The sampled files include:

1. Basasibwaki Teopista Nursing officer Masindi General Hospital was appraised by Sr.Canningom Frances on 12th July 2022
2. Nyandera Flossy Enrolled

1

- Midwife Masindi General Hospital was appraised by Sr. Canningom Frances on 12th July 2022
3. Musinguzi Rogers Medical Officer Masindi General Hospital was appraised by Dr. Twinomugisha Felix on 29th June 2022
 4. Pande Joseph Laboratory Technician Pakanyi Health Centre was appraised by Kirungi John on 1st July 2022
 5. Kabasindi Robinah Enrolled Nurse Kijunjubwa Health Centre III was appraised by Byaruhanga Medina on 8th June 2022
 6. Semwanje Molbert Dental Assistant Masindi General Hospital was appraised by Dr. Bruhan Byenkya on 12th July 2022
 7. Kasuma Peggy Nursing officer Masindi General Hospital was appraised by Kugonza Sunny on 6th July 2022
 8. Manyireki Hellen Enrolled Nurse Bwijanga Health Centre IV was appraised by Acidiri Geoffrey on 3rd July 2022
 9. Kahuma Geoffrey Clinical Officer Nyantonzi Health Centre III was appraised by Dr. Mbabazi Moses on 01st July 2022
 10. Ayebare Florence Laboratory Assistant Masindi General Hospital was appraised by Aluko Daniel on 23rd June 2022
 11. Alija Jordan Laboratory Assistant Masindi General Hospital was appraised by Aluko Daniel on 23rd June 2022

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence adduced to show that the DHO took any corrective action following the appraisal process.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	An up-to-date training database was reviewed by the assessment team. the database captures parameters such as Name, designation, course to be undertaken, mode of training, duration, sponsor, date of commencement, end date, award, and employment status To the above, on file was a request for study leave by Baitwabusa Rolita for a four year study in Pharmacy which was approved by CAO.	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	An up-to-date training database was reviewed by the assessment team. The database captures sections such as Name, designation, course to be undertaken, mode of training, duration, sponsor, date of commencement, end date, award, and employment status for example training of DHT members on disease surveillance conducted on 14th July 2022 was documented in the database, sexual and reproductive health for adolescents training conducted on 20th -22nd April 2022.	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			

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>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>A copy of the letter dated 7/10/2021 Ref: HEA 3521 was reviewed by the assessment team outlining health Facilities to receive PHC grant as well as cost centres for each facility. Some of the facilities targeted were; Kijunjubwa HC III, Ikoba HC III, Nyantonzi HC III and Bwijanga HC IV.</p>	2	
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A total of UGX 717,718,000 was appropriated as PHC-NWR out of which UGX 283,836,000 was for lower local health facilities.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>UGX 376,709,000 was for the General Hospital. UGX57,173,000 was for DHO's office.</p>	<p>The amount allocated for Health Services Monitoring and Inspection was UGX 10,000,000 as per page 37 of the Budget Estimates reflecting 3.5% of the funds allocated to lower local health facilities which was within a maximum of 15% as required by the Health Guidelines page 6 for FY 2020/2021.</p>	<p>Since the LG allocated only 3.5%, then it was non compliant.</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.

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

In quarter one, cash limits were received by the DLG on 9th July, 2021 from PS/ST under reference BPD 86/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 13th July, 2021. Warranting was done on 14th July, 2021, approved on 16th July, 2021 and transfers effected accordingly as per CAO's instructions. Cash limits were loaded on 14th July, 2021

In quarter two, cash limits were received by the DLG on 30th September, 2021 from PS/ST under reference MET 50/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 4th October, 2021. Warranting was done on 6th October, 2021 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions. Approval of warrant was done on 8th October, 2021. In quarter two, cash limit was loaded on 6th October, 2021.

In quarter three, cash limits were received by the DLG on 22nd December, 2021 from PS/ST under reference MET.50/268/01, communication to LLGs was done on 27th December, 2021. Warranting was done on 3rd January, 2022 and transfers effected as per CAO's instructions on 27th January, 2020. In quarter three, cash limit was loaded on 3rd January, 2022. This was after the recommended 5 days.

There were delays of more than five days from the time of receipt of expenditure limits from MOFPED to warranting and release of funds to LLGs in respect of PHC - NWR grant releases to Masindi District Local Government.

<p>9</p> <p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>0</p> <p>There was evidence that the LG invoiced and communicated/publicized quarterly releases to all health facilities within five working days from the date of receipt of expenditure limits from MOFPED as detailed below:</p> <p>For quarter one, Invoicing was done on 19th July, 2021</p> <p>For quarter two, invoicing was done on 12th October, 2021</p> <p>For quarter three, invoicing was done on 6th January, 2022</p> <p>NWR grants were publicized on various notice boards in all health facilities as required for instance CAO's circular letter dated 18th August, 2021, circular dated 2nd November, 2021 and circular dated 15th January, 2022. The five working days timelines were not adhered to.</p>
---	--	---

<p>9</p> <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>1</p> <p>The DLG publicized on the notes board, the quarterly financial releases to health facilities as per the following evidences seen;</p> <p>(1). A circular from the CFO dated May 27, 2022, to health center in charges 2022 titled "Funds to be transferred to your entity", with an attachment , Masindi general hospital and lower health facilities fourth quarter FY 2021/2022 Expenditure limits.</p> <p>(2). A circular from the CFO dated January 13, 2022, to health center in charges 2022 titled "\"Funds to be transferred to your entity\"", with an attachment , Masindi general hospital and lower health facilities third quarter FY 2021/2022 Expenditure limits.</p>
---	---	--

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0

The assessment team was able to access minutes for the quarterly review meetings which were on file for example DHMT minutes dated 3/10/2021 was generated by Michael Muddu ADHO Environment with a total attendance of 09 (Nine members). The meeting noted that planning process was to commence, Secretary health to attend meeting as an Ex official, Health facilities land to be demarcated and clear specifications for DHT to be issued. According the performance review meeting minutes of on 9th Dec. 2021, all the previous recommendations were implemented.

In the DHMT performance review meetings dated 10th October 2021, it was noted that there was inappropriate use of RBF funds by some health facilities as they were not following their work plans and procurement guidelines. The performance review recommended to lobby for training for facilities in charges for financial training. This training was held between 12th and 13 July 2022 at Kolping Hotel by the Ministry of Health RBF staff..

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence showing that the DHT implemented quarterly performance review meetings involving Implementing partners.

Quarter two meetings dated 03/10/2021 with 9 Participants, Minute 5/10/21. Involved IPs such as Baylor Uganda, Health Facility in - charges, DHMT, CAO.

Quarter three Meeting held on 10/01/2022. It involved 4 facility in charges, DHMT, WASH, Community Development, Education department, and Baylor Uganda.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

If not applicable, provide the score

The LG has one Hospital and 2 (Two) HSD. There was evidence of quarterly support supervision by the DHT, HSD respectively in all the four quarters. First Quarter (July-September) 14 facilities were supervised and a report was written by Issa Tibaingana and reviewed by Dr. Byamukama Solomon, the acting DHO.

Third quarter 15 facilities were supervised a report was written by Issa Tibaingana and reviewed by Dr. byamukama Solomon, the acting DHO.

Fourth Quarter (April-June) 15 facilities were supervised a report was e written by Issa Tibaingana and reviewed by Dr. Byamukama Solomon, the acting DHO, minutes written by Issa Tibaingana and reviewed by Dr. Byamukama Solomon, the acting DHO.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

• If not applicable, provide the score

There was evidence that the HSD carried out support supervision to lower level health facilities within the FY 2021/2022 as represented here below:

Q1: July-sept 2021 .report generated by Tibaingana Issa covering 14 (fourteen Facilities) ,minutes reviewed by Dr.Byamukama Solomon.

Q3:Jan-Mar 2022-15 facilities supervised,,report generated by Tibaingana Issa for the HSD.

Q4.April-june 2022 –generated by tibaingana Issa and reviewed by Dr.Byamukama Solomon (currently been transferred to Masindi Hospital)

There was evidence that a total of 17 Support supervisions by the District and IPs were carried out.for example quarter one July-sep. was carried but not signed and advised all supervisors to sign, Quarter 2 was generated by ADHO –Muddu Michael, on 5/10/2021,Quarter 3 while on 19/8/2022 while quarter 4 report was generated by Drabo kayi Martin.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

Evidence from the health Department provided recommendations from support supervision visits during FY 2021/2022 for which implementation was followed up as follows:

Bwijanga HC IV: A review of staff minutes dated 6/10/21: minute 4 was to review performance and address low ANC & PNC attendance, improve on documentation, conduct Health Education talks and harmonize PNC register Another follow up was on the expired HUMC for which a letter was written by the in charge dated 21/6/2022 informing the CAO about the expired HUMC and need for a new one.

Kimengo HC III: follow up on 1/6/2022 by HUMC on need for sign post, HB machine, need to fence the waste pit, need to procure screens and drip stand. This was approved by HUMC and screen, drip stand, drug shelf in store were procured using RBF funds.

Pakanyi HC III: The assessment team reviewed joint HUMC & staff minutes of 28/7/22 minute: 5/4/2022 on matters arising and way forward where they sighted late coming and Health facility not opening over the weekend.

A register book is being tracked and some staff were cautioned by the HUMC. The Facility in charge reported change in staff and compliance ever since even witnessed by attendance in the register.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that LG health department provided support supervision to health facilities to support in the management of medicines and health supplies during the previous financial year.</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the district allocated at least 30% of the LG health office budget to health promotion and prevention activities during FY 2021/2022</p>	0

11	1	<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 evidence the DHT implemented health promotion ,disease prevention and social mobilization in the FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>Quater 1:Radio talk shows were conducted and facilitated by Mr. Muddu Micheal -ADHO Environment on Kings Radio station on 10/7/2021, Radio Kitara on 8/10/2021, Kings radio on 17/8/2021, Radio Kitara on 2/9/2021 respectively.</p> <p>there was also distribution of 7,121,246 community masks and IECs at sub county level.</p> <p>Quarter 2 progressive report October- December 2021, 2 radio talk shows were conducted at Kitara Radio on Malaria Outbreak on 9/10/2021 & 10/8 /2021 respectively.</p> <p>The Department also trained 730 VHTs on Covid 19, DHT members were trained on Disease surveillance while 248 VHTs were trained on Notification of Covid funded by BRAC.</p>
11	1	<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 was specifically one project namely construction of Nyantonzi HC III OPD budgeted at shs 240,000,000 as per district approved budget, AWP page 18 and DDP III. The field appraisal report was compiled, in place and dated 4th April, 2022</p>

Investment Management

12	0	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The assessment was verbally informed that the LG Health sector had an up to date assets register in an electronic form but the assessment team was unable to look at it in the two days of assessment.</p>
12	1	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was only one project in the health department namely construction of Nyantonzi HC III OPD budgeted at shs 240,000,000 as per page 45 of the annual approved budget. The project was captured on page 87 of the DDP III and AWP page 18. Desk appraisal was conducted per report dated 29th March, 2022.</p>

12	1	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>here was essentially one project namely Construction of of Nyantonzi HC III OPD at a cost of shs 240,000,000 as page 34 of the Annual Approved Budget. The project was captured in the district DDP page 67 and AWP page 18.</p> <p>The Field Appraisal Report was in place dated 4th April, 2022. The appraisal report was conducted on 20th March to 3rd April, 2022 at Nyantonzi.</p>
12	1	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist</p> <p>Screening for the construction of OPD at Nyantonzi health center III dated 16th/June/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO was carried out. Mitigation measures like planting of grasss to replace the destrted plant cover was proposed and costed in the ESMP developed on 21st June, 2022 at Ugx1,800,000.</p>
13	0	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>No evidence of letters and/or memos to the PDU by the LG Health department to ascertain submission. However, the Infrastructure Procurement requests for the current FY were incorporated in the AWP and Consolidated Procurement Plan of Masindi DLG; The following Projects were visible;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPD Block construction at Nyantonzi HC III • Construction of Placenta pit at Kilanyi HC II

13	1	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The LG Health department submitted Procurement Requisition Forms – LG PP Forms to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY</p> <p>LG PP form 1 for the following project was submitted, forwarded (Confirmation of Need) by the DHO and confirmation of funding by CAO on 12th July, 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG PP form 1 for the Construction of OPD Block at Nyantonzi HCIII– Estimated at UGX 240,00,000/=
13	1	<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>Health infrastructure Projects for the previous FY (2021/2022) were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of Works. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Min55/DCC/2021-22, the Construction of 2 Stance Latrine with bath-shelters at Budongo HC II, and Construction of 4 Stance lined latrine at Kimengo HC III - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00025; approved by the Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 15/9/2021 • Under Min59/DCC/2021-22, the Renovation of Kikingura HC II OPD and Installation of Water Tank- MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00031; approved by the Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 15/9/2021 • Under Min125/DCC/2021-22, the Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & facelifting- MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00138; approved by the Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 7/3/2022

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the PITS for the Health construction projects within the last FY as per guidelines.

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Masindi DLG didn't not have HC II upgardes, however;</p> <p>The sampled projects included the following, and were Compliant as per approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs</p>
<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>1) The Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & facelifting– with Ceiling works repairs, Splash Apron works and general facelifting especially with Painting works. All Works were satisfactory, and Structure was intact at the time of Assessment</p> <p>2) Renovation of Kikingura HC II OPD and Installation of Water Tank was also Implemented accordingly as per set out LG Engineers instructions</p> <p>3) Construction of a 2 Stance Latrine with bath-shelters at Budongo HC II was also up to standard as technically guided by the Drawing and BoQs. According to the technical specifications of the drainable latrine, the block was to have 2 stances for toilets and one stance as a bathroom (shelter) – each stance being 900x1500mm on the interior, and 1300x1500mm for the bath-shelter. The accesses to the stances was ramped. The inspection cover was provided (to allow for emptying</p>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO HC Upgrades, thus No daily/weekly records maintained by the Clerk of Works</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO Monthly site meetings to hold for the health infrastructure projects implemented in the last FY w.r.t upgrade of HCIIIs to HCIIIIs since Masindi DLG did not benefit in that respect</p>	1

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

Joint Technical supervisions of the construction of health infrastructure projects (by the Engineers team - including the Environment Officer and DCDO among other officers) were regularly carried out (w.r.t Critical stages).

The reports seen by the Assessor included 10/6/2022, 14/6/2022, 17/5/2022, 18/4/2022, 2/3/2022, 15/2/2022 among other dates,

The DE. and works team also provided supervision of works as per Inspection and Supervision/Monitoring reports dated 20/5/2022, 10/6/2022, among others

The following projects were reported about;

a) Construction of 2 Stance Latrine with bath-shelters at Budongo HC II, and Construction of 4 Stance lined latrine at Kimengo HC III

b) Renovation of Kikingura HC II OPD and Installation of Water Tank

c) Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & facelifting

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The CFO availed the following;

(1) a request for payment for construction of a two stance pit latrine with a bath shelter at Budongo HC II, by Akabibamba Enterprises Ltd, dated 25/4/2022 accompanied with a payment Voucher, No. 43840420 dated 1/july/2022.

(2). Claim for rehabilitation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD by Kona company Ltd, dated 31/05/2022 accompanied with a payment Voucher, No. 43840421 dated 30/June/2022.

(3). Request for payment by Monaco contractors Ltd, dated 27/May/2022 accompanied with a payment voucher no 43840417 dated 30-June-2022.

The verification/certification reports were attached to the availed payments vouchers.

<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>Complete Procurement files for the health infrastructure contracts with Evaluation Reports and Minutes of the Contract Committee, and the very contract documents were seen by the Assessor.</p> <p>Files for the following projects were sampled accordingly;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 2 Stance Latrine with bath-shelters at Budongo HC II, and Construction of 4 Stance lined latrine at Kimengo HC III - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00025; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min55/DCC/2021-22 on 15/9/2021 after evaluation. The contract document was signed on 10/12/2021 • Renovation of Kikingura HC II OPD and Installation of Water Tank - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00031; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min59/DCC/2021-22 on 15/9/2021 after evaluation. The contract document was signed on 10/12/2021 • Renovation of Bwijanga HC IV OPD Ceiling & facelifting - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00138; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min125/DCC/2021-22 in a meeting held 7/3/2022 after evaluation. The contract document was signed on 11/4/2022 <p>The above projects are on the Contract Register for the FY 21/22, had all evaluation reports on file; and were approved by the Contracts Committee as above</p>
--	---	--

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	0	<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>There was no evidence that grievances were recorded, investigated, responded or reported, since the guidelines of ministry of gender were not followed of having committees from project site to the district, but instead the LG aligned all the grievances to the district committee</p>
<p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>				
15	0	<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 is on evidence that the LG followed up on the implementation of the health care waste management guidelines by HCs, however medical waste facilities have been constructed at the two health centers of Ikoba health centre III, Bwijanga HC IV. however at Kisalizi HC II, the old toilet is used as a placenta pit and no inclinor in place, at all the three medical facilities, there was evidence of open burning of medical wastes.</p>
<p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>				
15	2	<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 put in place a functional system for Medical waste management and central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider)</p> <p>There was a registered waste handler at Bwijanga HC IV called Green Label Services Ltd, an incinerator and placenta pit where waste is being managed for other health centers like Ikoba HC III and Kisalizi HC II, open burning, incinerator and placenta pit were being used to manage waste.</p>
<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 was no evidence that the LG had conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management</p> <p>The in-charges for all Health centers (Bwijanga HC IV, Ikoba HC III Kisalizi HC II) were not aware of any training in waste management and there were no minutes or reports for review to this effect.</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 was evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure, incorporating Environment, Social, Health and Safety Safeguards. for example during Renovation of OPD Bwijanga health center IV, ESMP was costed and incorporated in the BoQs as reviewed from the BoQ document and cost of the ESMP was Ugx762,500, page 6 of BoQ</p>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0

There was evidence for land proof ownership at the HCs where the health sector projects are being implemented

1. There was voluntary land contribution consent for Bwijanga HCs IV, dated 21/4/2022 signed by LC III (Mr Mudede James) certifying that the land where the renovation of the OPD belonged to the HC, the land tenure is customary with land holding size of 30m x 40m.

2. There was voluntary land contribution consent for Bwijanga HCs IV, dated 21/4/2022 signed by LC III (Mr Mudede James) certifying that the land where the construction of 2-satnce VIP latrine belonged to the HC, the land tenure is customary with land holding size of 20m x 20m.

3. There was voluntary land contribution consent for Kikingura HCs IV, dated 21/4/2022 signed by LC III (Mr Mudede James) certifying that the land where the renovation of the OPD belonged to the HC, the land tenure is customary with land holding size of 30m x 40m.

16	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>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 LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs</p> <p>The 3 HCs sites visited were, Bwijanga HCs IV, Ikoba HC III, and Kisalizi HC II, at all the sites medical waste was poorly managed and open burning of waste was evident</p> <p>Greening of the sites was not evident instead the Paspalum that was planted by the contractor was cut to give way for planting maize close to 2-stance VIP latrine project</p> <p>Landscaping was done and site signage was seen at the implemented projects, no minutes or report was available about workers on labor influx related social issues such as HIV/AIDS, Gender Based Violence (GBV), and Violence Against Children (VAC), Child Labor guidance at the time of this assessment</p>
16	2	<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 is evidence that the 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, for example during the construction of 4-stance pit latrine with a urinal at Kimengo health center III project contracted to Akabibamaba enterprise LMT, both the Environment Officer and CDO signed on substantial completion certificate dated 5/May/2022, stamped DCDO</p>

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & 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>	<p>As per the MWE-MIS for the current FY (2021/22), the rural water functionality for Masindi DLG was 87% which falls between 80% and 89% thereby justifying a score one (1)</p>	1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 		
1	<p>Water & 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 & 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>	<p>From the MWE -MIS for the current FY (2021/22), the % of WSS facilities with functional WSCs in Masindi DLG, as seen under the Management Column was 87% that falls between 80% to 89%, thereby justifying a score one (1).</p>	1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 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> <p>a. Above 80% score 2</p> <p>b. 60 -80%: 1</p> <p>c. Below 60: 0</p> <p>(Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)</p>	<p>Pending -awaits performance of LLGs IVA</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>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <p>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99%: Score 1</p> <p>o If below 80 %: Score 0</p>	<p>• According to the Masindi DLG 4th Quarter report for FY 2021/22 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by CAO on 25th /08/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 30th /08/2022; the Safe Water Coverage (SWC) for Masindi DLG was 95%. The Sub-Counties (S/Cs) with SWC below the district average and were therefore to be targeted included: (i) Budongo S/C with SWC of 92%; and (ii) Kimengo S/C with SWC of 79%.</p> <p>• As per the document titled Annual work plan for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by CAO on 15th/07/2021 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 21st/07/2021 and in reference to my analysis of the annual progress reports for FY 2021/2022, Masindi district water department implemented the following budgeted water projects in the targeted sub counties.</p> <p>i. Project 1: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00117: Drilling of ten (10) Deep boreholes: Bikonzi, Miirya, Pakanyi</p>	0

and Budongo, Bwijanga and Kimengo S/Counties at a cost of UGX 198,000,600; this was a target of 2 out of 10, equivalent to 20%

ii. Project 2: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00524; Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00498; Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00014 : Rehabilitation of twenty-four (24) boreholes in Budongo, Bwijanga, Miirya, Kimengo and Pakanyi S/Counties at a cost of UGX 192,604,298; which is a target of 9 out of 24, equivalent to 37.5%

iii. Project 3: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00116: Drilling of one (1) production well in Bikonzi S/C :at a cost of UGX 37,960,600; this was a target of 0 out of 1, equivalent to 0%

iv. Project 4: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00016: Construction of six (06) protected springs in Bwijanga, Budongo and Pakanyi S/C ounties: at a cost of UGX 31,885,614; this was a target of 4 out of 6, equivalent to 66.7%

• Therefore, the number of projects implemented in target S/Cs is 15 out of 41 budgeted projects in the Previous FY 2021/2022, equivalent to 36.6%, which is far below 80%, thereby justifying a score of zero (0).

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

As per the document titled Annual work plan for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by CAO on 15th/07/2021 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 21st/07/2021 and basing on sample of six (6) WSS contracts (three (3) service providers were contracted for Borehole rehabilitation) that were implemented in Masindi DLG, the following percentage variation of the engineering estimates were revealed:

i. Project 1: Masi534/Wrks/2021-

2

2022/00117: Drilling of ten (10) Deep boreholes: Bikonzi, Miirya, Pakanyi and Budongo, Bwijanga and Kimengo S/Counties.

- Contractor: Icon Projects Ltd;
- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 233,677,550 (A);
- Contracted Sum of UGX 198,000,600 (B);

ii. Project 2: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00524; Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00498; Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00014 : Rehabilitation of twenty-four (24) boreholes in Budongo, Bwijanga, Miirya, Kimengo and Pakanyi S/Counties .

- Contractors: Masindi Hand Pump Mechanics Association, Brown General Enterprises Limited and Waterflow Civil and Technical Services Ltd.;
- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 219,730,752 (A);
- Contracted Sum of UGX 192,613,298 (B);

iii. Project 3: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00116: Drilling of one (1) production well in Bikonzi S/C.

- Contractor: Icon Projects Ltd;
- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 34,403,490 (A);
- Contracted Sum of UGX 37,960,600 (B);

iv. Project 4: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00016: Construction of six (06) protected springs in Bwijanga, Budongo and Pakanyi S/Counties:

- Contractor: Cane Investment Uganda Ltd.;
- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 34,542,099 (A);

• Contracted Sum of UGX
31,885,614 (B);

• Therefore percentage variations in the contract price compared to the Engineer's estimate is calculated using the formula $[(A-B)/A]*100$ equivalent to: Project 1 = 15.3%; Project 2 = 12.3%; Project 3 = - 10.3% and Project 4 = 7.7%;

• Hence the variations in the contract price and engineer's estimates of the six (6) sampled WSS infrastructure investment contracts for FY 2021/2022 are all within +/-20%, thereby justifying a score of two (2)

2

0

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

• As per the document titled Annual work plan for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by CAO on 15th /07/2021 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 21st/07/2021, and the document titled Annual Implementation report (4th Quarter for FY 2021/22) (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi District CAO on 25th /08/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 30th /08/2022; not all the planned projects were completed by the end of the FY 2021/22. The following were the planned WSS infrastructure projects and level of achievement by the end of the FY 2021/22:

• Project 1: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00117: Drilling of ten (10) Deep boreholes: Bikonzi, Miirya, Pakanyi and Budongo, Bwijanga and Kimengo S/Counties and Project 3: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00116: Drilling of one (1) production well in Bikonzi S/C: Achieved 90.9% (1 borehole was not completed due to hitting a dry well/ aquifer) at a cost of UGX 309,865,00;

• Project 2: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00524; Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00498; Masi534/Wrks/2021-

2022/00014 : Rehabilitation of twenty-four (24) boreholes in Budongo, Bwijanga, Miirya, Kimengo and Pakanyi S/Counties: Achieved (only 10 under DWSCG out 24) 41.7% at a cost of UGX 91,554,475;

- Project 4: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00016: Construction of six (06) protected springs in Bwijanga, Budongo and Pakanyi S/Counties: Achieved 100% at a cost of UGX 35,301,000.

- Completion of 14 projects under DDEG is not captured in the Annual Performance report.

- Combining production well and deep made it hard to establish the exact amount spent on both projects to 100% completion.

- Besides, one (1) deep borehole (Karangwe) in Kimengo was not completed due to dry well encountered.

- Therefore, 26 out of 41 water facilities were constructed and clearly reported in the annual budget performance report thus $(26/41)*100=63.4\%$ equivalent to 63% projects completed.

- This is below 80%, thereby justifying a score of zero (0).

New_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 Ministry of Water and Environment Management Information System (MWE-MIS) assessment report for the FY 2021/2022, Masindi DLG had 1054 functional and 162 non-functional rural water sources, that was equivalent to a functionality of $[1054/(1054+162)]*100 = 86.7%$ approximated to 87%.

- Also, from MWE-MIS assessment report for the FY 2020/2021, Masindi DLG had 1047 functional and 165 non-functional rural water sources, that was equivalent to a functionality of $[1047/(1047+165)]*100 = 86.4%$ approximated to 86%.

- The variation in Masindi DLG rural water functionality from 86.4% to 86.7% represents an increase of 0.3% in the water supply facilities that are functional.

- There is an increase and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).

New_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 1% score 2

o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1

o If there is no increase : score 0.

- From Ministry of Water and Environment Management Information System (MWE-MIS) District Software Report (rural water Management) for FY/2021/2022, Masindi DLG had 746 functional WSCs out of the 861 established WSCs equivalent to Management of $[746/861]*100 = 86.6\%$ approximated to 87%.

- Also, MWE-MIS District Software Report (rural water Management) for FY/2020/2021, Masindi DLG had 740 functional WSCs out of the 853 established WSCs equivalent to Management of $[740/853]*100 = 86.8\%$ approximated to 87%.

- The variation in Masindi DLG rural water functionality from 86.8% to 86.6% represents a decrease of 0.2% in the water supply facilities with functional water and sanitation committees.

- There is no increase, and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0).

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3

As per review of document titled Annual Implementation report (4th Quarter for FY 2021/22) (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi District CAO on 25th /08/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 30th /08/2022 and in reference to my analysis of the 4th Quarter DWO progress report (REF: WAT/213/6) for FY 2021/2022 written by DWO on 6th/07/2022, Masindi district water department implemented (constructed/ rehabilitated) 41 WSS facilities in FY 2021/22 under DWSCG funding, GOU and DDEG. I sampled and visited four (4) WSS facilities in three (3) S/Counties and I observed/noted the following:

i. Drilling a production well under UGIFT funding in Kikuube village, Bikonzi S/C completed on 23th/06/2022 2022 (no information about commissioning).

- I found the production well was functional (used as hand pump)
- The production well was well numbered (Source ID: DWD 87519) and (not plate) engraved.
- It was not fenced and there was no soak pit.
- There was pathway for easy access but no paspalum planted and the environment was dirty with a lot of sugarcane husks; there was no WSC established.
- Since the production well was still installed with a hand pump, I could not test for the minimum well yield of 10 m³/ hr as reported in the technical specifications in the design report. Overall, the production well was (manually) functioning as reported by DWO.

ii. Construction of a medium protected well under UGIFT funding in Kikaranga village, Bikonzi S/C completed on 14th/03/2022 (no information about commissioning).

- I found the medium protected spring with two spouts installed functioning well
- The protected spring was well numbered (Source ID: SP/WAT269BW019) and (not plate) engraved.
- The fencing was dismantled for firewood
- There was pathway for easy access but no paspalum planted and most planted trees had been removed and some dried (evidenced by holes);
- Retaining wall varied between 225-

250 mm and was constructed using stones/ boulders and was up to 3m (in length) from the spouts

- there was no WSC member found during the field visit. The Masindi DWO and CDO reported existence of a nearby borehole thus used as a preferably alternative water source.

- upon testing the minimum water yield on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in $(19.66+19.16)/2= 19.41$ seconds approximated to $(10/19.41) = 0.512$ litres per second less than 1.2 litres per second per spout reported in the design and thus low flow.

- Steps had a rise of 190mm and a tread of 320mm that was in the range of technical specifications (a rise of 200mm and a tread of 300mm)

- Height of delivery pipes (spouts) from the ground was 400mm less than 600mm indicated in the construction drawings

- There was no drainage channel constructed to divert storm water from flowing into or flooding over the spring and there was no paspalum planted and thus there was return flow towards the spring at the time of field visit.

- Overall, the medium protected spring (constructed with two spouts) was functioning well as reported by Masindi DWO.

iii. Drilling of Kyodandi deep borehole in Kyodandi village, Miirya S/C: completed on 23rd/04/2022

- I found the borehole functional

- I tested the minimum well yield, and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in $(93+82)/2=87.5$ seconds approximated to $[(20/87.5)*3600] = 822.9$ litres per hour greater than 500 litres per hour reported in the

design and thus good minimum water yield.

- The deep borehole was well numbered (Source ID: DWD 87510) and (not plate) engraved.
- The environment was clean with an existing indigenous tree providing shade. However, there was no paspalum planted around
- There was an existing soak pit dug but it had no stones and was not buried yet.
- There is active WSC but I found one (1) WSC- the caretaker at the time of field visit
- The caretaker confirmed that since April 2022, each of the approximately 20 households pays 1,000 UGX/ month as water user fees collection;
- Caretaker confirmed that they were trained on general cleanliness around the borehole, avoid over pumping and animal loitering , playing/gossiping. Overall, the deep borehole was functioning well as reported by Masindi DWO.

iv. Rehabilitation of Kimengo H/U deep borehole under DDEG funding in Kimengo HC III village, Kimengo S/C: completed in Jan 2022.

- I found the borehole functional (recent repair was on Wednesday 2nd/11/2022)
- I tested the minimum well yield, and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in 196 seconds approximated to $[(20/196)*3600] = 367.3$ liters per hour less than 500 liters per hour reported in the design and thus low yielding borehole with poor minimum water yield.
- This was confirmed during the field visit as WSC member pointed out 'low yielding' as the main challenge of the borehole: every after five (5)

jerrycans of consecutive pumping, members had to wait for over 20 minutes otherwise one would 'pump air'

- The DWO highlighted that there is a strategic plan by NWSC to intervene with piped later.
- The deep borehole was (not plate) engraved but not numbered.
- WSC was established in February 2022 with the water facility serving about 30 households
- There had been conflicts and misunderstandings/ later resolved.
- The environment was not clean with an existing without trees and paspalum planted around
- There was an existing soak pit that had just been dug and packed with stones on Wednesday 2nd/11/2022
- We found 6 WSC members who confirmed that payment of water user fees water user fees used to be UGX 200 per Jerrycan and recently the community resolved that each member should pay UGX 3,000 per month
- Members confirmed that they were trained on general cleanliness around the borehole, avoid over pumping and animal loitering , playing/ gossiping.
- Overall, the deep borehole was functioning well as reported by Masindi DWO.

Therefore, on average all the four (4) WSS facilities I visited/ observed that were constructed/ rehabilitated were generally functioning well, and the Masindi DWO fairly reported on them in the Annual Performance and Progress Reports of 4th Quarter in the FY 2021/2022 and therefore, justifying a score of three (3)

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

As per quarterly WSS reports, Masindi district 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

There was evidence that Masindi district LG Water Office collected and compiled information on sub-county water supply and sanitation as reported in the minutes of the coordination committee meetings held each quarter incorporated in the following Quarterly reports:

i. 1st Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on 4th/11/2021 to MWE Permanent Secretary (PS), received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 18th/11/2021

ii. 2nd Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on 4th/02/2022 to MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 7th/02/2022

iii. 3rd Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on 22th/04/2022 to MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 28th/04/2022

iv. 4th Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on 25th/08/2022 to the MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 30th/08/2022.

The other information details on functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water coverage, and community

involvement especially in management through WSCs are also reported in the summary list attached to especially the 4th and 3rd Quarter report and Form 1 for data collection for new point water sources/facilities.

Examples of information in 4th Quarter included establishment of four (4) newly constructed water points (Boreholes) in 2021 by NGO (Salvation Army) submitted in 3rd quarter FY 2021/2022 and (some) were updated in the 4th quarter FY 2021/2022 as presented in Water Source database update forms:

- i. SP/WAT268/PKa Gimui protected spring in Kimina Baghdad Village, Katugo Parish in Buruli S/C (not updated in 4th Quarter report);
- ii. DWD 87513 Kijogoro P/S borehole in Kijogoro T/C, Kigulya Parish in Miirya S/C
- iii. DWD 87509 Budongo SS Borehole in Nyantonzi village, Nyantonzi Parish in Budongo S/C
- iv. SP/WAT269/BJ019 Rwebikohi protected spring in Kikaranga village, Rukondwo Parish in Bikonzi S/C (not updated in 4th Quarter report)

and therefore, justifying a score of two (2)

5

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that Masindi DLG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) as evidenced in all the Quarterly Reports, the newly constructed facilities are reported and their details are filled in Form 1 as a data collection form for point water sources for new facilities, detailing location of the new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.. These are compiled

0

information for
planning purposes:
Score 3 or else 0

together sent to MWE for updating
and the DWO downloads this
information as Form 4 compilations
of the updated MWE database
forming the DWO MIS.

There were also the following data
update reports for District Water and
Sanitation Conditional Development
Grant (DWSCDG) for FY 2021/22,
submitted to MWE as listed below:

- Submission of the 1st Quarter data
update report for DWSCDG for FY
2021/22 by CAO on 4th/11/2021 to
MWE PS, received by MWE Central
Registry on 18th/11/2021;
- Submission of the 2nd Quarter
data update report for DWSCDG for
FY 2021/22 by CAO on 4th/02/2022
to MWE PS, received by MWE
Central Registry on 7th/03/2022;
- Submission of the 3rd Quarter data
update report for DWSCDG for FY
2021/22 by CAO on 22th/04/2022 to
MWE PS, received by MWE Central
Registry on 28th/04/2022;
- Submission of the 4th Quarter data
update report for DWSCDG for FY
2021/22 by CAO on 25th/08/2022 to
MWE PS, received by MWE Central
Registry on 30th/08/2022;
- The information collected in the
Form 1 include: the type of source;
water source location; general
information covering month/year of
construction, source name, source
number, source of funding, current
ownership, and estimated number of
users; operation and maintenance
covering type of management,
establishment of WSCs and their
training, WSCs collecting user fees,
WSCs undertaking regular or minor
repairs, WSCs holding regular
meetings, and
environment/sanitation around the
source; Operation status
(Functionality); Other information as
required by the DWO; contacts of
village guide respondent and Data

verification. There was a compilation for form 1s at Masindi LG Water Office .

- All the data collected on the protected springs was not presented under Table: Location of new /rehabilitated water sources in the 4th Quarter data update report for DWSCDG for FY 2021/2022 thus, it was not clear how the DWO used information from for planning purposes (plan for villages/ S/Counties based on their access/ functionality of water sources).

- Besides, for the ten (10) newly constructed boreholes, data was only collected on four (4) boreholes yet number of target users were missing on form 1s.

- and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0)

5

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

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.

Pending: awaits performance of LLGs IVA

0

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence adduced to show that the Water Officer budgeted for the critical staff in the District Water Office.</p>	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence adduced to show that the District Natural Resources Officer budgeted for critical staff in the Natural Resources Department.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence adduced to show that the District Water Officer appraised staff in the District Water Office.</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

- There was no Capacity needs assessment report provided by Masindi DWO and no Training plans and Training reports were availed. Therefore, the DWO never submitted staff capacity needs to the PHRO for consolidation into the District Training database and no staff was trained.

- and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0)

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

- Safe Water Coverage (SWC) for Masindi District for the previous FY (2021/2022), as obtained from the DWO, and in reference to my analysis of of Masindi DLG 4th Quarter report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by CAO on 25th/08/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry on 30th /08/2022 was 95%. The Sub-Counties (S/Cs) with SWC below the district average, that were not covered by NWSC, and were therefore to be targeted included: (i) Budongo S/C with SWC of 92%; and (ii) Kimengo S/C with SWC of 79%.

- These were to be the target S/Cs for budget allocations in the FY 2022/23.

- As per the document titled Annual work plan Masindi District Water Sector for FY 2022/2023 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by CAO on 25th /08/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 30th/08/2022, the following were the budget allocations under the District Rural Water Supply-Development Fund part of the DWSCG and UGIFT:

(i) Drilling five (5) Deep Borehole in

Pakanyi S/C and Kiruli S/C under DWSCG, at a cost of UGX 20,187,273 @ and thus a total of UGX 100,936,365 of which zero (0) projects are planned to be implemented in target S/Counties.

(ii) Rehabilitation of five (5) deep boreholes in Kijunjubwa S/C, Miirya S/C, Bwijanga S/C and Kimengo S/C under DWSCG at a total cost of UGX 44,456,632 of which two (2) projects are planned to be rehabilitated in target S/Counties.

(iii) Three Stance Lined Latrine in Pakanyi S/C and Nyantonzi S/C under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 17,982,500 @ and thus a total of UGX 35,965,000 of which zero (0) projects are planned to be implemented in target S/Counties.

(iv) Spring well construction in Budongo S/C under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 5,267,209 of which none is planned to be implemented in target S/Counties.

(v) Drilling one (1) Deep Borehole in Kijujumbwa S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 35,187,273 of which zero (0) project is planned to be implemented in target S/Counties.

(vi) Construction of one (1) Pipe Water Supply System in Bwijanga S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 105,306,700 of which zero (0) project is planned to be implemented in target S/Counties.

(vii) Design of Piped Water System (Borehole); Feasibility studies, detailed design and tender documentation in Bikonzi S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 24,793,054 of which zero (0) project is planned to be implemented in target S/Counties.

• The Budget for FY 2022/23, therefore reflects a total of UGX 351,912,233 (A) allocated to water sources developmental projects out

of which UGX 72,664,841 (B) is allocated to target S/Cs.

• Therefore % of the budget allocation for FY 2022/2023 that is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage is $(B/A)*100 = \text{UGX } 72,664,841 / \text{UGX } 351,912,233 * 100 = 20.6\%$ approximated to 21%.

• This is far below 60 % and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0)

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that Masindi DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the FY 2022/23 as seen from the following:

(i) Letters written on 25th/10/2022 by the District Water Officer (DWO) to the SubCounty Chief of Budongo S/C, Bwijanga S/C, Kijunjubwa S/C, Pakanyi S/C, Nyantonzi, S/C, Kiruli S/C and Kimengo S/C on the subject of “Water Projects Implementation for FY 2022/23”:

Copies of Water Projects Implementation for FY 2022/23 were given to CAO, Secretary for Works and Technical Services RDC, LCV and CAO Masindi DLG

(ii) The district quarterly Software reports within the Quarterly progress reports listed below:

i. 1st Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on 4th/11/2021 to MWE Permanent Secretary (PS), received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 18th/11/2021

ii. 2nd Quarter Report for FY

3

2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3)
submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on
4th/02/2022 to MWE PS, received by
the MWE Central Registry and MWE
RWSSD on 7th/02/2022

iii. 3rd Quarter Report for FY
2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3)
submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on
22th/04/2022 to MWE PS, received
by the MWE Central Registry and
MWE RWSSD on 28th/04/2022

iv. 4th Quarter Report for FY
2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3)
submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on
25th/08/2022 to the MWE PS,
received by the MWE Central
Registry and MWE RWSSD on
30th/08/2022.

Other reports:

Display on Notice board (pinned in
the afternoon of assessment day) by
the District Water Officer regarding
the subject of "Masindi DLG Water
Section Budget Allocation to Sub
counties":

(i) Design of Piped Water System
(Borehole); Feasibility studies,
detailed design and tender
documentation in Bikonzi S/C under
UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 24,793,054

(ii) Construction of one (1) Pipe
Water Supply System in Bwijanga
S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX
105,306,700

(iii) Drilling one (1) Deep Borehole in
Kijujumbwa S/C under UGIFT, at a
cost of UGX 35,187,273

(iv) Three Stance Lined Latrine in
Pakanyi S/C under DWSCG at a
cost of UGX 17,982,500

(i) Three Stance Lined Latrine in
Nyantonzi S/C under DWSCG at a
cost of UGX 17,982,500

(ii) Spring well construction in
Budongo S/C under DWSCG at a
cost of UGX 5,267,209

(iii) Drilling four (4) Deep Borehole in Pakanyi S/C under DWSCG, at a total cost of UGX 80,749,092

(iv) Drilling Deep Borehole in Kiruli S/C under DWSCG, at a cost of UGX 20,187,273

(v) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kijunjubwa S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,222,000.

(vi) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Miirya S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,222,000.

(vii) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Bwijanga S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 8,615,000

(viii) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kimengo S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,540,000.

(ix) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kimengo S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 7,857,542.

• and therefore, justifying a score of three (3)

9

0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities

• There was some evidence that Masindi District Water Office monitored each of the FY 2021/2022 WSS facilities at least quarterly and basing on my analysis of the DWO monitoring plans and reports for FY 2021/2022, monitoring of WSS projects was done in three (3) out of the four (4) quarters since activities on project sites for most Water development projects for FY 2021/2022 started in the 2nd Quarter.

• The List of sources for Rural Water Supply and sanitation facilities for Masindi district constructed in FY 2021/2022 included the following:

i. Project 1: Masi534/Wrks/2021-

monitored quarterly:
score 2

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

2022/00117: Drilling of ten (10) Deep boreholes: Bikonzi, Miirya, Pakanyi and Budongo, Bwijanga and Kimengo S/Counties at a cost of UGX 198,000,600; 10 out of 10 boreholes were sufficiently monitored/ supervised, 100%.

ii. Project 2: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00524; Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00498; Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00014 : Rehabilitation of twenty-four (24) boreholes in Budongo, Bwijanga, Miirya, Kimengo and Pakanyi S/Counties at a cost of UGX 192,604,298; 7 out of 24 boreholes were sufficiently monitored/ supervised, 29.2%.

iii. Project 3: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00116: Drilling of one (1) production well in Bikonzi S/C: at a cost of UGX 37,960,600; 0 out of 1 production well was sufficiently monitored/ supervised, 0%.

iv. Project 4: Masi534/Wrks/2021-2022/00016: Construction of six (06) protected springs in Bwijanga, Budongo and Pakanyi S/C ounties: at a cost of UGX 31,885,614; All protected springs were sufficiently monitored/ supervised, 100%.

- According to the Masindi district Water Department 4th Quarter Implementation progress monitoring report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: WAT/213/6) written by District Water Officer (DWO) to the CAO, dated 6th/07/2022, only 24 out of 40 WSS facilities implemented/ rehabilitated were monitored at least quarterly. Ten (10) deep well were drilled, installed and were all functional. One dry well/ aquifer was encountered at Karangwe

- According to 3rd Quarter (5th/04/2022), 2nd Quarter (11th/01/2022) and 1st Quarter (7th/10/2021) document titled "Report on Monitoring of water sources" (REF: WAT/210/8) by District Water Officer (DWO) to the

CAO, all the six (06) protected springs were monitored. Seven (7) drilled and seven (7) rehabilitated boreholes in FY 2020/2021 were also monitored.

- However, there were no monitoring plans for each of the newly constructed 17 water facilities in Masindi DLG for FY 2021/2022.

- Overall, from my analysis of all the project implementation monitoring reports for FY 2021/2022, I conclude that the estimated percentage of water facilities monitored at least quarterly was $(24/40) \times 100 = 60\%$ that is less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly, and thereby, justifying a score of justifying a score of zero (0).

9

2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2

There is evidence that Masindi DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed:

- Minutes of the 1st Quarter Masindi DLG District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 29th/09/2021 at D'venue hotel Ltd, attended by 17 participants: Especially under agenda item 6 and 7 -"Presentation from Development Partners/ NWSC".

- Minutes for the 2nd Quarter Masindi DLG District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 17th/11/2021 at D'venue hotel Ltd, Masindi attended by 16 participants: Especially under agenda item 5-"Presentation and discussion of progress reports by cluster heads".

- Minutes of the 3rd Quarter Masindi DLG District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 24th/02/2022 at Kolping Hotel Ltd, Masindi attended by 17

participants: Especially under agenda item 5 - "Presentation and discussion of progress reports by TWT, NWSC, Water Sector".

• Minutes of the 4th Quarter Masindi DLG District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 6th/07/2022 at Kolping Hotel Ltd, Masindi attended by 20 participants: Especially under agenda item 4, 5, 6 and 7 on "Presentations from the DWO and Development Partners/ NWSC

Key Issue identified and discussed (presented under "Action points") included but not limited to the following:

(i) TWT should fill the form 1 properly before sending them to water source and make sure that source number and coordinates of the source are included in the form

(ii) The DHI should liaise with hospital administration so that consent for connection of sanitation facilities by the Municipal health inspector

(iii) All Public places should be visited to ascertain the presence of sanitation facilities by the Municipal Health Inspector

(iv) Political leadership should be invited for the commissioning of facilities made by water trust in the district

(v) Extension staff meeting should be organized by the water sector starting next financial year

(vi) Water office should ensure water analysis results presented by contractors are genuine

(vii) SMS sent by NWSC informing customers of any impending water shortage should be timely

(viii) Water trust should be advised to be flexible with the methodology of

implementation of their program to suit conditions of the district as more sensitization about their approach are also increased to bring results

(ix) Commissioning of water and sanitation facilities are done by district C/person

(x) All presentations at the DWSCC meeting be accompanied by hand outs

(xi) Quarterly meetings and informal meetings be encouraged to help in information sharing

(xii) Organizations involved in putting in place new water sources in the district should fill and return form 1 to water office

(xiii) Quarterly meetings to be held between NWSC and Masindi MC and schedule of activities agreed upon

• and therefore, justifying a score of two (2)

9

0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2

There was no evidence that Masindi district water office publicizes budget allocations for the current FY 2022/23.

A document titled “Masindi DLG Water Section Budget Allocation to Sub counties” was only missing on Masindi DLG Notice board but was later pinned in the afternoon of assessment day by the District Water Office. The following were the listed projects.

(i) Design of Piped Water System (Borehole); Feasibility studies, detailed design and tender documentation in Bikonzi S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 24,793,054

(ii) Construction of one (1) Pipe Water Supply System in Bwijanga S/C

under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 105,306,700

(iii)Drilling one (1) Deep Borehole in Kijujumbwa S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 35,187,273

(iv)Three Stance Lined Latrine in Pakanyi S/C under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 17,982,500

(i)Three Stance Lined Latrine in Nyantonzi S/C under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 17,982,500

(ii)Spring well construction in Budongo S/C under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 5,267,209

(iii)Drilling four (4) Deep Borehole in Pakanyi S/C under DWSCG, at a total cost of UGX 80,749,092

(iv)Drilling Deep Borehole in Kiruli S/C under DWSCG, at a cost of UGX 20,187,273

(v)Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kijunjubwa S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,222,000.

(vi)Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Miirya S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,222,000.

(vii)Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Bwijanga S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 8,615,000

(viii)Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kimengo S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,540,000.

(ix)Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kimengo S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 7,857,542.

• The projects were listed in a displayed Table with column entries of Project/ Activity Description, S/C, Parish Village, Approved Budget, and Funding/ Allocated Percentage/Status. Project allocation per S/C for FY 2022/2023 was as follows

- i. Bikonzi S/C: one (1) design of piped water system
- ii. Bwijanga S/C: one (1) construction of Pipe Water Supply System; one (1) Borehole rehabilitation
- iii. Kijunjubwa S/C: one (1) Deep borehole drilling; one (1) borehole rehabilitation
- iv. Pakanyi S/C: one (1) Three Stance Lined Latrine; four (4) Deep Borehole drilling
- v. Nyantonzi S/C: one (1) Three Stance Lined Latrine
- vi. Budongo S/C: One (1) Spring well construction
- vii. Kiruli S/C: One (1) Deep borehole drilling
- viii. Miirya S/C: One (1) Rehabilitation of Borehole
- ix. Kimengo S/C: Two (2) Rehabilitation of Borehole

However, list of WSS projects was not displayed on any of the LLG (S/Counties) sampled for field visits and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0)

10	3	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The Total Non-Wage Recurrent budget for the previous FY 2021/2022 was UGX 83,589,698 (A) while the amount spend on Mobilization was UGX 55,471,600 (8,916,000 +46,555,600) (B).</p> <p>Percentage of NWR rural water and sanitation budget allocated mobilization = $(B/A)*100 = (55,471,600 /83,589,698)*100= 66.4\%$</p> <p>This percentage is greater than the minimum of 40% as per sector guidelines and therefore, justifying a score of three (3).</p>
10	0	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>From the District software report, the DWO in liaison with the CDO established and trained just a few WSCs for the new facilities constructed in FY 2021/2022 on their roles and responsibilities on O&M for the facilities, and on hygiene as indicated in the Quarterly Software Reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basing on my analysis of the Masindi Water and Sanitation projects Monitoring Plan for FY 2021/2022 (CR/WAT/112/1) dated 20th/07/2021, eleven (11) deep boreholes drilled, seven (7) deep boreholes rehabilitated and six (6) springs protected during FY 2021/2022 were to be monitored during FY 2021/2022. • According to the Masindi district Water Department 4th Quarter Implementation progress monitoring report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: WAT/213/6) written by District Water Officer (DWO) to the CAO, dated 6th/07/2022, 3rd Quarter (5th/04/2022), 2nd Quarter (11th/01/2022) and 1st Quarter (7th/10/2021) document titled "Report on Monitoring of water

sources” (REF: WAT/210/8) by District Water Officer (DWO) to the CAO, all the six (06) protected springs were monitored and were found to have no existing water user committees and needed to be formed and trained. Out of the ten (10) drilled deep boreholes, Seven (7) were monitored and none had an existing water user committee. All the seven (7) rehabilitated boreholes in FY 2021/2022 were also monitored. Four (4) out of the seven (7) rehabilitated boreholes had no existing water user committees and needed to be formed and trained. The other three (3) rehabilitated deep boreholes had water user committees with missing members and thus needed to be revitalized and trained.

- There was a document titled “Report on Training of Water Source Committees” (REF: WAT/213/5), dated 31st /01/2022, 41 point water sources were implemented/ rehabilitated in FY 2021/2022. However, Masindi District Water Department availed only one (1) WSC training report CDO Miirya S/C to Masindi DWO on 12th/01/2022: trained WSCs for seven (7) water sources (Pakanyi Primary School, Kitwetwe village, Bisenyi village, Kahaara village, Kyondandi village, Kyabaswa village and Kyabaswa Primary school)

- For the four (5) Water facilities sampled in three (3) S/Counties namely:

- Drilling a production well under UGIFT funding in Kikuube village, Bikonzi S/C: There was no existing water user committee and thus there was no WSC member found during the field visit.

- i. Construction of a medium protected well under UGIFT funding in Kikaranga village, Bikonzi S/C : There was no existing water user committee and thus there was no

WSC member found during the field visit.

ii. Drilling of Kyodandi deep borehole in Kyodandi village, Miirya S/C: There is active WSC but I found one (1) Water User Committee member- the caretaker at the time of field visit. Caretaker confirmed that they were trained on general cleanliness around the borehole, avoid over pumping and animal loitering , playing/gossiping.

iii. Rehabilitation of Kimengo H/U deep borehole under DDEG funding in Kimengo HC III village, Kimengo S/C: WSC was established in February 2022 and I found 6 WSC members present and confirmed that they were trained on general cleanliness around the borehole, avoid over pumping and animal loitering , playing/ gossiping.

- It can therefore be concluded that Masindi District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer established (4 out of 41) and trained (7 out of 41) WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities, constructed in FY 2021/2022, and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0).

Investment Management

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:

Score 4 or else 0

Upon reviewing the Masindi DLG assets register for WSS facilities, I found out/ noted the following:

- There was a Masindi DLG Asset Register titled “District Water Office Water Supply Asset Register updated in Quarter Four 2021-2022” listed by NewID, Subcounty, Parish, Village, Type, YoC, Source Name, Source Number, Status, Source Funder. The facilities year of construction ranged between 1952 to 2021.
- The nine (9) deep boreholes, six (6) protected springs and one (1) production well drilled in FY 2021/2022 were not yet updated in the WSS register.
- Besides, the facilities were not listed per financial years thus it was hard to establish for instance the list and number of Masindi district WSS facilities for the last 10 financial years.
- The Asset Register was available at Masindi District Water Department. However, it was not up-to-date, and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0).

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Score 4 or else score 0.

Projects under water for FY 2022/2023 were categorized as:

- (i) Drilling of boreholes at various LLGs 4 projects per page 31 of the AWP
- (ii) Medium Spring Protection 4 projects per page 29 of the AWP
- (iii) Rehabilitation of boreholes 5 projects per page 30 of the AWP
- (iv) Construction of VIP pit latrines at various locations per page 30 of the AWP

The desk appraisals were conducted from 26th February, 2022 to 15th March, 2022. Desk Appraisal Report was in place dated 29th March, 2022

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- As per the document titled Annual work plan Masindi District Water Sector for FY 2022/2023 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by CAO on 25th /08/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 30th/08/2022, the following were the budget allocations under the District,

- the following were the budget allocations under the Masindi District Rural Water Supply to Sub counties - Development Fund part of the DWSCG and UGIFT

(i) Design of Piped Water System (Borehole); Feasibility studies, detailed design and tender documentation in Bikonzi S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 24,793,054

(ii) Construction of one (1) Pipe Water Supply System in Bwijanga S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 105,306,700

(iii) Drilling one (1) Deep Borehole in Kijujumbwa S/C under UGIFT, at a cost of UGX 35,187,273

(iv) Three Stance Lined Latrine in Pakanyi S/C under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 17,982,500

(v) Three Stance Lined Latrine in Nyantonzi S/C under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 17,982,500

(vi) Spring well construction in Budongo S/C under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 5,267,209

(vii) Drilling four (4) Deep Borehole in Pakanyi S/C under DWSCG, at a total cost of UGX 80,749,092

(viii) Drilling Deep Borehole in Kiruli S/C under DWSCG, at a cost of UGX 20,187,273

(ix) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kijunjubwa S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,222,000.

(x) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Miirya S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,222,000.

(xi) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Bwijanga S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 8,615,000

(xii) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kimengo S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 9,540,000.

(xiii) Rehabilitation of one (1) deep boreholes in Kimengo S/C, under DWSCG at a cost of UGX 7,857,542.

- There was evidence that the

beneficiary communities applied for WSS investments for the current FY 2022/23 as seen from the following applications/ requests sampled:

- i. Request for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LC1 of Kikingura village, Kitamba Parish, in Bwijanga S/C, dated 11th/07/2022
- ii. Request for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LC1 of Waiga B village, Kyakamese East parish, Pakanyi S/C dated 20th/06/2022
- iii. Application for School borehole rehabilitation from the district water Office by the Head/Teacher Miramura P/S in Bwijanga S/C dated 15th/01/2022
- iv. Request for a deep borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kyarumbeiha village, Kyakamese Parish, Pakanyi S/C dated 15th/01/2021
- v. Application for water projects (1- Extension of tap/piped water to Kijunjubwa Town Council; 2-Drilling of boreholes at Nyamukonge Cell, Nyamigamba Cell, Bukooba I Cell, Kijunjubwa South and Kijunjubwa North; and 3- Consideration of Kijunjubwa Town Council for a Production well) from the district water Office by the Masindi District Deputy Speaker/ Councilor Kijunjubwa Town Council) dated 27th/10/2022
- vi. Application for a Borehole from the district water Office by the Chairperson LCI of Kibaali Kitonde village, Bigando Parish, Miirya S/C dated 26st/10/2021

Therefore, all the seven (7) beneficiary communities applied for the seven (7) budgeted WSS investments (projects) for current FY 2022/23 and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There were two Field Appraisal reports; one dated 4th April, 2022 and another dated 6th May, 2022. The appraisals were conducted from 27th to 31st March, 2022 for a protection of a spring in a Awafala village,</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>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There was no WWS project at time of the assessment for the current FY, however from the agenda 12 of the council setting scheduled for 11/11/2022, takes into account revision of the water work plan, which takes into account the E&S safeguards. screening reports and costed ESMPs for the WSS projects(spring protection at Rwengabi village, spring protection at Nyakafunja, deep siting borehole at Waiga were reviewed, both dated 13/June/20220.</p>	0

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

a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0

As per the Approved Procurement Plan, the following water infrastructure investment projects among others were incorporated in the Procurement Plan Page 2 for the current FY

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

- Construction of Protected Springs at Kanyege, Nyakafunzo, Ekarakaven, Rwengabi and Ezomva Villages; Budgeted for UGX 26,336,045/=.

- Deep Borehole Drilling, Casting and Installation at Kyeikungubika-Kafu, Omwiguru I, Kirinju T/C, Kitooka - Juba, Waiga B, Wampara, Kyarumbeiha, and Katerirwe Villages; Estimated at UGX 161,498,184/=

- Production Well Drilling (Motorised) at Pumuzika Market; Budgeted for UGX 35,123,493/=.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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:

The water supply and public sanitation infrastructure Projects for the Previous FY were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of Works. These Included among others;

1) Drilling Casting and Installation of 10 Deep Boreholes at various locations, and one Production Well at Kikuube Village - *MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00018 &00017*; approved by the Contracts Committee under **Min42/DCC/2021-22 (I) & (II)**, in a meeting held on 15/9/2021

2) Construction and Engravement of 6 Protected Springs in various Villages in Budongo S/County - *MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00016*; approved by the Contracts Committee under **Min58/DCC/2021-22**, in a meeting held on 15/9/2021

3) Construction and Engravement of 2 Protected Springs at Kanyege and Kyempunu Villages in Budongo S/County - *MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00469*; approved by the Contracts Committee under **Min118/DCC/2021-22**, in a meeting held on 7/3/2022

12	2	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence of proper establishment of the PITS for the Water Sector projects within the last FY (2021/2022) as per guidelines</p> <p>Copies of joint appointments including the Opio Walter (DWO), the Nsimiire William (Senior Environment Officer), Bahemuka Godfrey the DCDO, among others as members of the PIT for Water and Sanitation projects of FY 2021/2022. The letters were dated 28th July, 2021 as signed by CAO.</p> <p>The projects included, among others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rehabilitation of 24 Boreholes in the different sub counties. - Construction and Engravement of 6 Protected Springs in various Villages - Drilling Casting and Installation of Deep Boreholes at various locations
12	2	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the four (4) water facilities I sampled and visited in three (3) S/Counties and presented below were constructed as per the standard Technical Designs provided by the DWO in the BOQs and Technical drawings:</p> <p>I sampled and visited four (4) WSS facilities in three (3) S/Counties and I observed/noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Drilling a production well under UGIFT funding in Kikuube village, Bikonzi S/C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The production well was installed and finished cast on a reinforced concrete aprons as reported in 4th Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on 25th/08/2022 to the MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 30th/08/2022.

- The production well was functional (used as hand pump) and was not fenced and there was no soak pit.

- The production well was well numbered (Source ID: DWD 87519) and (not plate) engraved.

- Since the production well was still installed with a hand pump, I could not test for the minimum well yield of 10 m³/ hr as reported in the contract document titled “Masindi DLG: Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Development: one (1) Production Well drilling, Development, Casting and Installation” provided by Masindi DWO

- Overall, the production well was (manually) functioning as reported by DWO.

ii. Construction of a medium protected well under UGIFT funding in Kikaranga village, Bikonzi S/C

- The medium protected spring was functioning well with two spouts installed

- The protected spring was well numbered (Source ID: SP/WAT269BW019) and (not plate) engraved.

- The fencing was dismantled for firewood

- Retaining wall varied between 225-250 mm and was constructed using stones/ boulders and was up to 3m (in length) from the spouts

- upon testing the minimum water yield on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in $(19.66+19.16)/2= 19.41$ seconds approximated to $(10/19.41) = 0.512$ litres per second less than 1.2 litres per second per spout reported in the technical specifications and thus low flow.

- Steps had a rise of 190mm and a tread of 320mm that was in the

range of technical specifications (a rise of 200mm and a tread of 300mm)

- Height of delivery pipes (spouts) from the ground was 400mm less than 600mm indicated in the construction drawings
- There was no drainage channel constructed to divert storm water from flowing into or flooding over the spring and there was no paspalum planted and thus there was return flow towards the spring at the time of field visit.
- Overall, the medium protected spring (constructed with two spouts) was functioning well as reported by Masindi DWO.

iii. Drilling of Kyodandi deep borehole in Kyodandi village, Miirya S/C:

- The borehole was installed and fitted with hand pump cast on reinforced concrete aprons as reported in reported in 4th Quarter Report for FY 2021/2022 (REF: CR/213/3) submitted by Masindi DLG CAO on 25th/08/2022 to the MWE PS, received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE RWSSD on 30th/08/2022
- It was functioning well and properly maintained, well fenced (wooden) and there was an existing soak pit dug but it had no stones and was not buried yet. It was constructed on area over 10m x 10m thus surrounded by clear pathway for easy access.
- The deep borehole was well numbered (Source ID: DWD 87510) and (not plate) engraved.
- I tested the minimum well yield, and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in $(93+82)/2=87.5$ seconds approximated to $[(20/87.5)*3600] = 822.9$ litres per hour greater than 500 litres per hour reported in the

contract document titled “Masindi DLG: Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Development: 10 Deep borehole drilling, Development, Casting and Installation” provided by Masindi DWO and thus good well yield.

- Overall, the deep borehole was functioning well as designed and reported by DWO.

iv. Rehabilitation of Kimengo H/U deep borehole under DDEG funding in Kimengo HC III village, Kimengo S/C:

- There was no clear information reported on the existing and new pipes that were needed for rehabilitation.

- I tested the minimum well yield, and on average a 20-litre jerrycan was filled in 196 seconds approximated to $[(20/196)*3600] = 367.3$ litres per hour less than 500 litres per hour reported in the design and thus low yielding borehole with poor minimum water yield.

- The deep borehole was (not plate) engraved but not numbered.

- There was an existing soak pit that had just been dug and packed with stones on Wednesday 2nd/11/2022

- Overall, the deep borehole was rehabilitated and functioning fairly well as reported by DWO.

Therefore, on average all the four (4) WSS facilities I visited/ observed that were constructed/ rehabilitated in three (3) sub counties were generally functioning well, and the Masindi DWO fairly reported on them in the Annual Performance and Progress Reports of 4th Quarter in the FY 2021/2022 and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects was carried out by the relevant technical officers including Atugonza Rameck the DE, Opio Walter the DWO, Senior Environment Officer Nsimire William, and Bahemuka Godfrey the DCDO as per the monthly Inspection and Supervision reports from July 2021, to June 2022

The projects sampled included;

- Rehabilitation of 24 Boreholes in the different sub counties.

- Construction and Engravement of 6 Protected Springs in various Villages

- Drilling Casting and Installation of Deep Boreholes at various locations

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts

o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2

o If not score 0

There was evidence that the DWO verified works and initiated payments to contractors within specified time frame. DWO certified payment including the Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the protection of a spring in a Awafala village, dated 21th/4/2022, , contractor M/s Cane Investments Ltd, before the payments were effected.

2. There was evidence that the DWO certified payment, Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the protection of a spring in a Bwinaira village, dated 21th/4/2022, , contractor M/s Cane Investments Ltd, before the payments were effected.

3. There was evidence that the DWO certified payment, Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the protection of a spring in a bagdad village, dated 21th/4/2022, , contractor M/s Cane Investments Ltd, before the payments were effected.

Procurement and Contract

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for all water infrastructure investments with all records; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals and/or Minutes

The Projects files among others included;

1. Drilling Casting and Installation of 10 Deep Boreholes at various locations, and one Production Well at Kikuube Village - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00018 &00017; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min42/DCC/2021-22 (I) & (II), in a meeting held on 24/8/2021 after a thorough evaluation process, and Clearance from the Solicitor General in a letter dated 7/2/2022 by Nyeko Joseph, on behalf of S/G. The Contract(s) was awarded to M/S ICON Projects Ltd at a Cost of UGX 254,086,000/=

2. Construction and Engravement of 6 Protected Springs in various Villages in Budongo S/Cty - MASI534/WRKS/2021-22/00016; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min58/DCC/2021-22, in a meeting held on 15/9/2021. after a thorough evaluation process. The Contract was awarded to M/S Cane Investments Ltd at a Cost of UGX 31,885,614/= and signed on 10/12/2021

Environment and Social Requirements

<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</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>There was 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 for example;</p> <p>In a letter with a reference CR/752/3, dated 25th/7/2022 addressed to the CAO stating the water grievance case for change of the identified location of the water points by Chairperson LC 1 Ibaralibi village , quoting the date, specific location, issue, and action taken/resolution, prepared by assistant district water officer in-charge of mobilisation (Miss. Kaliisa Roseline) and a log book was reviewed and grievances are recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances.</p>
<p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	

Safeguards for service delivery

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:

Score 3, If not score 0

There was evidence that DWO and the Environment Officer disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs

In the minutes dated 2/9/2021, with stipulated agenda and total number of 11 people attended the meeting chaired by DCDO and signed by assistant district water officer in-charge mobilisation (Miss Kaliisa Rosline) assigned to water department, and its evident that water source and catchment protection and; natural resource management guidelines were disseminated according to agenda number 4 of the meeting.

Members present

1. Mr Bahemuka Godfery
DCDO
William
2. Miss. Kaliisa Roseline
ADWO
Geofrey
3. Mr. Muhindo Zainabu
CDO
Vincent
4. Mr Ayebazibwe Alison
CDO
Tinkasimire Joyce
5. Mr. Mugisa
CDO
6. Mr Byenkya
SPSWO
7. Mr. Businge
SCDO
8. Mrs.
C/person
women
9. Mr Ocen Alfred
DWO
Walter
10. Mr. Opiyo
Ass water officer
11. Mr Nsimiire William
SEO

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>there was evidence for Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS infrastructure projects constructed during the previous FY were prepared and implemented,</p> <p>1. In the letter addressed to CAO, dated 5/7/2021, the assistant district water officer in-charge of mobilisation, submitted the Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for FY2021/2022, detailing its implementation and it was costed for the different activities</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>there was evidence of MOUs to show that all WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>1. borehole voluntary land contribution offered by Foundation board of Kigulya parish, stamped by L.C 1 Kijogoro village, and signed by foundation body and the school management land owners, dated 4/June/2022</p> <p>2. borehole voluntary land contribution offered by Nyandera space (size 10 by 10 metres), stamped by L.C 1 Kyabaswa kiganguzi village, and signed by Mr Nyandera space and others members present dated 3/June/2022</p> <p>3. borehole voluntary land contribution offered Kyenkya M (10 by 10 metres), stamped by L.C 1 Bisenyi village, and signed by pastor Kyankya M and witnessed by the members LC 1 exective 25/10/2021</p> <p>There is evidence that most of the WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent as seen from the following listed requests and the</p>	3

accompanying land consent statements:

i. Consent Agreement (land) Borehole site (10 by 10 meters) between the landowner and community of Miirya S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Nyandera Space as the Land owner, signed 3rd/06/2022 and Kyabaswa LC 1 Chairperson in the presence of eight (8) witnesses.

ii. Consent Agreement “Endagano Yokuhereza Ettaka Abwokwombeka Ekyoma Kyamaizi’ between the landowner and community of Miirya S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Kosiya Kajura as the Land owner, signed 10th/03/2022 and Kitooka LC 1 Chairperson in the presence of seven (7) witnesses.

iii. Consent Agreement “Endagano Ya Bowa Hol eya Kyabikule” between the landowner and community of Bwijanga S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Mrs. Nsisireki Sarah as the Land owner, signed 28th/08/2022 and Kyabikule LC 1 Chairperson in the presence of four (4) witnesses.

iv. Acceptance to allow Government to drill A borehole for Kijogoro Primary School between the landowner and community of Miirya S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Catholic Foundation School Management Committee of Kijogoro Primary School as the Land owner, signed 4th/07/2022 and Kijogogro LC 1 Chairperson signed 4th/06/2022 in the presence of three (3) witnesses.

v. Consent Agreement Piece of land for the borehole (10m x 10 meters) between the landowner and community of Miirya S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Mr. Kyenkyo Mohammed as the Land owner, signed 4th/07/2022 and Kyabikule LC 1 Chairperson signed 4th/07/2022 in the presence of five (5) witnesses.

vi. Consent Agreement “Endagaano yokugaba ettaka” between the landowner and community of Miirya S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Mr. Muhanza Kuruga as the Land owner, signed 6th/07/2022 and Kabutukuru LC 1 Chairperson signed 6th/05/2022 in the presence of six (6) witnesses.

vii. Agreement on donation of piece of land to drill a borehole between the landowner and community of Kimengo S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Mr. Bulemu Matiya as the Land owner, signed 12th/04/2022 and Karangwe LC 1 Chairperson signed 12th/04/2022 in the presence of four (4) witnesses.

viii. Agreement of giving a piece of land ten meters by ten metres to drill borehole water between the landowner and community of Pakanyi S/C for drilling of deep borehole with Ovoya Donasiano as the Land owner, signed 27th/06/2022 and Ibaralibi LC 1 Chairperson signed 27th/06/2022 in the presence of five (5) witnesses including three (3) witnesses of the land owner

There is evidence that eight (8) out of the ten (10) water facility projects (9 boreholes and 1 production well) budgeted for FY 2021/2022 were implemented on land where Masindi DLG had proof of consent , and therefore, justifying a score of three (3).

15	2	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>1. There was evidence that the Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the protection of a spring in a Awafala village, dated 21th/4/2022, , contractor M/s Cane Investments Ltd, before the payments were effected.</p> <p>2. There was evidence that the Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the protection of a spring in a Bwinaira village, dated 21th/4/2022, , contractor M/s Cane Investments Ltd, before the payments were effected.</p> <p>3. There was evidence that the Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms, on the protection of a spring in a bagdad village, dated 21th/4/2022, , contractor M/s Cane Investments Ltd, before the payments were effected.</p>
15	2	<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 CDO and environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>1. Monitoring reports were seen, environmental monitoring and social safeguards compliance for spring protection at Bagdad, monthly reports were submitted dated from 7/3/2022 and 20th/4/2022 and mitigation measures captured, project started on 30th/1/2022 to 30/3/2022</p> <p>2. Monitoring reports were seen, environmental monitoring and social safeguards compliance for spring protection at Ewafala, and monthly reports were submitted dated from 7/3/2022 and 20th/4/2022 and mitigation measures captured project started on 30th/1/2022 to 30/3/2022</p>

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
	Local Government Service Delivery Results			

Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land

Maximum score 4

Maximum 20 points for this performance area

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

The DPO availed, Dr. Ssebuguzi Fred, availed a document dated 10/03/2022, titled "Data base for Irrigation 2020" and another one dated 12/10/2022, with the title "Database for Irrigation 2021", both prepared by Mr. Byaruhanga Job, the District Agricultural officer, containing irrigated land as of those respective dates all belonging to only non beneficiaries of micro-scale irrigation program since the program was not yet implemented. According to these documents, as of 10th March 2022, Masindi DLG had 34 irrigation facilities while as at 12th October 2021, there were 37 irrigation facilities. The listed facilities included the following *inter alia*;

1. *Mr. Kabagambe
Livingstone in Kasindizi cell, Karujubu
Town council (3 acres),
No. 01 on the list of 10th
March 2020*
2. *Kimanya Women group in
Kasongoire village,
Budongo subcounty (4
acres), No. 10 on the list of
10th March 2020*
3. *Fica seed farm in Kimina
Village, kiruli subcounty
(30 acres), No.37 on the
list of 12th October 2021*

Thus Masindi DLG did not have an up to date data on irrigated land since the last time of update was 12th October 2021.

1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>From the two documents availed for assessment, the LG had 156.2 acres as of 30/3/2020 while it had 189.8 acres as of 22/10/2021, this makes it difficult to determine the percentage increase between the two FYs since the documents were not organized per FY.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p>	<p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p>	<p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p>	<p>A review of the staffing structure, staff lists, and appointment letters for LLG Extension Workers showed that the structure provides for 72 positions (3 at each of the 4 TC (Agric. Officer; Asst. Agric. Officer; and Asst. Vet. Office) and 6 at each of the 10 Sub County (Agric. Officer; Asst. Agric. Officer; Vet. Officer; Fisheries Officer; Asst. Animal Husbandry Officer; and Asst. Fisheries Development Officer) and only 21 are filled, indicating a 29.16% capacity.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 		

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

A review of the LLG Extension Workers staff lists, Attendance registers and deployment letters showed that information on position of Extension Workers filled is accurate. Three LLGs of Pakanyi Sub County, Bwijanga Sub County and Kyatiri Town Council were sampled for assessment.

In Pakanyi Sub County the following staff were found on the staff list and records:

1. Ms. Kamulegeya Edidah (Agricultural Officer);
2. Mr. Kyomya Fred (Assistant Veterinary Officer); and
3. Ms. Biira Yazeri (Assistant Forestry Officer)

In Bwijanga Sub County, the following were found on the staff list:

1. Busobozi Tobias (Assistant Fisheries Officer);
2. Amanyabyona Assumpta (Assistant Agricultural Officer); and
3. Dr. Kairu Chrisizestom (Veterinary Officer).

In Kyatiri Town Council no Extension Workers had been substantively posted but staff from other Sub Counties continued to offer services, including:

1. Ms. Biira Yazeri (Assistant Forestry Officer).

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
Maximum score 6				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	No approved performance improvement plan was availed	0
Maximum score 6				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	No PIP implementation reports were availed for assessment	0
Maximum score 6				

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG budgeted UGX735,303,000 towards the wage bill of the production department staff as per the Approved budget estimates for Masindi DLG for FY 2022/2023, availed by the DPO.</p>	1
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The DPO availed a staff list, having 21 members of staff in the department, deployed in different LLGs. However, the deployment is only 21 % of the staffing norm</p>	0

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

Review of LLG Extension Workers staff lists, Attendance Registers at the sampled LLGs, deployment letters and monitoring reports showed that Extension Workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed.

In Pakanyi Sub County the following staff were found on the staff list and records:

1. Ms. Kamulegeya Edidah (Agricultural Officer);
2. Mr. Kyomya Fred (Assistant Veterinary Officer); and
3. Ms. Biira Yazeri (Assistant Forestry Officer)

In Bwijanga Sub County, the following were found on the staff list:

1. Busobozi Tobias (Assistant Fisheries Officer);
2. Amanyabyona Assumpta (Assistant Agricultural Officer); and
3. Dr. Kairu Chrisizestom (Veterinary Officer).

In Kyatiri Town Council no Extension Workers had been substantively posted but staff from other Sub Counties continued to offer services, including:

1. Ms. Biira Yazeri (Assistant Forestry Officer).

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

Staff lists with telephone numbers of Extension Workers were conspicuously displayed on Notice Boards in all the three sampled LLGs, evidence that Extension Workers deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs. The LLGs of Pakanyi Sub County, Bwijanga Sub County, and Kyatiri Town Council were sampled for assessment.

In Pakanyi Sub County the following staff were found on the staff list on the Notice Board:

1. Ms. Kamulegeya Edidah (Agricultural Officer);
2. Mr. Kyomya Fred (Assistant Veterinary Officer); and
3. Ms. Biira Yazeri (Assistant Forestry Officer)

In Bwijanga Sub County, the following were found on the staff list:

1. Busobozi Tobias (Assistant Fisheries Officer);
2. Amanyabyona Assumpta (Assistant Agricultural Officer); and
3. Dr. Kairu Chrisizestom (Veterinary Officer).

In Kyatiri Town Council no Extension Workers had been substantively posted to the LLG.

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

Review of Personal files, Performance Plans, and Appraisal Reports of Extension Workers showed that the District Production Coordinator had conducted an Annual Performance Appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed Performance Plans and submitted a copy to HRO during

HRO during the previous the previous FY.
FY: Score 1 else 0

Some files reviewed included:

1. Dr. Ssebuguzi Fred, Principal Veterinary Officer posted to District Head Quarters was appraised on 10/08/2022 by the immediate supervisor Sanyu Phionah, Chief Administrative Officer.
2. Byaruhanga Job, Senior Agricultural Officer posted to District Head Quarters was appraised on 02/07/2022 by the immediate supervisor Dr. Ssebuguzi Fred, Ag. District Production Officer.
3. Isingoma Didan, Animal Husbandry Officer posted to District Head Quarters was appraised on 08/08/2022 by the immediate supervisor Dr. Wobusobozi Johnson, Senior Veterinary Officer.
4. Biira Yazeri, Assistant Fisheries Officer posted to Pakanyi Sub County was appraised on 30/06/2022 by the immediate supervisor Kamulegeya A. Edidah, Agricultural Officer.
5. Kwikiriza Jibril, Assistant Agricultural Officer posted to Pakanyi Sub County was appraised on 30/06/2022 by the immediate supervisor Asimwe David, Senior Assistant Secretary.
6. Sebwato Paul, Assistant Fisheries Officer posted to Budongo Sub County was appraised on 06/07/2022 by the immediate supervisor Tumusiime Wandera Amos, Senior Assistant Secretary.
7. Bbira Johnson, Veterinary Officer posted to Kimengo

- Sub County was appraised on 30/06/2022 by the immediate supervisor Kisembo Patrick, Senior Assistant Secretary.
8. Kabasindi Eunice, Agricultural Officer posted to Kimengo Sub County was appraised on 05/07/2022 by the immediate supervisor Kisembo Patrick, Senior Assistant Secretary.
 9. Busobozi Tobias, Assistant Fisheries Officer posted to Bwijanga Sub County was appraised on 06/07/2022 by the immediate supervisor Asaba Irene, Senior Assistant Secretary.
 10. Amanyabyona Assumpta, Assistant Agricultural Officer posted to Bwijanga Sub County was appraised on 27/06/2022 by the immediate supervisor Asaba Irene, Senior Assistant Secretary.
 11. Dr. Kairu Chrisizestom, Veterinary Officer posted to Bwijanga Sub County was appraised on 06/07/2022 by the immediate supervisor Asaba Irene, Senior Assistant Secretary.
 12. Okello Richard Martin, Assistant Veterinary Officer posted to Miirya Sub County was appraised on 01/07/2022 by the immediate supervisor Kyamiza Musa, Senior Assistant Secretary.

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	Corrective action taken included coaching and mentoring for performance improvement, and technical training sessions.	1
	Maximum score 4			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	The DPO did not avail any training report for the assessment.	0
	Maximum score 4			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	No training database was availed for assessment	0
	Maximum score 4			

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>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>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program 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>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program 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>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0

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

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
----	--	---	--	---

Maximum score 8

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	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
----	--	---	--	---

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	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
----	--	---	--	---

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	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
----	---	---	--	---

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>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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 for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</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>ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0</p>	<p>Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.</p>	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	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
	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	Not applicable in this round of assessment because the DLG did not receive funds to implement Micro-scale irrigation program activities.	0
	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	Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment	0
	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>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment</p>	0
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>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment</p>	0
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>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment</p>	0
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> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment</p>	0
----	---	--	--	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment	0

**Micro-scale Irrigation
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	There was no evidence adduced by HRM at the time of assessment to show that the District had a substantively appointed Senior Agricultural Engineer.	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.	Not applicable, since there was no project being implemented in this sector at the time of the assessment	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The position of Civil Engineer (Water) was substantively filled by Mr. Ocen Alfred appointed by the CAO in a letter dated June 23, 2017, as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 151/2017.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization was substantively filled by Mr. Opio Walter appointed on 16/12/2005 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 416/2005.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was no evidence adduced by HRM during the assessment to show that the District had a substantively appointed Borehole Maintenance Technician.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	There was no evidence adduced by HRM at the time of assessment to show that the District had a substantively appointed Natural Resources Officer.	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was no evidence adduced by HRM at the time of assessment to show that the District had a substantively appointed Environment Officer.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Forestry Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Biryetega Simon a Senior Forestry Officer appointed in a letter dated March 13, 2008 by the CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 38/2008	10

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 for Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening.

1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for borehole drilling at Bisenyi village dated 16/6/2021 and signed by both EO and CDO was completed, an ESMP prepared which costed Ugx240,000 dated 11/01/2022, monitored in May and June, mitigation measures, planting of indigenous trees, acquire land consent, wooden fence around the facility

2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for Spring protection at Ewafala village, dated 16/June/2021 and signed by both EO and DCDO was completed, an ESMP prepared which costed Ugx500,000, dated 16/June/2021, monitored done in 20/April/2022 and 7/03/2022, mitigation measures, eg fencing the facility

3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for spring protection at Bagdad village, dated 16/June/2021 and signed by both EO and DCDO was completed, an ESMP prepared which costed Ugx500,000, dated 16/June/2021, monitored done in 20/April/2022 and 7/03/2022, mitigation measures, eg fencing the facility

2	<p>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</p>	<p>b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for the Water sector projects because the screening never recommended for ESIAs and since at the time of screening the WSS projects were captured under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019. The projects included; borehole drilling at Bisenyi village and Spring protection at Ewafala village among others.</p>	10
2	<p>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</p>	<p>c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to Masindi DWO, all existing piped water systems/ schemes in Masindi DLG were constructed and are operated by the MWE. • Therefore, Masindi DLG specifically the Water Department had not yet constructed any piped water system(s) therefore, there was no need to apply and get water abstraction permits issued by DWRM thereby justifying a score ten (10) 	10

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The position of District Health Officer was not substantively filled. The incumbent, Dr. Abirigo Jino was substantively appointed as Senior Medical Officer in a letter from the CAO dated 15/11/2008 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 271/2008.	0
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	The position of ADHO Maternal, Child Health and Nursing was substantively filled by Mr. Mugisha Brian , appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 04/07/2019 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 103/2019.	10
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	The position of ADHO Environmental Health was substantively filled by Mr. Baguma Patrick , appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 17/02/2017 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 19/2017.	10
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.	The position of Principal Health Inspector was not provided for on the approved staffing structure for Masindi District.	0
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	The position of Senior Health Educator was substantively filled by Mr. Muddu Michael Sam , appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 24/06/2015 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 109/2015.	10
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	The position of Biostatistician was substantively filled by Mr. Bagonza Geoffrey appointed by the CAO in a letter dated August 17, 2015 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 66/2015.	10
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

1

New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.

g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.

HRM did not adduce any evidence that the LG had substantively appointed a District Cold Chain Technician. There was no evidence of an assignment of duties by the CAO.

Applicable to Districts only.

Maximum score is 70

1

New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

1

New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

1

New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

Applicable to MCs only.

Maximum score is 70

Environment and Social Requirements

2

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:
a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

There was evidence that environmental and Social Screening (E&S) of Health projects for the current FY, E&S was completed and, ESIAs/ESMPs were prepared and costed and implemented/followed up.

1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of OPD at Nyantonzi health center III dated 16th/June/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO was carried out, ESMP costed Ugx1,800,000 dated 21th/June/2022 and signed by both EO and DCO, monitoring has not been done because the project has not yet kicked off.

15

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

Maximum score is 30

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

The LG did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for the Health sector projects because the screening never recommended for ESIAs and at the time of screening since all civil works projects were captured under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019.

The projects included; the construction of OPD at Nyantonzi health center III , ESMP costed Ugx1,800,000 dated 21th/June/2022 and signed by both EO and DCO, screening was done dated 16th/June/2022 and signed by both DCO and EO, monitoring has not been done because the project has not yet kicked off.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
-----	-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------

Human Resource Management and Development

1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The position of District Education Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Kyomuhendo Francis , appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 27/02/2012 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 238/2011.	30
	<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>			

1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The HRM availed the Assessment Team a customized and costed staff structure for Masindi District approved in a letter from the Ministry of Public Service ref.: ARC 135/306/01 dated January 27, 2017, showing that the District has two positions of Inspector of Schools:	40
	<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>			

1. Ms. Kiiza Monica was appointed by the CAO in a letter dated May 17, 2016, as directed by the DSC under Minute No.60/2016 as Sr. Inspector of Schools; and
2. Mr. Baharagate Godfrey was appointed by the CAO as Inspector of Schools in a letter dated August 10, 2015, as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 43/2015.

Environment and Social Requirements

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

There was evidence for Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening

1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine with wash room at Kitwetwe P/s in Miirya sub-county, dated on 10/June/2021 signed by both CDO and EO, ESMP prepared and costed at a tune of Ugx635,000, dated 10/June/2021, signed by both CDO and EO, monitoring was done dated 20/12/2021

2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 2 class rooms at Kilanyi Muslim P/S dated on 10/June/2021 signed by both CDO and EO, ESMP prepared and costed at a tune of Ugx1651,000, dated 11/June/2021, signed by both CDO and EO, monitoring was done

3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 5-stance line pit latrine with a urinal at Nyabyeya P/S in Budongo Sub-county, dated on 10/June/2021 signed both CDO and EO, ESMP prepared and costed at a tune of Ugx635,000, dated 11/June/2021 signed by both CDO and EO, monitoring was done

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

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:
b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.

The LG did not carry out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for the education sector projects because the screening never recommended for ESIAs and at the time of screening all civil works projects were captured under category C projects that do not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) as provided for in the Schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 2019. The projects included; the construction of 5-stance lined pit latrine with wash room at Kitwetwe P/s in Miirya sub-county and the construction of 2 class rooms at Kilanyi Muslim P/S among others.

**Crosscutting
Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Chief Finance Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Baguma David appointed on 09/03/2018 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 30/2018	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Planner was substantively filled by Mr. Magezi B. Godfrey Abwooli appointed on 07/10/2005 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 113/2017	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Engineer was substantively filled by Mr. Atugonza Rameck appointed on 19/10/2005 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 413/2005	3

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Natural Resources Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Akwetaireho Simon appointed on 27/03/2019 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 71/2019	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	At the time of assessment, there was no evidence adduced that the DLG had substantively appointed a Natural Resources Officer. The incumbent, Dr. Sebuguzi Fred was substantively appointed Principal Veterinary Officer by the CAO in a letter dated 26/05/2015 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 92/2015.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Bahemuka Godfrey appointed on 02/04/2019 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 70/2019	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of District Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Kalyegira Moses appointed on 18/07/2022 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 416/2022	3

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>The position of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Byarugaba Godfrey appointed on 13/03/2003 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 18/2003</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Ms. Ibanda Pheonah Friday appointed on 26/03/2015 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 67/2017</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Principal Human Resource Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Opigo Cyrus in a letter dated February 13, 2018 by the CAO as directed by the DSC under DSC Minute No. 15/2018.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Nsimire N. William in a letter dated August 25, 2009 by the CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 125/2009.</p>	2

1	2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Sr. Land Management Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Mugoya James appointed on 11/02/1998 in a letter by CAO as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 40/971,07/10 2005-SLO.</p>
1	0	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the HRM did not adduce evidence that the LG had a substantively appointed Senior Accountant. The incumbent, Mr. Katusabe Mugisa was substantively appointed as Accountant in a letter from the CAO dated 23/06/2017 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 118/2017</p>
1	2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Principal Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Mr. Okise Patrick , appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 17/07/2020 as directed by the DSC under Minute No. 208/2020. .</p>
1	2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of PHRO (Secretary DSC) was substantively filled by Ms. Nyandera Angella , appointed by the CAO in a letter dated 08/12/2010 as directed by the DSC under Minute No.218/2010. .</p>

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>The Assessment Team found that at the time of assessment, Masindi District Local Government had 10 Sub Counties and only 5 had substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretaries (Sub-County Chiefs). These are Mr. Kyamiza Musa appointed under DSC Minute No. 333/2005; Mr. Tumusiime Wandera Amos appointed under DSC Minute No. 150/2020; Ms Asaba Irene appointed under Minute No. DSC 05/2019; and Mr. Kamukama Denis Sinai appointed under Minute No. 393/2022. The other officers were holding office in the 5, mostly new Sub Counties on assignment of duties by the CAO. Two of the 4 Town Councils have Mr. Kigenyi Frank appointed under DSC Minute No. 57/2018 as SAS and Mr. Serunjogi Abdu appointed under Minute No. DSC 60/2008 assigned duties as Town Clerk in a letter dated July 27, 2021 from CAO.</p>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the team found that the LG had the following substantively appointed CDOs. Ms. Ayebazibwe Alison appointed under DSC Minute 129/2009; Ms. Muhindo Zainabu appointed under Minute 21/2015; Ms. Kalisa Roseline appointed under DSC Minute 76/2015; Mr. Mugisa William appointed under DSC Minute 77/2015; Ms. Karuhanga Charlotte appointed under DSC Minute 402/2022; and Mr. Sunday Godwin appointed under DSC Minute 402/2022. HRM did not adduce any evidence that the other officers serving as CDOs had been substantively appointed. Field visits by the Assessment Team to sampled LLG in Pakanyi Sub County and Kyatiri Town Council established that the officers substantively appointed in the mother Sub Counties continued to care take their respective offices in the new LLGs.</p>	0

2

0

New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG
Maximum score is 15

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

Evidence adduced by HRM showed that at the time of assessment, the LG DSC had substantively appointed Mr. Kirungi Richard under Minute 148/2020; Mr. Mudiira Alfred under Minute 389/2005; Ms. Kabonesa Susan under Minute 65/2016; Mr. Musinge Milton under Minute 318/2008; Mr. Mbabazi Jonathan under Minute 221/2020; Mr. Tuhaise Jolly under Minute 148/2020; and Ms. Azikuru Irene under Minute 65/2016 as Senior Accounts Assistants. There was no evidence adduced to show that the Town Councils which came into being in July 2022 had substantively appointed Senior Accounts Assistants.

Environment and Social Requirements

3

2

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

Masindi DLG had Shs 27,064,000 warranted for the Natural Resources Department of Masindi DLG as detailed on page 24 of the Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022. Shs 31,574,000 was released to the Department as reflected on page 24 of the Annual Performance Report and financial statements for FY 2021/2022. Performance was 117% in excess of 100%. Social safe guards were released to the department as required.

Computation:

$$\frac{31,574,000}{27,064,000} \times 100 = 117$$

$$27,064,000$$

This was equivalent to 117% performance indicating that all funds as warranted for implementation of environmental and social safeguards were released to the department and spent as required (100%).

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

Maximum score is 4

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

b. Community Based Services department.

score 2 or else 0.

The Community Based Services department had shs 42,097,000 warranted in FY 2021/2022 as reflected on page 26 of the Annual Performance Report. Shs 42,097,000 was released to the department the financial year under review and all the total amount was spent as reflected on page 26 of the Annual Performance Report and financial statements for FY 2021/2022. Performance was 100% as required. Computation:

$$\frac{42,097,000}{42,097,000} \times 100 = 100\%$$

$$42,097,000$$

This was equivalent to 100% performance and therefore all funds as warranted for implementation of environmental and social safeguards were released and spent by the department.

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

Maximum score is 12

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

There was evidence for Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening

Evidence

1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for construction for 5-stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Kitwetwe primary school, sector education, dated 10/June/2021, signed by both the CDO and DEO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx635,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklists seen, total contract sum Ugx23.500,000, all these done before commencement of the works.

2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for spring protection at Ewafala village sector water, dated 16/June/2021, signed by both the CDO and DEO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx190,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen, dated 20/4/2022

3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for borehole drilling at Budongo Seed School sector water, dated 16/June/2022, signed by both the CDO and DEO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx240,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen dated 7/June/2022, another one 10/May/2022

4. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Kimengo health center III sector health, dated 2/June/2021, signed by both CDO and DEO, the ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx575,000 monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen, all these done before commencement of the works works

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

Maximum score is 12

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

score 4 or 0

There was no evidence that LG carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG).

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

Maximum score is 12

c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0

There was evidence that the LG prepared and costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; .

Evidence

1. The construction for 5-stance lined pit latrine with a wash room at Kitwetwe primary school, sector education in Miirya Sub-county, ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 TOTAL cost for ESMP Ugx635,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen, total contract sum Ugx23.500,000, all these done before commencement of the works works

2. Spring protection at Ewafala village sector water, dated ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx190,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen, dated 20/4/2022, all these done before commencement of the works.

3. Borehole drilling at Budongo Seed School sector water in Budongo Sub-county, ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx240,000, monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen dated 7/June/2022, another one 10/May/2022, all these done before commencement of the works.

4. Construction of a 4-stance pit latrine Kimengo health center III sector health in Kimengo Sub-county, ESMP prepared and costed for FY 2021/2022 total cost for ESMP Ugx575,000 monitoring was done and monitoring checklist seen, all these done before commencement of the works.

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 OAG opinion on the LG performance FY 2021/2022 was unqualified</p>	10
---	--	--	---	-----------

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).

maximum score is 10

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),

score 10 or else 0.

Provision of information to PS/ST on status of implementation of OAG and IAG findings:

The CAO responded to the six queries that were raised by the Office of the Auditor General in respect of FY 2020/2021 per letter dated 21st December, 2021. The letter was copied to Principal Internal Auditor and District Chairperson. The MOFPED acknowledged the CAO's letter on 23rd December, 2021. This was done before February, 2022. All the six queries raised by the OAG were cleared at the time of the assessment.

As for the IAG, the CAO responded to the six queries that were raised in FY 2020/2021 through letter dated 21st December, 2021. Some of the queries raised included the following:

- (i) Failure to follow up procurement procedures;
- (ii) Delayed response to the LGPAC queries;
- (iii) Handling of civil works in the district.

All the six queries had been cleared at the time of the assessment.

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

Maximum Score 4

If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,

score 4 or else 0.

The DLG submitted the Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 on 16th August, 2022 per CAO's letter dated 25th July, 2022 within the prescribed time frame. The CAO's letter was copied to PS MOLG, Accountant General, Chairperson of the district and RDC. The report was counter signed by the PS/ST 16th August, 2022. The MOLG acknowledged the CAO's letter on 16th August, 2022 and the Accountant General on the same date.

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The DLG submitted the Annual Performance Report for FY 2021/2022 on 9th July, 2022 within the prescribed time frame. The report was submitted through the PBS system.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The DLG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY 2021/2022 by August 31 of the current Financial Year as follows:</p> <p>1st Quarter on 26/11/2021;</p> <p>2nd Quarter on 07/02/2022;</p> <p>3rd Quarter on 16/05/2022;</p> <p>4th Quarter on 09/07/2022.</p>	4