



Local Government Performance Assessment

Namutumba District

(Vote Code: 574)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	43%
Education Minimum Conditions	45%
Health Minimum Conditions	60%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	45%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	49%
Educational Performance Measures	75%
Health Performance Measures	46%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	55%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

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 was evidence that the DDEG funded projects were functional and utilized as per the project profile. For instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 5-stance lined pit latrine constructed at Budaba Primary school was in Nabweyo Sub county was completed as per quarter 4 annual performance report, page 84 and the completion report dated 28th April 2020. The latrine was in good shape and was in use by the Pupils of Budaba Primary School. • A 4-stance lined pit latrine at the District headquarters was completed as per quarter 4 annual performance report, page 84 and as per the completion certificate dated 8th June 2020. The latrine was in use by the District of Namutumba staff. 	4
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o by more than 10%: Score 3 o 5-10% increase: Score 2 o Below 5 % Score 0 	Not applicable.	0

Service Delivery
Performance

Maximum 6 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

There was evidence that DDEG funded investment projects implemented in FY 2019/2020 were completed as per the work plan; Ref: Namutumba District approved workplan and quarter 4 performance report .

The LG had planned for 10 investment projects under DDEG and were completed as per quarter 4 performance report as indicated below.

1. Construction of a four-stance lined VIP pit latrine at the District Headquarters Administration block, (Ref: page 54 of the AWP, was 100% complete Ref. page 84, annual performance report.)
2. Construction of a five-stance lined pit latrine at Budaba P/S, (Ref: page 54 of the AWP, was 100% complete, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
3. Completion of administration block phase III, (Ref: page 9 of the AWP, was 100% complete, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
4. Siting, Drilling, Casting, and Installation of one deep well at Budomero-Bwayuya, (Ref: page 53 of the AWP, was 100% complete, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
5. Face lifting of an Education Office Block, (Ref: page 54 of the AWP, was 101% complete, Ref. page 83, annual performance report).
6. Supply of a mowing machine, (Ref: page 54 of the AWP, was 101% complete, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
7. Supply of two laptop computers; one to Planning Unit and another to PDU, (Ref: page 53 of the AWP, was 101% complete, Ref. page 83, annual performance report).
8. Supply of 72 three-seater desks to Kikaluu, and Nawansagwa Primary Schools, (Ref: page 54 of the AWP, was 100% complete, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
9. Supply of 72 three-seater desks to Kisewozi and Nabitula Primary Schools, (Ref: page 54 of the AWP, was 100% complete, Ref. page 84, annual performance report)
10. Development of a physical development plan for Nangonde and Bulange Trading Centres in Namutumba District, (Ref: page 54 of the AWP, was 99% complete, Ref. page 84, annual performance report)

This was 100% completion as per the LG Q4 performance report.

Investment
Performance

Maximum 4 points on
this performance
measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0.

There was evidence that the District had budgeted and spent on all eligible DDEG projects for the previous FY on eligible projects; Ref Q4 LG performance reports, page 56

The total DDEG grant was Ugx. 2,824,341, 000 Ref: page 1 of the LG budget estimates.

Namutumba District had budgeted for 10 projects and expenditure was 100% as verified below,

- Construction of a four-stance lined VIP pit latrine at the District Headquarters Administration block, the budget allocated was Ugx. 10,080,000 (Ref: page 54 of the budget estimates which was spent 100%, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
- Construction of a five-stance lined pit latrine at Budaba P/S, the budget allocated was Ugx. 22,000,000 (Ref: page 54 of the budget estimates, which was spent 100%, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
- Completion of administration block phase III the budget allocated was Ugx. 52,000,000, (Ref: page 9 of the budget estimates which was spent 100%, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
- Siting, Drilling, Casting, and Installation of one deep well at Budomero-Bwayuya budget allocated was Ugx. 20,000,000(Ref: page 53 of the budget estimates which was spent 100%, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
- Face lifting of an Education Office Block budget allocated was Ugx. 800,000, (Ref: page 54 of the budget estimates which was spent 101%, Ref. page 83, annual performance report).
- Supply of a mowing machine the budget allocated was Ugx. 4,500,000, (Ref: page 54 of the budget estimates which was spent 101%, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
- Supply of two laptop computers; one to Planning Unit and another to PDU the budget allocated was Ugx. 7,000,000, (Ref: page 53 of the budget estimates which was spent 101%, Ref. page 83, annual performance report).
- Supply of 72 three-seater desks to Kikalu, and Nawansagwa Primary Schools the budget allocated was Ugx. 10,080,000, (Ref: page 54 of the budget estimates which was spent 100%, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).
- Supply of 72 three-seater desks to Kisewozi and Nabitula Primary Schools the budget allocated was Ugx. 10,080,000, (Ref: page 54 of the budget estimates which was spent 100%,

Ref. page 84, annual performance report).

- Development of a physical development plan for Nangonde and Bulange Trading Centres in Namutumba District the budget allocated was Ugx. 20,000,000, (Ref: page 54 of the budget estimates, which was spent 99%, Ref. page 84, annual performance report).

The LG had spent 100% of the budgeted DDEG funds according to Q4 performance reports hence was compliant.

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

Under the DDEG funded projects for the previous FY there were 5 projects.

The variations in contract price of sampled works/supplier for the previous FY contracts were all within +/-20% of the LG Engineers' estimates (Reserve Price).

a) Consultancy services in the Physical Development and detailed Plan implementation for Nangonde Sub county and Bulange sub county

Procurement Ref No: Namu574/Srvcs/19-20/00010, with the Engineer's estimates (Reserve Price) was UGX. 20,000,000 against the Contractor's price of UGX.19, 942,000 with a variation of UGX. 58,000 equivalent to 0.29%. Therefore, the LG scores the 2 points since the variation in the contracts was within +/-20%.

Contractor: Spatial Data Ltd

N.B. This was not necessarily an infrastructure investment project.

b) Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Budaba Primary school (Nabweyo Sub County) Procurement Ref No: Namu574/WRKS/19-20/00023 with the Engineer's estimates (Reserve Price) was UGX. 22,000,000 against the Contractor's price of UGX.21, 984,462 with a variation of UGX.15, 538 equivalent to 0.07%. Therefore, the LG scores the 2 points since the variation in the contracts was within +/-20%.

Contractor: PAB Contractors Company Ltd.

c) Construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at the District headquarters Procurement Ref No: Namu574/WRKS/19-20/00024 with the Engineer's estimates (Reserve Price) was UGX. 22,000,000 against the Contractor's price of UGX.19, 124,024 with a variation of UGX. - 61,280 equivalent to -0.27 %. Therefore, the LG scores the 2 points since the variation in the contracts was within +/-20%.

Contractor: PAB Contractors Company Ltd.

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided a list of staff deployed at the LLGs but when the assessor visited the 3 sampled LLGs, the following was found.</p> <p>Ag. SAS Mazuba S/C , Mr. Wakabi Nathan could not avail the staff list to compare with the one provided by the PHRO. When the AT visited Magada S/C, Mr. Mugaba Anthony a Parish chief at Izirangobi Parish was the only staff found at the station but he too did not have the staff deployment list. Mr. Kabakubye Samuel, the T/Clerk of Namutumba T/Council was found by the assessor at the office but he also did not provide the staff list of Namutumba T/Council. It was therefore not possible to establish the accuracy of the information on the positions of LLG staff filled.</p>	0
4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all DDEG infrastructure projects were in place as per Annual Performance Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Budaba Primary school (Nabweyo Sub county) was completed as per quarter 4 annual performance report, page 84 and the completion report dated 28th April 2020. The latrine was in good shape with a ramp and metallic doors were fitted well. • Construction of a 4-stance lined pit latrine at the District headquarters was completed as per quarter 4 annual performance report, page 84 and as per the completion certificate dated 8th June 2020. The latrine was in good shape with a ramp and metallic doors were well fitted. 	2
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>Assessment of LLGs had not started</p>	0

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results. Score: 2 or else score 0	Assessment of LLGs had not started	0
---	---	--	------------------------------------	---

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	Assessment of LLGs had not started	0
---	---	--	------------------------------------	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the LG submitted the consolidated staffing requirements for coming FY 2021/2022. The SHRO claimed they had submitted but did not avail a copy of the letter submitted for the assessment.	0
---	--	---	--	---

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	The SHRO, WakilwaineDamali said they did not have the tracking and analysis report of staff attendance for July 2019 to December 2019	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

The LG had 9 Departments.

The following HoDs were appraised against their performance agreement of 2019/2020 and below are their performance reports.

1. Ms. Babiat Harriet, Ag. District Engineer, head of Works was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Aloysius Aloka according to a report dated 13/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 76% with comments 'Satisfactory performance in spite of Covid-19 in the last quarter.

2. Mr. Basaliwa George, the CFO Head of Finance and Planning was appraised by the CAO on 28/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 80.5%. The appraiser commented ' a very commendable report. The officer is committed to his worker'

3. Mr. Isiiko Mohammed the DEO (Head of Education) was appraised by the CAO, Mr. Aloysius Aloka on 7/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 69% and comments 'the officers' performance is good and encouraging, he is result oriented.

The other HoDs were not appraised despite the CAO communicating to them to bring copies of the past years' performance agreement for review in a letter dated 7/7/2020 and ref: CR/Adm/154.

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

The LG had a rewards and Sanctions committee in place with members appointed to this committee.

The committee is functional as evidenced by the meeting minutes.

On 29/9/2019. The committee sat in the District Service Commission Board Room with the following members present.

1. Mr. Wamburu S. Emmanuel, the D/CAO- Chairperson

2. Dr. Kiirya James DHO – Member

3. Mr. Isiiko Mohammed DEO – Member

4. KagoyaZainabu PHRO – Secretary

Members absent with apology were;

1. Mr. Kabakubya Samuel TC – Member

2. Mr. MusitaAppolo DPO – Member.

Under Min. NTB/R&S/10/08/2019 Mubiru David Lubale the committee heard Mr. Mubiru and resolved that;

1. He produces a police report of the accident he was involved in.

2. He presents to the committee the medical report from the health facility in Mbale to enable the committee reach the conclusion of his case.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.

Score 1 or else 0

The HRO stated that the LG had not established a consultative committee for staff grievance redress which is functional

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>Not all staff recruited during the previous FY accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Namu kubembe an Office attendant was appointed on 21/5/2019 and accessed payroll on 28/7/2019 2. Mr. Bogere Charles a Parish Chief was appointed on 12/3/2019 and accessed payroll on 28/7/2019 3. Ms. Namulinda Damali a Parish Chief was appointed on 12/3/2019 and accessed payroll on 28/7/2019 4. Ms. Teefe Suzan, the Procurement Officer was appointed on 12/3/2019 and accessed payroll on 28/7/2019 5. Dr. Lubiite Allan a Medical Officer was appointed on 13/2/2019 and accessed Payroll on 28/7/2019. 	0
---	--	--	---	---

9	<p>Pension Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>Not all staff that retired during the previous FY accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Mutagaya Samson an Agriculture Officer IPPS retired on 30/9/2020 had not accessed Payroll by the time of assessment. 2. Ms. Isiiko Suzan an Education Assistant retired on 24/4/2020 and had not accessed pension payroll by the time of assessment 3. Mr. William Kamwada, an Education Assistant IPPS 362944 retired on 9/6/2020 and accessed pension payroll in Sept. 2020 4. Mr. WilberfoceNdekera Were a Head Teacher Primary retired on 22/7/2020 and accessed Payroll in August 2020 <p>Ms. Nyapendi Mary a Senior Education Officer IPPS 366731 retired on 12/11/2019 and accessed payroll in August 2020.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG warranted and transferred direct DDEG to LLGs in accordance with the requirements of the budget in FY 2019/20.</p> <p>The total budget for DDEG was Ugx. 515,513,000, Ref. page 4 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2019/20.</p> <p>The LG had 9 sub counties and 1 town council</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

and DDEG to LLGs were transferred for all quarters to all 10 sub counties as verified from transfer vouchers below.

Quarter 1 DDEG funds were transferred on 6th August 2019 to;

1. Voucher No. 24694482 to Ivukula S/C worth Ugx. 9,190,667
2. Voucher No. 24694483 to Kibaale S/C worth Ugx. 7,884,333
3. Voucher No. 24694602 to Nabweyo S/C worth Ugx. 8,129,333
4. Voucher No.24694484 to Nangonde S/C worth Ugx 6,659,667
5. Voucher No. 24694601 to Bulange S/C worth Ugx. 17,054,667
6. Voucher No. 24694486 to Magada S/C worth 18,279,333
7. Voucher No. 24694709 to Mazuba S/C worth 6,796,000
8. Voucher No. 24694485 to Namutumba S/C worth 14,741,667
9. Voucher No. 24694708 to Nsinze S/C worth Ugx. 10,932,000
10. Voucher No. 31091073 to Namutumba T/C worth Ugx. 14,406,667

Sub-total Q1 transfers = Ugx 114,074,334

Quarter 2 DDEG funds were transferred on 30th October 2019 to;

1. Voucher No. 24694482 to Ivukula S/C worth Ugx. 9,190,667
2. Voucher No. 26233802 to Kibaale S/C worth Ugx. 7,884,333
3. Voucher No. 26233806 to Nabweyo S/C worth Ugx. 8,129,333
4. Voucher No. 26272563 to Nangonde S/C worth Ugx 6,659,667
5. Voucher No. 26233805 to Bulange S/C worth Ugx. 17,054,667
6. Voucher No. 26233804 to Magada S/C worth Ugx. 18,279,333
7. Voucher No. 26233766 to Mazuba S/C worth Ugx. 6,796,000
8. Voucher No. 26233803 to Namutumba S/C worth Ugx. 14,741,667
9. Voucher No. 26233765 to Nsinze S/C worth

Ugx. 10,932,000

10. Voucher No. 26233764 to Namutumba T/C worth Ugx. 14,406,667

Sub-total Q2 transfers = Ugx 114,074,334

Quarter 3 DDEG were transferred on 29th January 2020 to;

1. Voucher No. 27891189 to Ivukula S/C worth Ugx. 9,190,667

2. Voucher No. 27891190 to Kibaale S/C worth Ugx. 7,884,333

3. Voucher No. 27891137 to Nabweyo S/C worth Ugx. 8,129,333

4. Voucher No. 27891191 to Nangonde S/C worth Ugx 6,659,667

5. Voucher No. 27891193 to Bulange S/C worth Ugx. 17,054,667

6. Voucher No. 27891193 to Magada S/C worth Ugx. 18,279,333

7. Voucher No. 27891150 to Mazuba S/C worth Ugx. 6,796,000

8. Voucher No. 27891192 to Namutumba S/C worth Ugx. 14,741,667

9. Voucher No. 27891149 to Nsinze S/C worth Ugx. 10,932,000

10. Voucher No. 27891138 to Namutumba T/C worth Ugx. 14,406,667

Sub-total Q3 transfers = Ugx 114,074,334

Grand total- DDEG for all three quarters = Ugx. 342,223,002

Thus, the percentage of DDEG funds transferred to LGs was $(342,223,002 / 515,513,000) \times 100$

The LG transferred 66.38% of DDEG funds to LLGs thus the LG was compliant.

10

Effective Planning,
Budgeting and
Transfer of Funds for
Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on
this Performance
Measure

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

Score: 2 or else score 0

From the IFMIS report, GOU Approved Warrant
Report Namutumba District Ref: 01-Jul-2019 to
30-Jun-2020, dated 27-11-2020, the District had
warranted DDEG funds for the FY 2019/2020 as
follows;

- Q1 DDEG funds cash limits were received on
24th July 2019, warranted on 1st August 2019
and transferred to Sub counties on 6th August
2019.

- Q2 DDEG funds cash limits were received on
07th October 2019, warranted on 23rd October

- Q3 DDEG funds grant cash limits were
received on 10th January 2020, warranted on
14th January 2020

From all DDEG transfers there was a delay by
more than 5 days from the time of receipt of cash
limits from MoFPED, to warranting and release
of funds to LLGs, thus the LG was not compliant.

0

10

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

The LG CAO invoiced and communicated a
breakdown on DDEG funds for all quarters to
HoDS as follows;

- Q1 funds were invoiced on 11th July 2019

- Q2 funds were warranted on 30th October
2019

- Q3 funds were warranted on 29th January
2020

There was no evidence that the CAO
communicated all DDEG transfers to LLGs, the
CAO communicated to the Heads of
Departments the quarterly DDEG releases not to
LLGs thus Namutumba District was non-
compliant in this area.

0

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

There was evidence that the LG conducted four supervisory visits to assess the construction of DDEG projects during FY 2019/2020 as indicated below.

In quarter 1 a multisectoral monitoring was conducted to assess the functionality and progress of project implementation of education and health centre projects. Ref: Quarter one Monitoring Report prepared by the Planner.

In quarter 2 a monitoring and inspection was conducted to assess the performance of all capital projects in the district, Ref. report dated 4th January 2020, prepared by the Ag. District Engineer submitted to the CAO on 4th January 2020.

In quarter 3 a multisectoral monitoring was conducted to assess the level of implementation of the projects, identify implementation gaps for follow up, fast track delayed projects and ensure utilization of funds. Ref: Monitoring Report for Quarter 3 FY 2019/20 prepared by the Planner.

In quarter 4 a monitoring was conducted on 15th June 2010, to assess the level of implementation of the project and ascertain the usability of a VIP project, a DDEG project at the District, Ref: monitoring report for Quarter 4 FY 2019/20 prepared by the Planner and submitted to the CAO in a letter dated 15/6/2020.

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that monitoring reports were discussed by the TPC and identified issues were recommended for action as indicated below;

The TPC meeting held on 29th October 2019 Ref; Min 2/28/10/2019 the District Planner presented quarter one monitoring report which included the functionality and progress of implementation of multiyear projects. The recommendations made included, replacing hollow doors with solid doors, improving drainage along damaged road, need to label completed projects, page 2.

The TPC meeting held on 29th June 2020 Ref; Min 2/DTPC/29/07/2020, the District Planner presented Q4 monitoring report which included the status of the progress of projects that were monitored. The recommendations made were to restore the environment (plant the grass) and clear the site, project manager was advised to ask the contractor to provide grill doors. These recommendations were to be considered in the next meeting page 3.

The TPC meeting held on 20th February 2020; Ref; Min 03 /DTPC/20/02/2020, the planner presented the findings of quarter 3 monitoring report which included the construction of Budaba P/S which had reached the slab level , construction of a five stance pit latrine at Kiranga P/S which was completed and needed to be marked and handed over officially page 4.

The TPC meeting held on 30th January 2020; Ref; Min 06/DTPC/30/01/2020, the Ag. District Engineer presented the findings of quarter 2 monitoring report FY 2019/20 which included the construction of inspection of Kagulu HC II whose construction had progressed at 85 %, construction of roads. Recommended the recruitment of more critical staff, lobbying for a complete road unit from the Ministry, and the road unit that needed to be protected by constructing a parking yard. Page 8 to 9.

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The LG maintained an asset register as per PBS Format, however it was not updated. The register was not consistent with the Accounting Manual Format.</p> <p>The LG did not maintain an updated Assets Register for land and Buildings as per Formats prescribed on pages 157 to 170 of Local Governments Financial and Accounting Manual 2007.</p> <p>Non residential worth Ux. 1,574,365,763, Roads and bridges Ug. 190,887,397, furniture and fittings Ugx 36,069,851, Others Ugx. 513, 393, 719 all accumulatively totaling to Ugx. 2,314,716,730 were additions and not included Ref; page 47 summary statement of stores and assets physical assets as at the end of the year.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence which indicated that the LG used the Board of Survey of FY 2018/19 to inform the management of assets including motor vehicles, office furniture and fittings, management decision as per section 34 of the PFMA Act 2015.</p> <p>The Board of Survey FY 2018/19 was dated 30th July 2019, CR/Adm/108 submitted to MoFPED on September 4th, 2019 made recommendations on page 20.</p> <p>The LG had the Board of Survey of FY 2019/20 dated 31st August 2020, which was submitted to the Accountant General, MoFPED on 25th September 2020 August 2019 in a letter dated 31st August 2019, CR/Adm/108. Recommendations made in the previous board of survey report were incorporated on page 20 of the Board of Survey FY 2019/20.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The Chief Administrative Officer had on 14th January 2016 August, under reference No CR/Per/156/110 appointed 10 Members to the Committee. The appointment for all 10 members was renewed on 4th May 2020, under reference No. CR/Adm/ and they included the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opolot Apollo Bernard, the Chief Administrative Officer (Chairperson) 2. Samanya Paul- Physical Planner (Secretary) 3. Ikaaba Dauda-Senior Environmental Officer (Member) 4. Isiko Muhammad-District Education Officer (Member) 	0

5. Balabalanda Khalif Hadad-District
Community Development Officer (Member)

6. Nalema Susan – District Health Inspector
(Member)

7. Kisakye David-Principal Agricultural Officer
(Member)

8. Babita Harriet- District Engineer- (Member)

9. Kabakurya Samuel- Town Clerk-Namutumba
TC (Member)

10. Kagwa Abey -District Water Officer-
(Member)

Whereas the existing Committee was functional during the FY 2019/2020, it was not fully constituted as it lacked a Physical Planner in Private Practice and a staff surveyor as evidenced by the minutes of meetings held as presented below:

- Quarter 1 meeting was held on 24th September 2019, Ref: Min 3/NDPPC/24/09/2019 discussed the building plans. Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department on 2nd November 2020 Ref: CR/Adm.
- Quarter 2 meeting was held on 8th October 2019, Ref: Min 3/NDPPC/8/10/2019 discussed and approved building plans. Minutes of the physical planning Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department on 2nd November 2020 Ref: CR/Adm.
- Quarter 3 meeting was held on 17th December 2019, Ref: Min 2/NDPPC/17/12/2019 discussed building plans. Minutes of the physical planning committee proceedings were submitted to the Commissioner Physical Planning Department on 2nd November 2020 Ref: CR/Adm.

However, only 3 sets of minutes were submitted to MoLHUD. The LG had not held quarter 4 committee meeting.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects; Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the 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 was evidence of desk appraisal of investment DDEG funded projects by the District in FY 2019/2020</p> <p>From the Namutumba District Local Government Five Year District Integrated Development Plan 2015/16-2019/20 approved under council Min. 13/27/04/2015 the following were planned DDEG projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement of the laptops, page 73 of DDP Plan 73 • Construction of pit latrine at page 74 • Supply of 3-seater desks at page 74 • Drilling of boreholes page 79 • Completion of administration block page 75 <p>The District Budget Conference held on 8th November 2018 discussed capital service delivery investments for FY 2019/20, ref; page 2. During the conference, the planner made a presentation on all DDEG projects for FY 2019/20. A report on the budget conference dated 12th November 2018 was prepared and submitted to the CAO on 12th November 2018.</p> <p>The DTPC meeting held on 16th January 2019 under ref: Min.4 /DTPC/16/01/2019 presented and discussed departmental workplans/action plans for FY 2019/2020, page 6.</p>	2
----	---	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects: e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided on field appraisal of DDEG financed projects</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else score 0.

There was evidence that project profiles were developed and prepared for investments in the AWP and the formats were in line with the LG planning guidelines.

The LG had planned for one project under the AWP FY 2020/21 as evidenced on page 10 of the AWP, was costed at Ugx. 164,457,000

The TPC meeting held on 30th January 2020, Min 4/DTPC/30/01/2020 discussed project profiles for all investment projects FY 2020/21. The Chair asked members to take note of whether the planning and budgeting process, environmental mitigation measures were incorporated. With the input from the meeting the consolidated investment profile document was to be part of the annual action plan for FY 2020/2021.

From the sampled project profile, the format of project profile was as below,

Department: Administration

Sector: Administration

Title of Project: Partial Completion of Administrative Block Plans IV

Implementing Agency: Namutumba District Local Government

Location: District headquarters (Kaiti)

Total Planned Expenditure: Ugx. 162,457,000

Funds secured: Ugx 162,457,000

Funding Gap: NIL

Recurrent expenditure: NIL

Start date: July 2020

Completion date: December 2021

Project objectives: To provide good working environment and office space to all staff

Targeted beneficiaries: All staff and clients at the units

Project Background and Justification: Staff had no offices which affected the permeance of the District in terms of service delivery.

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 evidence that the LG had screened for environmental and social risks/impact of approved projects for construction using checklists for example;</p> <p>i. Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Budaaba primary school in Budaaba village, Nabwego sub county. Endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer on 9th July 2019.</p> <p>ii. Construction of a 4 stance pit latrine at Namutumba District Head Quarters in kaiti village, Namutumba sub county. Endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer on 10th July 2019.</p> <p>iii. Construction of District Administration Block Phase 3 in Kaiti village, Nautumba Sub County. Endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer on 7th July 2019.</p> <p>However the CDO had not endorsed on the screening forms yet the indicator required that both CDO and Environment Officer endorse therefore the LG scored zero.</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 were only one Infrastructure project for the current FY implemented using the DDEG was incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan of 2020/2021 in the Namutumba District Local Government Council Meeting held on 20th May 2020. MIN: COU/NDLG/20/5/2020</p> <p>PPDA-Eastern Region Office Mbale received on 18th August 2020.</p> <p>MFPED received on 2nd September 2020.</p> <p>Approved AWP on 28th May, 2020. MIN 7/28/5/20.</p> <p>Partial completion of Administration block phase IV. Namu574/Srvcs/20-21/00001 Under open domestic bidding, signing date: 10 July 2020</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Minute of the Namutumba Contracts Committee meeting held on 30th September 2020 for the Partial completion of Administration block phase IV: Min12/NDCC/30/09/2020-21-i, worth UGX. 144, 380,080.</p> <p>The awardee contractor was M/s Ailwar General Works (U) Ltd.</p>	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 of Project Implementation Team	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Budaba Primary school (Nabweyo Sub county) The latrine is in good shape. The contractor fixed a ramp The Metallic doors well fitted well fitted. Completion report dated 28th April 2020, The latrine is in good shape. The contractor fixed a ramp The Metallic doors well fitted well fitted. Construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at the District headquarters Work completion certificate dated 8th June 2020	1

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 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 as was observed from the sampled infrastructure projects,

Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Budaba Primary school (Nabweyo Sub county)
Procurement Ref No: Namu574/WRKS/19-20/00023 by PAB Contractors Company Ltd.

- Certification files: Form 8 28th April 2020
- Completion certificates :N/A Defect Liability Period
- LPO dated 5th May 2020.
- Voucher Payment No: 29406365
- Dated: 21st May 2020
- Signed S&E compliance: 28th April 2020
- Supervision Status Report on works executed on 28th April 2020 by Assistant Engineering Officer – Kumbuga Frank

Construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at the District headquarters Procurement Ref No: Namu574/WRKS/19-20/00024 Contractor: PAB Contractors Company Ltd.

- AWP No: Namu574/WRKS/19-20/00024 page 7
- Certification files: (final) No. 1 dated 8th June 2020
- Completion certificates: Still under DLP
- LPO dated 17 June 2020
- Voucher Payment No: 30525151
- Dated: 26TH June 2020
- Signed S&E compliance: 20th June 2020
- Supervision Report on works executed on 8th June 2020 by DE to CAO.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	The LG had verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract for instance: Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Budaba Primary school (Nabweyo Sub county), the works was complete by 28th April 2020, and requisition was initiated on 21st May 2020 by the contractor and payment effected on 21st May 2020 as per the voucher No: 29406365. Construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at the District headquarters, the works was complete by 8th June 2020, and requisition was initiated on 17 June 2020 by the contractor and payment effected on 26th June 2020 as per the voucher No: No: 30525151. All payment were executed within the required timeframe of thirty (30) days.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	The LG did not have complete files for the Procurements for the FY 2020/2021 the only one availed was as follows, Contracts register 2020/2021 available. Procurement files available: For instance: Minute of the Namutumba Contracts Committee meeting held on 30th September, 2020 for the Partial completion of Administration block phase IV: Min12/NDCC/30/09/2020-21-i, • Advert: ODB dated 10th July 2020 in the Daily Monitor • Requisition forms PPF1: Nil • The Evaluation report dated: Nil • Minutes of 30th September, 2020 Contracts Committee Meeting decision date: Nil • Min12/NDCC/30/09/2020-21-i, • BEB Notice: Nil • Letter of Bid Acceptance: 16th October 2020 • Bidder's acceptance: 21st October 2020 • The awardee contractor was M/s Ailwar General Works (U) Ltd. • Contract agreement: 28th October 2020. • Amount: worth UGX. 144, 380,080.	0

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant. Score: 2 or else score 0	At the time of assessment, the LG had no evidence of a designated person to coordinate response to feed-back grievances / complaints. Therefore, the LG scored zero.	0
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. If so: Score 2 or else 0	At the time of assessment, the LG did not have evidence of a specified system for Recording, investigating and responding to grievances. The assessment team was provide with a printed sheet of paper with grievances as evidence of a centralized complaints log for recording grievances. This was not accepted as admissible evidence therefore the LG scored zero	0
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0	At the time of assessment, the LG did not have evidence of publicized grievance redress mechanisms for aggrieved parties to know where to report and get redress. therefore the LG scored zero	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	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	There was evidence that the Environment Social and Climate change interventions had been integrated into the LG Development Plan, AWP and Budgets Development as observed below; From a sampled project indicated in the District Integrated Development Plan 2015/16-2019/20 approved under council Min. 13/27/04/2015 • For construction of classroom blocks, IEA measures were cited on page 110, of the DDP and budgeted for in AWP under monitoring supervision and appraisal budget was 50,000,000, page 33 of the budget estimate. For Drilling of 14 deep bore wells Environmental Impact assessment and mitigation measures were observed on page 123 of the DDP, monitoring, supervision, and appraisal of capital works was cited on page 43 19,802,000.	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence which indicated that DDEG guidelines were disseminated to LLGs as observed in Minutes for the DTPC meeting held on 20th February 2020. Ref: Min: 2/DTPC/20/02/2020, dissemination of the discretionary development equalization grant (DDEG) guidelines for September 2019, page 2. During the DTPC meeting members from the Sub counties were in attendance as observed from page 1 and 2 of the minutes.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costing Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the LG incorporated costing Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, for example;</p> <p>i. In the contract document of construction of a 4 stance pit latrine at Namutumba District Head Quarters in kaiti village, Namutumba sub county, Environment and Social Management Plans were not costing in the BoQs.</p> <p>iii. Construction of District Administration Block Phase 3 in Kaiti village, Nautumba Sub County. Environment and Social Management Plans were not costing in the BoQs. Therefore the LG scored zero because the indicator required incorporated costing Environment and Social Management Plans in the BoQs.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had a project with costing of the additional impact from climate change for example; Construction of 4 stance latrine at Namutumba District Head Quarters there was an additional impact from climate change by planting of four (4) trees, planting paspalum grass around the pit latrine.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all 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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment the LG provided a certificate of title, freehold register volume 665, folio 25, of area 87.4 hectares. Located in Busiki County, Namutumba District, known as Plot 34 Busiki Block 22. Ownership Namutumba District LG P.o Box 53. Dated 31st August 2009. The title certified that the two projects (construction of Administration Block and pit latrine) at the District headquarters were located on District land.</p> <p>However, Budaba primary school was located on church land and the LG had no documentation to that effect yet they carried out construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at the school therefore the LG scored because the indicator required evidence that all projects were implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was no evidence to prove that the Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs</p>	0

<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had Environment and Social compliance Certification forms completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors for example;</p> <p>Certificate form dated 28th April 2020 completed and signed by the Senior Environment Officer and CDO for construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Budaba primary school.</p> <p>ii. Certificate form dated 20th June 2020 completed and signed by the Senior Environment Officer and CDO for construction of 4 stance pit latrine at Namutumba District Headquarters.</p> <p>iii. Certificate form dated 20th June 2020 completed and signed by the Senior Environment Officer and CDO for completion of Administration Block at Namutumba District Headquarters.</p>
---	--	--

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

There was evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations up to end of FY 2019/2020 as at 30th June 2020 but not all bank accounts were reconciled up to 30th September, 2020 as indicated below;

- The Treasury Single Account (TSA) comprising departmental Accounts maintained at Bank of Uganda A/C No. 005740528000000 was reconciled up to 31st October 2020.
- Namutumba DLG General Fund Account A/C No. 95060200000607 was reconciled up to 31st August 2020.
- Namutumba Youth Livelihood Project Recovery Account A/C No. 9030014969771 was reconciled up to 30th June 2020.
- Namutumba District Revenue Collection Account A/C No. 005740168000001 was reconciled up to 30th June 2020.
- Namutumba ACDP Account A/C No. 95060200000629 was reconciled up to 30th June 2020.
- Namutumba Building Resilience Account A/C No. 95060200000704 was reconciled up to 30th June 2020.
- Namutumba DCU UMFSN Project A/C No. 9030014969925 was reconciled up to 30th June 2020.
- Namutumba District UWEP Recovery Account A/C No. 9030014966373 was reconciled up to 30th June 2020.

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

There was evidence that the LG had prepared all quarterly Internal Audit Reports as indicated below;

- Quarter 1 was prepared on 18/10/2019
- Quarter 2 was prepared on 31/01/2020
- Quarter 3 was prepared on 23 /06/2020
- Quarter 4 was prepared on 30/07/2020

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had provided IA information to the LG Council/Chairperson and the LG PAC.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The status reports on IA were submitted and acknowledged by the LG Chairperson and the LG PAC on the following dates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 1 was received on 18/10/2019 as noted from the delivery book acknowledgment of receipt, dated 18 October 2020. • Quarter 2 was received on 31/01/2020, as noted from the delivery book acknowledgment of receipt, dated 31 January 2020. • Quarter 3 was received on 23/05/2020, as noted from the delivery book acknowledgment of receipt, dated 23rd June 2020. • Quarter 4 was received on 30/07/2020, as noted from the delivery book acknowledgment of receipt, dated 30th July 2020. 	
			<p>These reports were submitted to the District Speaker and copied to the Resident District Commissioner, Internal Auditor General, MoFPED, Chairperson Audit Committee, Eastern Region, Auditor General, Chairperson District Public Accounts Committee, Chief Administrative Officer.</p>	
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p>	<p>There was evidence provided on review of the internal audit reports by the LG PAC.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had prepared a PAC report which indicated that Q1 of the Internal Audit report had been reviewed as evidenced by a PAC report produced on 29th February 2020 Ref: CR/252 on review of Internal Audit Report for the period July-September, 2019, FY 2019/20.</p>	
			<p>There was no evidence indicating that Q2, Q3 and Q4 Audit Reports had been reviewed by the LG PAC thus the LG was non-compliant.</p>	

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the revenue collected was not within the required +/- 10 %.</p> <p>From the Draft financial statements 2019/20, page 23 of the Statement of Appropriation of Accounts, the Local revenue was projected at Ugx 134,000,000 and the Actual local revenue collection realized was Ugx 156, 837,329, Ref: page 40 of the statement of performance of revenues. This translated into a revenue collection ratio of 117% which was 17.0% above the target and was outside the required range of +/- 10% range.</p>	0
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>There was evidence that the LGs OSR increased in FY2019/20 compared to FY 2018/19</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY2018/2019 was Ugx. 95,785,025 as shown on page 9 of the Final Accounts FY2018/2019.</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2019/2020 was Ugx. 156, 837,329, as shown on page 40 of Financial statement ended 30th June 2020.</p> <p>Thus Ugx.156,837,329 (FY 2019/2020) minus Ugx 95,785,025 (FY 2018/2019)</p> <p>This was an increase of Ugx 61,052,304</p> <p>$61,052,304 / 95,785,025 \times 100 = 63.73\%$</p> <p>This was an increase in revenue, of 63.73% increase which translated into 36.2% collection. This was more than the required range of 5-10%.</p>	2
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues as per 85 of LGA and fifth schedule (part V)</p> <p>Local Revenue collections subjected to sharing with LLGs was Ugx. 103,350,025 as observed from Page 41 of Final Accounts FY 2019/2020</p> <p>Total LST remitted on 26th June 2020 was Ugx 53,214, 213 as verified from the following vouchers;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher No. 30525197 to Namutumba S/C worth Ugx. 8,155,875 2. Voucher No. 30525202 to Nsinze S/C worth Ugx. 9,762,513 3. Voucher No. 30525194 to Ivukula S/C worth Ugx. 6,955,000 	0

4. Voucher No. 30525199 to Bulange S/C worth Ugx. 4,342,000

5. Voucher No. 30525198 to Magada S/C worth Ugx. 5,290,025

6. Voucher No. 30525203 to Mazuba S/C worth Ugx. 1,187,550

7. Voucher No. 30525200 to Nabweyo S/C worth Ugx. 3,055,000

8. Voucher No. 30525196 to Nangonde S/C worth Ugx. 1,628,250

9. Voucher No. 30525195 to Kibaale S/C worth Ugx. 2,873,000

10. Voucher No. 30525201 to Namutumba T/C worth Ugx. 9,965,000

The LG received an advance of Ugx. 114,450,015 from MoFPED, out which the LG shared Ugx. 76,300,010 on 26th June 2020 to LLGs as verified from the vouchers below;

1. Voucher No. 30525197 to Namutumba S/C worth Ugx 11,308,394.

2. Voucher No. 30525202 to Nsinze S/C worth Ugx. 5,280,769

3. Voucher No. 30525194 to Ivukula S/C worth Ugx. 6,280,769

4. Voucher No. 30525199 to Bulange S/C worth Ugx. 5,380,769

5. Voucher No. 30525198 to Magada S/C worth Ugx. 2,780,769

6. Voucher No. 30525203 to Mazuba S/C worth Ugx. 2,780,769

7. Voucher No. 30525200 to Nabweyo S/C worth Ugx. 8,162,035

8. Voucher No. 30525196 to Nangonde S/C worth Ugx. 5,380,769

9. Voucher No. 30525195 to Kibaale S/C worth Ugx. 2,780,769

10. Voucher No. 30525201 to Namutumba T/C worth Ugx. 9,965,000

Sub-total= $(50,135,812/114,450,015) \times 100 = 43.8\%$

The District remitted only 43.8 % of the advance revenue received in FY 2019/20 against the requirement of 65% contrary to Section 85 of LGA and Fifth Schedule (Part V).

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts were published on district notice board for instance an advert dated 16th December 2019; and BEB Notice: 30th January 2020</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG published the LGPA results for 2018/19 as observed from Namutumba District website https://www.namutumba.go.ug which was accessed on 27th November 2020.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District conducted discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation.</p> <p>This was observed from the spot message script held on 2nd July 2020 at Busoga One Radio prepared by the communications officer. CR/Adm/201</p> <p>A report on quarter one radio talk show about the activity held on 30th September 2019 at 87.7 Baba FM, in Bugembe Town Council was availed and it was dated 4th October 2019.</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 no evidence provided on publicly availing the tax information on tax rates, collection procedures and procedures for appeal.</p>	0
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence on preparation of the IGG report including a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status. This was because the Council had no such cases that warranted the intervention of the IGG.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG PLE pass rate had not improved and had a negative of 11.5 between the previous school year but one and the previous year, for example, in 2018 the total number of candidates for PLE was 5,036. Those who passed were as follows:</p> <p>Grade I: 370, Grade II: 1,849 and Grade III: 1,333. The total number of those who passed between Grade 1 and III was 3,552 which gave a % of $3552/5036 \times 100 = 70.5\%$.</p> <p>In 2019 the candidates who sat for PLE were 5310 and those who passed in Grade I were 180, grade II were 1691 and in grade III were 1,260 which gave a total of 3131 pupils who passed between Grade 1 and III. The % was $3131/5310 \times 100 = 58.9\%$.</p> <p>Therefore, the increase was a negative improvement by 11.5%.</p>	0
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>The UCE pass rate had improved by 1.1%% between the previous school's year but one and the previous year, for example,</p> <p>In 2018, the number of candidates who sat for UCE was 1,281 and the total who passed was 464.</p> <p>Therefore, the pass rate was $464/1,281 \times 100 = 36.2\%$</p> <p>In 2019 the number of candidates was 1380 and the total of 516 passed.</p> <p>Therefore, the pass rate was $516/1,380 \times 100 = 37.3\%$</p> <p>Therefore, the performance improvement was $37.3 - 36.2 = 1.1\%$ increase.</p>	2

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>LLG performance assessment was not conducted the previous FY.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 		
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education development grant had been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines for example, the development grant was used for renovation 4- classroom blocks at Buwidi P/S at a cost of UGX 44,000,000 and construction of 5-stance latrines at Katengerere P/S at a cost of UGX 22,000,000.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DEO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors for renovation of 4 classroom blocks at Buwidi P/S for UGX 44,000,000 dated 17/6/2020. The DEO also certified works at Katengerere P/S for construction of 5-stance latrines payment of UGX 22,000,000 dated 21/6/2020. There was no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO certified payment at the TIME of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

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
 $\pm 20\%$ of the MoWT
estimates score 2 or else
score 0

According to the contracts, the following were
established: For instance:

a) Construction of 5 stances lined pit latrine at
Namutumba Primary school (Namutumba TC)
Reference No, Namu 574/Wrks/19-20/00005; with the
MoWT's estimates (Reserve Price) were UGX,
22,000,000, while contractors' estimates were UGX.
21,999,637 with a variation of UGX.363 equivalent to
0.0016%. Therefore, the LG scores 2 points since the
variation in the contracts was within $\pm 20\%$.

Contractor: Prosper Engineering Services.

Contract agreement dated 5th March 2020.

b) Construction of 5 stances lined pit latrine at
Namalowe Primary school (Namutumba Sub County)
Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00003; with
MoWT's estimates (Reserve Price) were UGX,
22,000,000, while contractors' estimates were UGX.
21,989,772 with a variation of UGX.10,228 equivalent
to 0.04%. Therefore, the LG scores 2 points since the
variation in the contracts was within $\pm 20\%$.

Contractor: Ms. Native Investments Ltd

Contract agreement dated 5th March 2020.

c) Re-roofing of a Four Classroom block Buwidi
Primary school (Maganda S/county) Reference No,
Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00001; with MoWT's estimates
(Reserve Price) were UGX, 44,000,000, while
contractors' estimates were UGX. 44,000,000 with a
variation of UGX.0 equivalent to 0%. Therefore, the LG
scores 2 points since the variation in the contracts was
within $\pm 20\%$.

Contractor: Namunhanha Construction Company Ltd

Contract agreement dated 5th March 2020.

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

There were three sampled Education projects, for the
previous FY all completed on time, For instance:

Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namutumba
Primary school (Namutumba TC). Procurement
Reference No, Namu 574/Wrks/19-20/00005; Minutes
from contracts committee meetings Minute
32/NDCC/30/01/2019-20(vi),

Commencement: 12th March 2020 expected to 12th
June 2020 but, 24th April 2020,

Certificate No. 1. For payment Issued on date: 24th
April 2020.

Voucher No. 29335262. Dated 11th May 2020

Certificate of Practical completion dated: Was ending
in October and still in process.

Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namalowe
Primary school (Namutumba sub county)

Procurement Reference No, Namu 574/Wrks/19-
20/00005; Minutes from contracts committee meetings
Minute 32/NDCC/30/01/2019-20(iv),

Commencement: 5th March 2020 expected to 5th June
2020 but, 24th April 2020,

Certificate No. 1.; for payment Issued on date: 24th
April 2020.

Voucher No. 29317108. Dated 6th May 2020.

Certificate of Practical completion dated: Not yet Was
ending 24th October and still in process.

Re- roofing of a Four Classroom block Buwidi Primary
school (Maganda S/county) Reference No,
Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00001;

Minutes from contracts committee meetings Minute
32/NDCC/30/01/2019-20(ii),

Commencement: 5th March 2020 expected to 5th June
2020 but, 24th April 2020,

Certificate No. 1. for payment Issued on date: 25th May
2020.

Voucher No. 30525153. Dated 26th June 2020.

Certificate of Practical completion dated: Still under the
DLP (6 Months).

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>The LG had recruited 1,438 primary school teachers with a wage bill of UGX 9,076,622,411 as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines.</p> <p>Therefore $1,438/1,438 \times 100 = 100\%$</p>	3
---	---	---	--	---

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>The schools in LG that met the basic requirements and minimum standards were 104 out of 109 schools. Therefore $104/109 \times 100 = 95.4\%$</p> <p>The percent was above 70.</p> <p>For example, the 3 sampled schools had, a Vision, workplan, list of management committees, National Flag and Flag pole, Motto, Minutes, records and pupils' clubs.</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>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG had accurately reported on teachers and where they were deployed according to deployment Staff list. For example, at Nawampandu P/S which was sampled had a head teacher and 18 teachers, Isegero P/S had a head teacher and 9 teachers and St. Jude Nakisi P/S had a head teacher and 15 teachers.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that LG had a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools dated 26/11/2020.</p>	2
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 – 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There were 109 schools out 109 registered Primary schools had submitted reports. For example, Isegero P/S report was dated 5/12/2019.</p> <p>Therefore $109/109 \times 100 = 100\%$</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that 109 UPE schools were supported to prepare and implement SIPs, for example, Isegero P/S, Nawampandu P/S and St, Jude Nakisi had prepared and submitted SIPs plans to DEO dated 2/2/2020. Therefore $3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$</p>	4

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG had collected and compiled return forms for 109 registered schools for year 2019/2020 and submitted on 6/1/2020.</p> <p>Therefore, $109/109 \times 100 = 100\%$.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had budgeted UGX 9,117,076,622,411 for 1,438 teachers (a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers) per school for the current FY 2020/2021. Therefore, $1,438/1,438 \times 100 = 100\%$.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had deployed 1,438 teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY. For example, at Nawampandu P/S which was sampled had a head teacher and 18 teachers, Isegero P/S had a head teacher and 9 teachers and St. Jude Nakisi P/S had a head teacher and 15 teachers.</p>	3
---	--	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>It was evident that the teacher deployment data was disseminated. However, the three sampled schools namely, Isegero, Nawampandu and St. Jude Nakisi P/S had not displayed the information on the Notice Boards.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that 109 Head teachers were appraised out of 109 Head teachers. Therefore $109/109 \times 100 = 100\%$. The appraisal reports were in one box file. The names of headteachers and dates of appraisal were however not captured</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that all the Secondary School Head Teachers were appraised and reports submitted by the D/CAO to the HRM. The SHRO said they had not started working appraisal of the H/Ts of the 5 secondary schools in Namutumba DLG. Score is 0</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans

score: 2. Else, score: 0

The LG Education Department had 5 staff and they were appraised as follows.

1. Mr. Isiko Mohammed, the DEO was appraised by Mr. Aloysius Aloka the CAO on 7/7/2020 with overall performance rating of 69%

2. Mr. Kalisengawa Fred, the Senior Inspector of Schools was appraised by the DEO on 20/6/2020 and endorsed by the PAS on 10/7/2010

3. Mr. Bwaita Godfrey Nathanael, the Sports Officer was appraised by the DEO on 1/4/2020 and endorsed by the PAS on 4/7/2020

4. Ms. Namugwano Sarah, the Education Officer –SNE was appraised by the SIS on 5/7/2020 and endorsed by the DEO ON 30/6/2020

5. Ms. Batana Damalie Juliet, SEO was appraised by the DEO on 30/6/2020 and endorsed by the PAS 10/7/2020

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 2 Else, score: 0

The LG had prepared a training plan and budgeted for in the District Budget for 2019/2020 at a meeting dated 9/11/2019 under Min.4/INSP/2019. For example, Record Keeping and Management.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>It was noted that the LG had confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually, according to the submission made on 15/7/2019 and acknowledged on 15/7/2019.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines in accordance with the budget allocation of UGX 45,000,000 dated 15/7/2019.</p> <p>The total amount allocated was UGX 45,000,000 and money released was, $45,000,000/45,000,000 \times 100 = 100\%$</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG submitted the PBS time stamp capitation grants for three quarters. This was cited on the PBS, GOU Approved Warrant Report Namutumba District Ref: 01-Jul-2019 to 30-Jun-2020, dated 27-11-2020 and GoU Cash Limits Report as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term 1 capitation grant cash limits were received on 24th July 2019 and warranted on 10th August 2019. • Term 2 capitation grant cash limits were received on 8th January 2020 and warranted on 10th January 2020 • Term 3 capitation grant cash limits were received on 8th April 2020 and warranted on 14th April 2020 <p>Term one warrants were submitted beyond 5 days; from the date of receipt of cash limits thus the LG was non-compliant.</p>	0

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>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>There was Evidence that the LG had invoiced and the DEO/ MEO had communicated! publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED. For example,</p> <p>In quarter 1, it was dated 19/9/2019, with amount of UGX 294,826,000, in quarter 2, was dated 5/2/2020 with amount of UGX 294,826,000 and in quarter 3 with amount of UGX 294,826,000 dated 12/5/2020.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>		
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department had prepared inspection plans dated 20/2/2020 in a meeting held on 20/2/2020 under Min.8/INSP/2020.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>All the 109 UPE schools had been inspected and monitored as dated 9/1/2019 Under Min.3/INSP/ in 2019.</p> <p>Therefore, $109/109 \times 100 = 100\%$</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The inspection reports had been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions and that those actions were subsequently followed-up. For example, in a meeting held on 9/11/2019, the issue discussed was on, Record keeping in schools, under Min.4/INSP/2019. For example, term 3 inspection report was dated 18/11/2019.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that one out of 3 sampled schools had the inspection report for term 3 left in St. Jude Nakisi P/S in 2019. However, Isegero and Nawampandu Primary schools could not find the reports at the time of assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence on a council responsible for education discussing and reviewing service delivery issues.</p> <p>The LG had an Education Committee which had discussed education service delivery issues as follows;</p> <p>The Committee meeting held on 27/08/2019, Min 02/EDUC/AUG/27TH 2019, presentation and discussion of education department reports. The meeting reviewed the performance of pupils, the rate of performance, the implementation of UPE, Co-curricular activities, capital projects and emergency construction Ref. page 1 and 2.</p> <p>The Committee meeting held on 28/02/2020, Min 7/Educ/28th/Feb/2020, presentation and discussion of the results of UPE and USE by the Chairperson. Further, under Min.8/Educ/28th /Feb/2020 the DEO presented the UPE and USE results in 2018 and 2019, discussed the co-curricular activities sports, progress of construction activities. The meeting tasked the DEO to follow up with headteachers on circulating the performance of their respective schools.</p> <p>Council meeting held on 17th October 2019 Min. 83/Council/17/10/2019, presentation of the District state of address, on page 1 the District Chairperson, presented the Annual Education performance /service delivery and indicated that the education department activities were progressing well.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, score: 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school in a workshop conducted by the DEO office on 5/11/2019 at Namutumba P/S which was attended by Headteachers and SMC members. The objective of the workshop was to sensitise the participants on their roles and responsibilities. The second activity was to guide the SMC members in the development of SIPs as indicated in a training report dated 5/11/2019.</p>	2

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, score: 2, else score: 0	There was evidence that the 3 sampled schools had Asset Registers, namely, Isegero P/S was dated 30/12/2019, Nawampandu P/S was dated 31/12/2019 and Nakisi P/S was dated 31/12/2019.	2
12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP 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	<p>There was evidence indicating that the investments projects for education were derived from the development plan, prioritized in the AWP and discussed by the DTPC.</p> <p>From the DDP the following projects were cited,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Construction of 50 classrooms, was derived from page 73 of the DDP plan and page 74• Construction of 4 stance pit latrines was derived from page 74 of the DDP• Procurement of 720 3-seater desks was derived from page 74 of the DDP• Installation of the 20 lightening arrestors was derived from page 74 of the DDP <p>The TPC held on 16th January 2019 presented and discussed of departmental workplans / actions plans for FY 2019/2020, Ref: Min 4/DTPC/16/01/2019, page 6 to 7.</p> <p>The Budget conference report on proceedings of the District Budget conference held on 8th November 2018 presented and discussed capital service delivery investments FY 2019/2020, Ref: Budget Conference Report dated 12th November 2018, page 4.</p> <p>Thus, the LG was compliant in this area.</p>	1
12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0	By the time of the assessment, there was no evidence provided on project field appraisal for education projects.	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Education infrastructure projects were incorporated in the Namutumba District LG procurement plan and approved on an unavailable date; Minute: Nil and date submitted to CAO: Nil.</p> <p>However, the Department of Education submitted its Nine sector infrastructure projects to PDU on</p> <p>a) Construction of Nabweyo Seed Secondary School Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00005</p> <p>b) Construction of 2 two classroom block at Kisowozi primary school. Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00006.</p> <p>c) Construction of 2 two classroom block at Katengereira primary school. Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00007</p> <p>d) Construction of 2 two classroom block at Kagulu primary school. Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00008</p> <p>e) Construction of one stance pit latrine at St. Paul Buwongo. Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00009</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>As per the education infrastructure investments the Council had contracts committee minutes.</p> <p>Minutes of the 18th Contracts committee meeting for the FY 2020/21 held on Monday, 30th June 2020 in the Planning Unit.</p> <p>83/NDCC/30/06/2019-20 Approval of procurement method, bidding documents, invitation to bid advert and bidding fee</p> <p>Contract Committee Chairperson: Mr. Naabye Henry the District Planner.</p> <p>Construction of 2 two classroom block at Kisowozi primary school. Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00006 of Min. 12/NDCC/30/09/2020-21-iv</p> <p>Construction of 2 two classroom block at Katengereira primary school. Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00007 of Min. 12/NDCC/30/09/2020/21-v.</p> <p>Construction of 2 two classroom block at Kagulu primary school. Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00008 of Min. 12/NDCC/30/09/2020/21-</p> <p>However, for the current FY, there were no education infrastructure investments requiring SG approval.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the PIT was established</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>All the Education/ school infrastructure projects followed the MoES technical designs.</p> <p>Spot measurements at Namutumba Primary school had the 5 stance pit latrine meeting the MOH standard technical designs.</p> <p>At Namalowe Primary school, the 5 stance pit latrine was complete however, with a crack in the wall and there was no manhole cover.</p> <p>The Namutumba Seed Secondary School is 93% complete when you consider the BOQ specifications. Finishing works still undergoing. However, the playground is still pending and fixing the drainage and water runoff.</p> <p>There were D/Engineer's reports on the education project works as shown below:</p> <p>a) Supervision Report of construction of Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namutumba Primary school (Namutumba TC) dated 27th April 2020. All works were done according to specification as per the certificate No. 1 dated 24th April 2020</p> <p>b) Supervision report for construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namalowe Primary school (Namutumba Sub County) dated 24th April 2020. All works were done according to specification as per the certificate No. 1 dated 24th April 2020</p> <p>c) Status report of Re- roofing of a Four Classroom block Buwidi Primary school (Maganda S/county). Floor casting and finishing, door fitting on all four class rooms, plastering re-roofing and painting were as per site instructions issued by the DE.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>List of sector specific infrastructure projects in AWP for FY 2019/2020:</p> <p>Namu574/Wrks/19-20/0001- Re- roofing of a Four Classroom block Buwidi Primary school</p> <p>Namu574/Wrks/19-20/0002- construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Buwalira Primary school</p> <p>Namu574/Wrks/19-20/0003- construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namalowe Primary school</p> <p>Namu574/Wrks/19-20/0005- Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namutumba Primary school</p> <p>Reports and Minutes from site monitoring visits:</p> <p>a) Supervision Report of construction of Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namutumba Primary school (Namutumba TC) dated 27th April 2020. All works were done according to specification as per the certificate No. 1 dated 24th April 2020</p> <p>b) Supervision report for construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namalowe Primary school (Namutumba Sub County) dated 24th April 2020. All works were done according to specification as per the certificate No. 1 dated 24th April 2020</p> <p>c) Status report of Re- roofing of a Four Classroom block Buwidi Primary school (Maganda S/county). Floor casting and finishing, door fitting on all four class rooms, plastering re-roofing and painting were as per site instructions issued by the DE.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>During supervision, there was full participation of engineers, environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction</p> <p>a) Minutes for site meeting No2. For construction of Nawanpadu Seed Secondary School in Namutumba District dated 5th March 2020 and 13th September 2020. Member included RDC, DCDO, DEO, DE, BOG members, District Planner, Education Officer Special Needs, Internal Auditor, SPO, and Head procurement, Managing director of company, politicians Safety and Health Officer, Chairman LC5.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG provided evidence which indicated that all payment requests for sector infrastructure in FY 2019/2020 were initiated and executed as per contract and implementation results.</p> <p>From the Projects undertaken by Namutumba payments were made for stages that were satisfactorily completed and approved as per signed contracts; For instance</p>	1

1. Zuka Investment Ltd was contracted to construct a five-stance lined pit latrine at Nakazinga P/S on 5th March 2020 at a contract sum of Ugx. 21,704,566. Zuka Investments Ltd raised a request for payment worth Ugx. 19,681,259. on 1st June 2020. The DEO initiated the payment which was certified by the Ag. DE, and CAO on 15th June 2020. Payment for works certificate worth Ugx. 19,570,897 was prepared by the Assistant Engineer, DEO, District Engineer, Principal Internal Auditor and CAO on 15th June 2020. A payment report for constructions worth Ugx. 19,570,897 was prepared by the Assistant Engineering Officer (MoES) on 11th June 2020 and noted by the Ag District Engineer on 15th June 2020. Requisition for payment was prepared by the DEO, CFO, and CAO approved it on 18th June 2020 worth 20, 619, 337. Payment was done on 26th June 2020, worth 19,382,178. VR. 30525132

2. Kajaib Contractors and Designers Namutumba was contracted to construct a five-stance lined pit latrine at Namuwondo P/S on 5th March 2020 raised a request for payment worth Ugx. 21,999,896 on 25th May 2020. The DEO initiated the payment which was certified by the Ag. DE, and CAO on 15th June 2020. Payment for works certificate worth Ugx. 19,837,194 was prepared by the Assistant Engineer, DEO, District Engineer, Principal Internal Auditor and CAO on 5th March 2020. A payment report for constructions worth Ugx. 19,837,194 was prepared by the Assistant Engineering Officer (MoES) on 25th May 2020 and noted by the Ag District Engineer on 27th May 2020. Requisition for payment was prepared by the DEO and approved by the CFO and CAO on 1st June 2020 worth 20,899,900. Payment was affected on 26th June 2020, worth 19,645,906, VN. 30525141

3. Prospa Engineering Ltd was contracted to construct a five-stance lined pit latrine at Namutumba P/S on 5th March 2020 at a contract sum of Ugx. 21,999,637. Prospa Engineering Ltd raised a request for payment worth Ugx. 21, 999,637 on 20th April 2020. Payment for works certificate worth Ugx. 19,836,960 was prepared by the Assistant Engineer, DEO, District Engineer, Principal Internal Auditor and CAO on 5th March 2020. A payment report for constructions worth Ugx. 19,836,960 was prepared by the Assistant Engineering Officer (MoES) on 24th April 2020 and noted by the Ag District Engineer on 27th April 2020. Payment was remitted on 11th May 2020, worth 19,645,675, VR. 29335262

All the above payments were initiated and executed as per contracts, thus the LG was compliant.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Education sector procurement plan had been submitted to the PDU.</p> <p>Contract implementation progress reports were not readily available at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Minutes of the 6th Contracts Committee Meeting for the FY 2019/2020 held on 6th December 2019 in the District Service Commission Board room. The committee included:</p> <p>Contract Committee Chairperson: Mr. Naabye Henry the District Planner.</p> <p>Member present:</p> <p>Isiko Muhammed -DEO</p> <p>Samanya Paul-Physical Planner</p> <p>Kawunguzi Rose- IT Personnel</p> <p>Kisanafu Yusuf- Senior Procurement Officer</p> <p>Minutes from contracts committee meetings include:</p> <p>Re- roofing of a Four Classroom block Buwidi Primary school : Min. 22/NDCC/06/12/2019-20-ii</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Buwalira Primary school: MIN22/NDCC/06/12/2019-20-iii</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namalowe Primary school:Min.2/NDCC/30/01/2019-20-iv.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>Evidence on file showed that the LG had a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records in the Previous FY. For example:</p> <p>Minutes of the 6th Contracts Committee Meeting held on 6th December 2019 in the District Service Commission Board room.</p> <p>Re- roofing of a Four Classroom block Buwidi Primary school : Min. 22/NDCC/06/12/2019-20-ii</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advert: 16th December 2019 • Requisition forms PPF1: 30th July 2019 • The Evaluation report dated 24th January 2020 • Minutes of award of Contracts Committee Meeting decision dated, 30th January 202; Min. 32/NDCC/30/01/2019-20-ii • BEB Notice: 30th January 2020 • Letter of Bid Acceptance: 17th February 2020 • Bidder's acceptance: 21st February 2020 • The awardee contractor was Namunhanha 	1

Construction Company Ltd

- Contract agreement: 5th March 2020

- Contractor's procurement reference:
Namu574/Wrks/19-20/0001

Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Buwalira Primary school

Minutes from contracts committee meetings
MIN22/NDCC/06/12/2019-20-iii

- Advert: Selective Bidding 16th December 2019

- Requisition forms PPF1: 30th July 2019

- The Evaluation report dated 24th January 2020

- Minutes of award : Min. 32/NDCC/30/01/2019-20-iii

- Contracts Committee Meeting decision dated, 30th January 2020.

- BEB Notice: 30th January 2020

- Letter of Bid Acceptance: 17th February, 2020

- Bidder's acceptance: 18th February 2020

- The awardee contractor was Ms. Sseka Group of Companies Ltd.

- Contract agreement: 5th March 2020.

- Contractor's procurement reference:
Namu574/Wrks/19-20/0002

Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namalowe Primary school

- Advert: Selective Bidding 16th December 2019

- Requisition forms PPF1: 30th July 2019

- The Evaluation report dated 24th January 2020

- Minutes of award of Min. 32/NDCC/30/01/2019-20-iv

- Contracts Committee Meeting decision dated, 30th January 2020

- BEB Notice: 30th January 2020

- Letter of Bid Acceptance: 17th February

- Bidder's acceptance: Letter missing

- The awardee contractor was Ms. Native Investments Ltd.

- Contract agreement: 5th March 2020

- Contractor's procurement reference:
Namu574/Wrks/19-20/0003

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG did not have evidence of grievances / complaints recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework under the Education sector therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that LG had disseminated the Education</p> <p>Guidelines in a meeting held on 29/7/2019 at Basoga Nsadhu Technical Institute where the DEO, Under Min.5/05/2019 distributed the Education Guidelines on Budgeting, Planning and Implementation Guidelines for Primary and Secondary Schools.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG had evidence of cost ESMPs that were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents for example;</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namutumba primary school in Namutumba Town Council. Ref: NAMU 574/wrks/19-20/00005. BoQ Element E, (F) provide a lump sum for clearing the site and plant grass and trees as may be instructed. Costed at UGX 40,000. ii. Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kiranga primary school in Kibaale sub-county. Ref: NAMU 574/wrks/00008. BoQ Element F, (c) 100 litre plastic placed on ground concrete base, complete with all accessories, costed at UGX 400,000. Element E (f) provide lump sum for clearing the site and plant grass and trees as maybe instructed. Costed at UGX 300,000.iii. Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Buwalira primary school in Nangode sub-county. Ref: 574/wrks/19-20/00002 BoQ Element E, Environment mitigation measures (F) Provide a lump sum for clearing the site and plant grass and trees as maybe instructed. Costed at UGX 90,000.</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>At the time of assessment there was no evidence to prove that the LG had proof of ownership of land at the schools where the boreholes were drilled. For example; Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrines at Kiranga primary school, Namutumba primary school and Buwalira primary school.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO had conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment and Social certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example;</p> <p>Certification forms for Namutumba primary school approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO on 27th April 2020.</p> <p>ii. Certification forms for Kiranga primary school approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO on 19th June 2020.</p> <p>iii. Certification forms for Buwalira primary school approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO on 25th May 2020.</p>	1

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>Sampled 3 health facilities: Nsinze Hc IV, Namutumba HC III, and Nabisoigi HC III, compared the total OPD for FY 2018/19 with that of 2019/20; and also compared total deliveries for FY 2018/19 to those of 2019/20.</p> <p>OPD</p> <p>A) Total FY 2018/19 = 33, 900</p> <p>B) Total FY 2019/20 = 37,277</p> <p>Difference = (B-A) = 3,377</p> <p>% Change = (A-B/A) x 100% = 10%</p> <p>Deliveries</p> <p>A1) Total FY 2018/19 = 2036</p> <p>B1) Total FY 2019/20 = 2549</p> <p>Difference = (A1-B1/A1) x 100% = 25.1%</p> <p>Scored OPD scored only 10% increase in service utilization (Less than 20%), but the health facility achieved 25.1% increase in deliveries (more than 20% increase in service utilization).</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70% and above; score 2 • 50 – 69% score 1 • Below 50%; score 0 	xxx	0

2

Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

Note: To have zero wait for year one

b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:

- 75% and above; score 2
- 65 – 74%; score 1
- Below 65; score 0

Namutumba district LG had 6 health facilities participating in Result Based Financing (RBF) during the last quarter of FY2020/2021 (July-September 2020). These 6 health facilities had scored as follows when they were assessed by the DHO. team:

Nsinze HC IV scored 98.8%

Namutumba HC III scored 96.9%,

Nabisoigi HC III scored 96.1%

Magada HC III scored 93.2%

Bulange HC III 92.1%, and

Ivukula HC III scored 93%

The average score was above 75%.

2

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent the health development grant on eligible activities.

The total health grant was Ugx. 2,363, 793,000, Ref: page 2 of the LG budget estimates FY 19/20

According to the LG budget estimates, Ref: page 23 the following were budgeted for;

- Renovation of maternity ward at Nabisoigi HC worth 18,459,000
- Renovation of female ward at Nsinze HCIV worth 26,946,000
- construction of main gate at Nsinze worth Ugx 16,000,000
- Renovation of maternity ward and laboratory at Magada HII, WORH 20,000,000

As per the LG budget performance: page 57 the performance of health grant was 402%

Thus, in FY 2019/2020 the District had budgeted and spent all the health development grant on eligible activities as per the Health Grant guidelines.

2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0

From sampled vouchers, certification of works for all Health Projects Contracts were done before payment to suppliers in FY 2019/2020. For instance;

1. For payment worth Ugx. 35,333,380, VR. No. 30525165 made on 26th June 2020 to Munhanha Construction Company Ltd towards renovation of a maternity ward at Nsinze HC IV. Certification of works

was done by the Assistant Engineer Officer on 18th June 2020 and payment certificate was prepared by the Senior Assistant Engineering Officer, approved by the District Engineer, and verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 18th June 2020. The DHO raised a requisition for which was recommended by the CFO, and approved by the CAO on 19th June 2020 worth 38,913,145

2. Payment worth 15,820,407, VR. 30525153 made on 26th June 2020 to Namunhanha Construction Company Ltd towards renovation of a maternity ward at Nabisoigi HCIII on 21st May 2020. Certification of works was done by the Assistant Engineer Officer on 16th June 2020

The payment certificate was prepared by the Senior Assistant Engineering Officer, approved by the District Engineer, and verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 17th June 2020. The DHO raised a requisition for payment which was recommended by the CFO, and approved by the CAO on 18th June 2020 worth 16,830,220

3. Payment worth 17,423,301, VR. 30525146 made on 25th June 2020 to Visvar Investments Ltd towards upgrading of Kagulu HC II to HC III on 21st May 2020. Certification of works was done by the DHO and the Assistant Engineer Officer on 18th June 2020. The payment certificate was prepared by the Senior Assistant Engineering Officer, approved by the District Engineer, and verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 18th June 2020. The DHO raised a requisition for payment which was recommended by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 18th June 2020.

These payments were made after certification of works was done by the DHO. However, there was no evidence on certification of works by the Environment Officer and CDO before the LG made payments to the suppliers, hence the LG was non-compliant in this area.

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

Namutumba District Local Government had 5 Health Infrastructure projects.

According to the sampled contracts, the following was established:

a) Renovation of the female ward at Nsize HCIV (Nsinze Sub-county) Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00028;

with MoWT's estimates (Reserve Price) was UGX, 22,946,194, while contractors' estimates were UGX. 42,945, 422 with a variation of UGX.19, 999,228 equivalent to -87%. Therefore, the variations in the contracts were way above +/-20%.

Contractor: Namunana Construction company Ltd.

Contract agreement dated 21st May 2020.

b) Renovation of laboratory at Maganda HC III (Maganda Sub-county) Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00030, with MoWT's estimates (Reserve Price) were UGX, 10,000,000, while contractors' estimates were UGX. 9, 850,000 with a variation of UGX.150,000 equivalent to 1.5%. Therefore the variation in the contracts was within +/- 20%.

Contractor: Sseka Group of Companies Ltd.

Contract agreement dated 21st May 2020.

c) Renovation of Maternity ward at Nabisoigi HCIII (Kibaale TC). Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00029

with Engineer's estimates (Reserve Price) were UGX, 18,989,449, while contractors' estimates were UGX. 18,855,220 with a variation of UGX. 134,229 equivalent to 0.7%. Therefore, the variation in the contracts was within +/-20%.

Contractor: Namunana Construction company Ltd.

Contract agreement dated 21st May 2020.

Based on the aforementioned, not all contracts variations were within the allowable +/-20%.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY

- If 100 % Score 2
- Between 80 and 99% score 1

The Health Infrastructure projects, for the previous FY, were all completed as per work plan/Consolidated procurement plan. For instance:

a) Renovation of female ward at Nsize HCIV (Nsinze Sub county) Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00028;

Contract agreement dated: 21st May 2020.

Commencement: 21st May 2020, expected to end on 21st June 2020, however it was extended to 18th

• less than 80 %: Score 0 June 2020.

Certificate No.1, dated 18 June 2020.

LPO: 20TH June 2020

Payment Issued on date 26th June 2020.

Voucher No: 30525165

Certificate of Practical completion dated: Still under DLP.

b) Renovation of laboratory at Maganda HC III (Maganda Sub-county) Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00030;

Contract agreement dated: 21st May 2020.

Commencement: 21st May 2020, expected to end on 21st June 2020, however it was extended to 15th June 2020.

Certificate No.1, dated 15 June 2020.

LPO: 20TH June 2020

Payment Issued on date 26th June 2020.

Voucher No: 3052515

Certificate of Practical completion dated: Still under DLP.

c) Renovation of Maternity ward at Nabisoigi HCIII (Kibaale TC). Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00029

Contract agreement dated: 21st May 2020.

Commencement: 21st May 2020, expected to end on 21st June 2020, however it was extended to 17th June 2020.

Certificate No.1, dated 17 June 2020.

LPO: 20th June 2020

Payment Issued on date 26th June 2020.

Voucher No: 30525153

Certificate of Practical completion dated: Still under DLP.

4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	Namutumba District LG had staffing norm of 309 staff, 178 staff on post and a wage bill of 2, 162,563,656/= at the time of assessment. This meant a staffing level of 58%. For instance, Nsinze HC IV lacked anesthetic Officer and Anethethetic Assistant, Assistant Educator, a second Clinical Officer among others.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	The LG health infrastructure construction projects were as per the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs. For instance: Construction works of upgrading Kagulu HCII to III which commenced on 30th January 2019. It was expected to end on 30th July 2019. But there were extension of periods to 30th October 2019, request date 30TH August 2019; then up to March 2020 letter request dated 31st October, 2019.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	It was completed 18th June 2020, although currently under the Defect Liability Period (DPL). The following were noticed:	
			Foundation, walling, room sizes, roof structure sampled are as per designs (according to the applicable level of the construction) The workmanship was professional.	
			There is precast concrete class 20; 20mm aggregate : finished fair on all exposed surfaces including bedding and jointing in cement sand (1:3) mortar	
			Solid Concrete block-work jointed and pointed in cement sand (1:3) mortar with and including hoop iron wall ties in every alternative course.	
			The measurements of the iron sheets (G. 28) taken comply with industry accepted building dimensions. There was a lightening arrester also installed at the Kagulu HCII.	
			Wheras Kagulu HCIII was complete however, the contractor installed hollow doors instead of solid cored flash doors. The water spills in the labor suit does not drain into the trap.	

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Number of staff on pay roll for the three sampled health facilities was as follows: Nsinze HC IV had 36, Namutumba HC III had 16 and Nabisoigi HC III had 19. Site visit and inspection of staff lists and duty rosters confirmed the staffing as provided on the payroll by the DHO. Number of staff on pay roll matched those on staff list and duty rosters found at health facilities.</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>Facilities reported constructed in FY 2019/2020 included: renovation of Maternity ward at Nabisoigi, Renovation of Female ward at Nsinze, Upgrading Kagulu HC II to HC III, Renovation of laboratory at Magada HC III, Construction of a Gate and Akari shelter at Nsinze HC IV. These works appeared in PBS AWP and Budget of FY 2019/20.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>The three sampled health facilities had submitted their Annual Work plans and Budgets for FY 2019/2020 after March 31st 2019.</p> <p>Nsinze HC IV and Nabisoigi HC III Annual Work Plans and Budgets were available at the DHO's office but the dates of submission had not been indicated on the documents. Namutumba HC III had submitted its Annual Work Plan and Budget to Town Clerk Naamutumba on 2nd September 2019.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence to show that the sampled health facilities namely Nsinze HC IV, Namutumba HC III and Nabisoigi HC III had prepared and submitted their Annual Budget performance Reports for FY 2019/2020 by July 15th 2020 to the DHO/CAO as required. No such document was availed to the assessment team.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>All the three sampled health facilities namely Nsinze HC IV, Namutumba HC III and Nabisoigi HC III had developed Performance Improvement Plans for FY 2020/21 and all the three had submitted them to the DHO Namutumba district 28th August 2020, The PIPs had incorporated performance weakness issues identified in the assessment.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The sampled health facilities namely Nsinze HC IV, Namutumba HC III, and Nabisoigi HC III had submitted monthly (HMIS 105) and quarterly (HMIS 106a) into the district DHIS2 system 100% and timely 100% as required during FY 2019/20.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance

Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Nabisoigi HC III had submitted on 13th October 2020, Nsinze HC IV, and Namutumba HC III had submitted on 27th October 2020. Only 1 of the 3 sampled health facilities had submitted RBF claim Invoices timely by 15th of the month following the 1st quarter (July-Sept 2020).

0

6

Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance

Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.

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

Namutumba District LG had verified, compiled and submitted RBF claim invoices that had been submitted by health facilities to the MOH (electronically by e-mail) on 29th October 2020. This was beyond the 3rd week of October 2020

0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Health Department quarterly performance reports were submitted beyond one month of the next quarter as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 1 was submitted on 11th November 2019 • Quarter 2 was submitted on 20th January 2020 • Quarter 3 was submitted on 30th April 2020 • Quarter 4 was submitted on 18th August 2020. <p>The Health quarterly budget performance for Q1 and Q4 were submitted beyond the first month of the following quarter.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Namutumba DHO/DHT had developed an approved PIP 2020/2021 and submitted to CAO/DTPC on 28th October 2020 and to MoH on 31st October 2020</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 Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>By the time of assessment, Namutumba district LG had not yet received RBF funds to implement FY 2020/21 PIP. Implementation of the PIP had not yet been effected.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Namutumba District LG had a staffing norm of 309 staff, 178 staff on post and a wage bill of 2, 162,563,656/= at the time of assessment. This meant a staffing level of 58%. For instance, Nsinze HC IV lacked anesthetic Officer and Anethethetic Assistant, Assistant Educator, a second Clinical Officer among others.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Standard staffing norms for HC III was 19 workers, HC IV was 49 workers.</p> <p>By the time of assessment, Nsinze HC IV had 36/49 (73.5%) Namutumba HC III 16/19 (84.2%) and Nabisoigi HC III 19/19 (100%) on their staff deployment lists. One health facility had staffing level below 75%</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The staff found on lists and duty rosters in the sampled Health Facilities; Nsinze HC IV, Namutumba HC III and Nabisoigi HC III matched with deployment lists given by DHO for FY 2020/2021.</p>	3
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment the health facilities had publicized health worker lists on manila paper on facility noticeboards or walls, but they were not dated.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the</p>	<p>The LG had --- health facilities and appointed an in-</p>	1

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

charge in each of the health facility. The health facility in-charges were appraised as follows.

1. Ms. Kiwala Moreen an Enrolled Nurse in-charge Bugobi HCII was appraised by the SAS Bualange on 30/6/2020 and endorsed by the DHO on 30/7/2020 and CAO on 22/9/2020

2. Mr. Balikowa Robert, a Clinical Officer in-charge Ivukula HCIII was appraised by Mr. Ndhaye Richard, a SMCO on 15/7/2020 and endorsed by the DHO on 19/8/2020 and PAS on 24/8/2020 with overall performance rating of 4.

3. Mr. Walujjo Emmanuel, an Enrolled Nurse In-charge Kagulu HCIII was appraised by Ms. Mukhokosi Janet, AN/O 27/6/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and PAS on 7/7/2020 and 12/8/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 3

4. Mr. Kyakuterekera Paul a SCO in-charge Bulange HCIII was appraised by the Dr. Kiirya James, a Medical Officer on 21/7/2020 and endorsed by the CAO on 13/10/2020 with overall performance rating of 5.

5. Ms. Kateme Harriet, a SMCO in-charge Nabisoigi HCIII was appraised by Dr. Isabirye Robert on 20/7/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and CAO on 11/8/202 and 24/8/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 5.

6. Mr. Ndhaye Richard a SMCO in-charge Namutumba HCIII was appraised by Mr. Kabakubya Samuel, the Pricncipal Township Office Namutumba Town Council on 3/8/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and CAO on 11/8/2020 and 24/8/2020 respectively with overall performance rating 4.

7. Ms. Wamwendeire Florence, a Clinical Officer in-charge Magada HCIII was appraised by Mr. Kamiza R.W. Tom, a SMCO on 11/7/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and CAO on 25/7/2020 and 29/7/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 4.

8. Dr. Isabirye Robert a Medical Officer in-charge Nsinze HC IV was appraised by Dr. Kiirya James the DHO on 11/8/2020 and endorsed by the CAO on 24/8/2020 with overall performance rating of 5

9. Ms. Namulondo Irene, an Enrolled Nurse in-charge Namuwondo HCII was appraised by Mr. Ndhaye Richard a SMCO on 4/7/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and CAO on 30/7/2020 and 22/9/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 5

10. Ms. Nsooli Joyce, an Enrolled Nurse in-charge Kisimu HCII was appraised by Mr. Ndaye Richard a SMCO on 3/8/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and CAO on 30/8/2020 and 22/9/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 4.

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

The LG appraised 9 out of 10 health workers for 2019/2020 as indicated below.

1. Dr. Lubiite Allan, a Medical Doctor deployed at Nsinze HCIV was appraised by Dr. Isabirye Robert, a Medical Officer on 31/7/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and CAO on 11/8/2020 and 24/8/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 5.

2. Ms. Namansa Martha, an Assistant Nursing Officer at Nabisoigi HCIII was appraised by Ms. Kateme Harriet a SMCO on 30/6/2020 and endorsed by the DHO on 9/9/2020 with overall performance rating of 4

3. Mr. Simiyu Isaac, a Nursing Officer at Magada HCIII was appraised by Ms. Wamwendeire Florence a MCO on 2/7/2020 and endorsed by the CAO on 9/9/2020 with overall performance rating of 4

4. Ms. NamudopeAnnet, a Nursing Assistant at Ivukula HCIII was appraised by Kwesonsa Betty an Enrolled Nurse on 5/7/2020 and endorsed by Mr. Mwesigwa Charles and PAS for CAO on 5/7/2020 and 12/8/2020 respectively with overall performance rating not indicated.

5. Ms. ChemayekPhilis an Enrolled Nurse at Namutumba HCIII was appraised by Mr. Ndhaye Richard, a SMCO 3/8/2020 and endorsed by the DHO and PAS on 30/8/2020 and 22/9/2020 respectively with overall performance rating of 4

6. Mr. Gombaniri Jeremiah, an Assistant Entomological Officer at Nsinze HCIV was appraised by Dr. Isabirye Robert on 3/8/2020 and endorsed by the DHO on 9/9/2020 with overall performance rating of 4

7. Ms. Mukhokosi Janet an AN/O at Ivukula HCIII was appraised by Mr. Balikowa Robert a Clinical Officer on 2/7/2020 and endorsed by the DHO on 10/9/2020 with overall performance rating of 4

8. Ms. Hissa Florence Racheal an Enrolled Nurse at Bulange HCIII was last appraised by Mr. BalyejusaMohamadi on 8/6/2019 and endorsed by the DHO and PAS 2/8/2019 and 12/8/2019 respectively with Overall performance rating of 4

9. Ms. Kiiza Louis an Enrolled Nurse at Nabisoigi HCIII was appraised by Ms. AlucheireHildah a MCO on 8/10/2020 and endorsed by Mr. Mwesigwa Charles a MCO on 12/10/2020 with overall performance rating of 4

10. Mr. Kawanguzi Milton a Medical Records Assistant at Kaiti HCII was appraised by Mr. Isabirye Julius the District Biostatistician on 29/9/2020 but not endorsed by any one, with overall performance rating of 4.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of corrective actions taken based on the appraisal reports.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>In a report dated 19th August 2019, the DHT had conducted Annual Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health (RMNCAH) symposium.</p> <p>In another training activity report dated 2nd July 2020 indicated that the DHT had conducted a TOT training on the new HMIS tools (HIV tools and Non-HIV tools), 17th to 28th June 2020.</p> <p>The DHT could have done more in this area, unfortunately CPD was a funding gap in the AWP & Budget for FY 2019/20</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had a hard copy of CPD database documented in a counter book</p>	1
Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>In an E-mail letter dated 2nd September 2020 the CAO had written to the PS Ministry of Health confirming facilities that were due to benefit from PHC- Non-Wage Recurrent for the current FY 2020/2021.</p>	2

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.

There was no evidence that LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines.

0

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG made warrants of the PHC NWR releases for all quarters. This was cited on the PBS, GOU Approved Warrant Report Namutumba District Ref: 01-Jul-2019 to 30-Jun-2020, dated 27-11-2020 and GoU Cash Limits Report as indicated below;

- Q1 PHC grant cash limits were received on 24th July 2019 and warranted on 1st August 2019.
- Q2 PHC grant cash limits were received on 07th October 2019 and warranted on 15th October 2019
- Q3 PHC grant cash limits were received on 14th January 2020 and warranted on 24th January 2020
- Q4 PHC grant cash limits were received on 14th April 2020 and warranted on 15th April 2020

However, warrants for Q1, Q2 and Q3 were submitted beyond 5 days; from the date of receipt of cash limits thus the LG was non-compliant.

0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The CAO invoiced and communicated a breakdown of Primary Health Care Conditional Grant to all health facility in charges in lower Health facilities as follows;

From MoFPED quarterly circulars on expenditure limits to all accounting officers Local Governments were as follows.

- Quarter 1: was dated 7th July 2019; Ref: MET.50/268/01

- Quarter 2: was dated 2nd October 2019; Ref: MET.50/268/01

- Quarter 3: was dated 8th January 2020; Ref: MET.50/268/01

- Quarter 4: was dated 8th April 2020; Ref: MET.50/268/01

From Namutumba Gou Invoice Register and the CAOs quarterly communications on PHC releases to HCs it was observed that;

- Quarter 1: was invoiced on 12/07/2019 and a communication on the release was dated 02/09/2019

- Quarter 2: was invoiced on 30/10/2019 and a communication on the release was dated 15/10/2019

- Quarter 3: was invoiced on 10/02/2020 and a communication on the release was dated 10/02/2020

- Quarter 4: was invoiced on 28/04/2020, there was no communication.

From the bank statements of sampled Health Facilities PHC funds were received as follows;

- Nsinze HC IV Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 PHC funds worth Ugx. 13,775,250 per quarter were received on 20/08/2019, 6/11/2019, 16/03/2020, 07/05/2020 respectively.

- Nabisoige HC III, Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 PHC funds worth Ugx. 3,222,000 per quarter were received on 20/08/2019, 6/11/2019, 16/03/2020, 07/05/2020 respectively.

- Namutumba HC III, Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 PHC funds worth Ugx. 3,712,035 per quarter were received on 20/08/2019, 6/11/2019, 16/03/2020, 07/05/2020 respectively.

From the above information, there was a delayed communication in releases of PHC funds to the sampled Health Facilities, thus the LG was not compliant.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>By the time of assessment Namutumba District LG had publicized all health facilities receiving PHC NWR on noticeboards.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From available evidence adduced at the time of assessment, Namutumba DHT conducted quarter 2 performance review meeting on 17th December 2019, and Quarter 3 review meeting on 26th January 2020</p> <p>In Minute 3/17/12/2019 of the quarter 2 review meeting, the introduction of RBF program in Namutumba district had been discussed and indicated that initial assessment for RBF initiation into the district health facilities was to be conducted in January 2020. The meeting had recommended that the health facilities be prepared well before assessment so that they qualify for the program. As a follow-up action, a departmental meeting report dated 12th February 2020 indicated that the DHT had implemented recommendations made in Quarter 2 &3 review meeting reports, preparations for the RBF assessment had been done.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Attendance lists appended to the Quarterly Performance review meetings indicated that the review meetings involved all Facility in-charges; Departmental heads such as DEO, District planner, District Program Officer for RHITES-EC, CDO, ACAO-Health</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>By the time of assessment the LG had only one (1) HC IV and only one (1) functional HSD based at Nsinze HC IV. The district had no hospital.</p> <p>Reports available at the time of assessment, indicated that the Health Educator 97th October 2019, 13th December 2019,; the CAO had visited the health facility on 19th December 2019 and 9th January 2020; the full integrated DHT supervised the facility in 4th quarter from 5th to 13th May 2020, and ADHO-MCH supervised the facility 7th May 2020.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Busiki HSD based at Nsinze HC IV conducted support supervision of lower health facilities III and II in all the 4 quarters during FY 2019/20. The facilities supervised included: Bulange hC III, Namutumba HC III, Magada HC III, Bukonte HC II, Nabisoigi HC III, Ivukula HC III, Nabweyo HC II.</p> <p>Among issues identified for corrective action were: Lack of running water in laboratories and maternity wards; Absenteeism, untrained HUMC committees, Poor management of medical wastes, and lack of Personal Protective equipment among others</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>By the time of assessment the DHT had carried out a number of mentorship trainings to address weak areas. For example during Quarter II Support Supervision conducted in November 2019 one of the objectives was to conduct mentorship to weak areas., therefore during the supervision the teams conducted CB-DOTS on sight mentoring in Bulange HC III, Namutumba HC III, Magada HC III and Nsinze HC IV; and conducted mentoring in Disease Surveillance in Bugobi HC II, Namuwondo HC II, Irimbi HC II, and Malama HC II; Again during Quarter III support supervision conducted March 2020, the teams conducted mentorship in COVID-19 management in the health facilities that had been supervised including Nsinze HC IV, and Namutumba HC III,</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Namutumba district LG health department had a Medicines Management and Surveillance Focal Person (MMS-FP), MS Naigaga Doreen who was also the Assistant Inventory Officer. She witnessed the delivery of medicines by the NMS and the last mile delivery of medicines to health facilities by THREE WAYS contracted firm.</p> <p>The MMS-FP also conducted quarterly supervision during FY 2019/20 and the following were some of the challenges observed during her supervision activities:</p>	1
			<p>A lot of polypharmacy; stock cards and stock books not filled in some facilities, Vaccine control books not filled, Bats infestation in some facilities. Corrective recommendations were made.</p>	
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence on allocation of at least 30% of the District Health Office Budget to Health Promotion and prevention activities.</p> <p>Allocated funds to PHIs office was = UGx.92,245,000</p> <p>The total funds allocated to promotion activities was Ugx. 47, 206,000 Ref: quarter 4 report, page 24 promotion and prevention activities</p> <p>The percentage allocated to promotion was $(47,206,000/92,245,000) \times 100 = 51.2\%$</p> <p>The 51.2% was within the allowable 30% that was spent on promotion and prevention activities, thus the LG was compliant in this area.</p>	2
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>DHO's report dated 9th March 2020 indicated that Environmental Health and Sanitation, Mass Measles-Rubella Immunization campaign, Family Planning outreaches, and Safe Male circumcision. Children had also been dewormed during Child Days., Health Education and Promotion had been conducted, , home visiting and inspection of public places had been conducted during FY 2019/20, Health education was conducted in clinics and the district had put in place preventive measures for COVID-19</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>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>At the time of assessment there was evidence in the sampled health facilities that the district had implemented COVID-19 SOPs. Particularly hand washing, social distancing and wearing masks in the health facilities</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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 District health Department had only inventory report dated 24th July 2020</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)); score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence indicating that the investments projects for health were derived from the development plan, prioritized in the AWP and discussed by TPC.

From the DDP , page 78, the LG had planned for the following investment projects in the health department;

- Construction of stance house
- Construction of five staff house
- 20 4 distance pit latrines
- Fencing of 3 health units
- Construction of 3placenta pits
- Renovation on Nsinze health IV
- Supply of patient's beds
- Installation of solar panels at three health centre units

The TPC held on 16th January 2019 presented and discussed departmental workplans / actions plans for FY 2019/2020 including health departmental workplans, Ref: Min 4/DTPC/16/01/2019, page 7.

The Budget conference report on proceedings of the District Budget conference held on 8th November 2018 presented and discussed capital service delivery investments FY 2019/2020, Ref: Budget Conference Report dated 12th November 2018, page 5.

Thus, the LG was compliant in this area.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0

There was no evidence that the LG had conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions.

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures before being approved for construction using the checklist. However, this was done without the CDO's input yet the CDO and Environment Officer are required to do so jointly. Therefore, the LG scored zero. Examples of the screened Health Facilities were; Installation of gate and Askari's room at Nsinze Health Center IV located in Nsinze sub county. Forms were filled and signed by the Environment Officer on 8th July 2019.</p> <p>ii. Renovation of Maternity ward at Nabisongi Health Center III in Namutumba sub county. Forms were filled and signed by the Environment Officer on 9th July 2019.</p> <p>iii. Renovation of Laboratory at Magada Health Center III. Forms were filled and signed by the Environment Officer on 8th July 2019.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Submission letters to the PDU/memos were not available</p> <p>The AWP was available. Example include:</p> <p>a) Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00002: Fencing of Kagulu HcIII. page 4</p> <p>b) Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00003: Remodeling of Maternity ward and Partial fencing of Bulange HCIII. page 4</p> <p>c) Namu574/Wrks/20-21/00004: Renovation of theatre and Nsinze HCIV. page 4</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Memos of copy of Form PP1 to PDU not submitted.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>Minutes of the Namutumba district contracts committee meeting held on 2ND March 2020 in the District Service Commission room.</p> <p>Tenth Contracts Committee meeting minutes for the previous FY evidenced for instance the contracts committee meeting held on 2nd March 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation of female ward at Nsize HCIV (Nsinze Subcounty) Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00028; Min 41/NDCC/02/03/2019-20-i • Renovation of laboratory at Maganda HC III (Maganda Sub-county) Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00030, Min 41/NDCC/02/03/2019-20-iii • Renovation of Maternity ward at Nabisoigi HCIII (Kibaale TC). Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00029; Min 41/NDCC/02/03/2019-20-ii • Construction works of upgrading Kagulu HCII to III under UgIFT- Lot 4 <p>Contract Ref No: unknown</p> <p>Awarded to Visvar Investment Ltd on unknown date and Minute.</p> <p>The Solicitor General letter not seen</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The PIT was not constituted as there was no evidence.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>		

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

e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0

All infrastructure health projects followed the standard technical designs provided by the M0H and those designs and BOQs provided by the LG Engineer

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

If there is no project, provide the score

Sampled project:

Nsinze Health Center IV was inspected and some measurements were taken and validated using the standard technical designs. The Workmanship was good, windows fitted with glass panes, walking lane refurbished, fixed lightning conductor, painting in good visual assessment for internal and external walls and 3 doors were re-fixed.

Kagulu HCIII was completed however, the contractor installed hollow doors instead of solid cored flash doors. The water spills in the labor suit does not drain into the trap. The DE indicated that they had informed the contractor to have these anomalies rectified.

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

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

Progress report for the Upgrade of Kagulu Health Centre II dated 8th March 2019, 8th May 2019, 6th June 2019 and 18th June 2019.

Progress report for the Upgrade of Kagulu Health Centre II dated, 30th June 2020.

Monitoring Report for Upgrading of Kagulu Health Center II to HCIII dated 8th May 2019.

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

If there is no project, provide the score

Minutes of site meeting or Upgrading of Kagulu Health Center II to HCIII held at Kagulu Health Center II on 11th March 2020. Members present included PAS, Contractor, District Planner, DHO, DE, Head PDU, and Chairperson LC 3.

Namatumba District Local Government Joint Stakeholders Monitoring meeting held at Kagulu HCIII Construction site held on 7th August 2019. Member present included the CAO, DHO, Ag, DE, c/o, Environmental Officer, DCDO, Ag SAS, C/P HMC, Contractors representative.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence of monthly site meetings. However, there was one record of 'Namutumba District Local Government Joint Stakeholders Monitoring meeting held at Kagulu HCIII Construction site held on 7th August 2019. Member present included the CAO, DHO, Ag, DE, c/o, Environmental Officer, DCDO, Ag SAS, C/P HMC, Contractors representative.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>DE report on technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDO. For instance: Namutumba District Local Government Joint Stakeholders Monitoring meeting held at Kagulu HCIII Construction site held on 7th August 2019. Member present included the CAO, DHO, Ag, DE, c/o, Environmental Officer, DCDO, Ag SAS, C/P HMC, Contractors representative.</p>	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>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the sampled contracts there was evidence that all payment requests from suppliers were verified and initiated by the DHO: For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For payment worth Ugx. 35,333,380, VR. No. 30525165 made on 26th June 2020 to Munhanha Construction Company Ltd towards renovation of a maternity ward at Nsinze HC IV. The contractor had raised the request for payment on 18th June 2020 worth Ugx. 42,945,422. Certification of works was done by the Assistant Engineer Officer on 18th June 2020 and payment certificate was prepared by the Senior Assistant Engineering Officer, approved by the District Engineer, and verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 18th June 2020. The DHO raised a requisition which was recommended by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 19th June 2020 worth 38,913,145. 2. For Payment worth 15,820,407, VR. 30525153 made on 26th June 2020 to Namunhanha Construction Company Ltd towards renovation of a maternity ward at Nabisoigi HCIII on 21st May 2020. The Contractor had raised the request for payment on 17th June 2020 worth Ugx. 18,855,220. Certification of works was done by the Assistant Engineer Officer on 16th June 2020. The payment certificate was prepared by the Senior Assistant Engineering Officer, approved by the District Engineer, and verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 17th June 2020. The DHO raised a requisition for payment which was recommended by the CFO, and approved by the CAO on 18th June 2020 worth 16,830,220 3. For payment worth 17,423,301, VR. 30525146 made on 25th June 2020 to Visvar Investments Ltd towards upgrading of Kagulu HC II to HC III on 21st May 2020. The supplier had raised the request for payment on 26th May 2020 worth Ugx. 83,465,216. Certification of works was done by the DHO and the Assistant Engineer Officer on 18th June 2020. The payment certificate was prepared by the Senior Assistant Engineering Officer, approved by the District Engineer, and verified by the Principal Internal Auditor on 18th June 2020. The DHO raised a requisition for payment which was recommended by the CFO and approved by the CAO on 18th June 2020. <p>The DHO initiated and verified the payment to Viscar after 17 days which was after 2 weeks thus the LG was not compliant.</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>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>Renovation of female ward at Nsize HCIV (Nsinze Sub county) Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00028; date and means of advert was Selective Bidding dated 16th March 2020 closing on 31st March 2020. The Evaluation report: 24th April, 2020. Minutes of Contracts Committee Meeting decision dated, 5th May 2020; Min 58/NDCC/05/05/2019-20-I and BEB Notice: 5th May 2020.</p> <p>Renovation of laboratory at Maganda HC III (Maganda Sub-county) Reference No, Namu574/Wrks/19-20/00030 date and means of advert was Selective Bidding dated 16th March 2020 closing on 31st March 2020. The Evaluation report: 24th April, 2020. Minutes of Contracts Committee Meeting decision dated, 5th May 2020; Min 58/NDCC/05/05/2019-20-iii and BEB Notice: 5th May 2020.</p>	1
----	--	---	--	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG had no any evidence of grievances / complaints and there was no proof of a Grievance Redress Committee.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was no evidence that the LG had Disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities. The LG stated that they had not received guidelines for FY 2019/2020. A copy of the guidelines on record were those of 2013, titled Health care workers guide 2nd edition 2013 disseminated in FY 2015/2016. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG had no evidence of a copy of contract to show that there was a service provider contracted to manage medical waste. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had conducted a three (3) day training of the District health management team on infection, prevention, control held on 30th June to 2nd July 2020 at the District Headquarters to create awareness in healthcare waste management. There was evidence of an attendance book were members that were presented signed for example the ADHO Ssegonga Margaret, the Medical Officer Dr. Isabirye Robert, the Health Inspector Mugoya Juma.</p>	1
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>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence of costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY. Therefore the LG scored zero. For example:</p> <p>Contract document for Installation of gate and Askari's room at Nsinze Health Center IV located in Nsinze sub county. Ref: NAMU 574/wrks/19-20/000161, and Renovation of Female Ward at Nsinze Health Center IV in Namutumba sub county. Ref: NAMU 574/wrks/19-20/00028. Therefore the LG scored zero.</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>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was no evidence that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership. For example Nsinze Health Centre IV, Magada Health Centre III, Nabisongi Health Centre III. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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.	At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for; Nsinze Health Centre IV, Magada Health Centre III, and Nabisongi Health Centre III respectively. Therefore the LG scored Zero.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence of Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO. Prior to payments of contractor. For example;</p> <p>i. Certificate form for Renovation of Maternity Ward at Nsinze Health Center IV by M/s Munhanha Construction company limited dated 18th June 2020 completed and signed by the Environment Officer and CDO mitigation cost at UGX 225,000.</p> <p>ii. Certificate form for Renovation of Maternity Ward at Nabisongi Health Center III by M/s Namunhanha construction limited dated 20th June 2020 completed and signed by the Environment Officer and CDO mitigation cost at UGX 1,085,000.</p> <p>iii. Certificate form for construction of Main gate and Asakari's room at Nsinze Health Center IV by M/s Namunhanha construction limited not dated completed and signed by the Environment Officer and CDO mitigation cost at UGX 87,500.</p> <p>iv. Certificate form for Renovation of Laboratory at Magada Health Center III by M/s Seka Group of companies dated 17th June 2020 completed and signed by the Environment Officer and CDO mitigation cost at UGX 100,000.</p>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	From the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS sector data report, it was observed that Namutumba DLG had rural water source functionality percentage of 88% (Water summary 2019/2020	2
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	From Water and Sanitation committee FY 2019/20 from the Ministry of Water and Environment , it was observed that Namutumba DLG had established 516 Water and Sanitation committees out of which only 512 WSCs were functional translating to $(512/516)*100= 99.2\%$	2
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	No performance assessment had been carried out to the LLG by the LG at the time of assessment.	0

<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>There was evidence that Namutumba DLG planned and budgeted for water projects during FY 2019/20 in sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average- In the fourth quarter financial progress report dated 15th July, 2020, the LG planned to drill 18 number deep wells at estimated budget of Ugx.376,650,000 in the following sub counties;</p> <p>Bulange sub county 51%</p> <p>Mazuba sub county 47%</p> <p>Ivukula sub county 33%</p> <p>The district average safe water access by the end of the FY 2018/19 was at 56%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim certificate issued on 16th June 2020, for the drilling, casting, and installation of 19 Deep boreholes by KLR Uganda Ltd shown that the projects in the sub counties were completed giving $(4/4)*100= 100\%$. <p>In the fourth quarter progress report FY 2019/20 dated 15th July, 2020 in the budget expenditure indicated Ugx.362,869,189 of the development budget spent and</p> <p>In the same quarter four report, it was observed that all the four projects planned in sub counties below the district average access had been implemented leading to,</p> <p>$(4/4)*100= 100\%$ implementation rate to the above water sources projects.</p>
--	--	--

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

For the sampled projects the following observations
were recorded concerning.

The engineers' estimate and the contract price'

- Siting, drilling, casting and installation of 19 deep wells; Engineers' estimate was Ugx.372, 600,000 the contract price was UGX.379, 202,831 variation was Ugx. 6,602,831 equivalent to $(6,602,831/372,600,000)*100$

= 1.8%

- Construction of a 3 – stance lined VIP pit latrine at Namakoko T/C in Kibaale sub county.; Engineers' estimate was Ugx.14,052,000, the contract price was UGX.12,953,000. variation was Ugx.-1,099,000 equivalent to $(-1,099,000/14,052,000)*100$

= 7.8%

- Supply of borehole parts for LG FY 2019/2020

the engineers' estimate was Ugx.17,000,000, the contract price was Ugx. 16,950,000 with a variation of Ugx.50,000 equivalent to $(50,000/17,000,000)*100 = -0.3\%$.

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

The negative meant that the Engineers' estimate was higher than the cost quoted by the contractors and likewise the vice versa.

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

There was evidence that all WSS infrastructure projects were completed as per the annual work plan, by the end of the FY as was observed from the interim certificate and completion certificates issued as follows;

- Interim certificate issued on 16th June 2020, for the drilling, casting, and installation of 19 Deep boreholes by KLR Uganda Ltd .

- Certificate of completion issued on 19th may, 2020, for the construction of a 3-stance lined pit latrine at Namakoko in Kibaale sub county by MS Mojo general engineering co, Ltd

In the fourth quarter progress report FY 2019/2020 dated 17th June 2020 page 18 indicated the completion of the planned 19 number deep wells funded by DWSCG at budgeted amount of Ugx.372, 600,000 had been 100% spent giving the LG 100% implementation rate.

3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>From the MWE MIS data on functionality of water sources, it was observed that during FY 2018/19, Namutumba DLG registered water source functionality of 86% and in FY 2019/20, the functionality was 88% leading to;</p> <p>$(88-86)\%/86\%*100 = 2.33\%$ increase in the water source functionality.</p>	2
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 5%: score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>According to MWE MIS data for FY 2018/19, Namutumba DLG had functional WSCs equivalent to 451 and in FY 2019/20 functional WSCs had increased to 510 in number, this gave an increase of 59 functional WSCs leading to $(59/451)*100= 13.1\%$ increase.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>There was evidence that DWO had accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities was as reported according to;</p> <p>On field visits for the sampled completed projects for FY 2019/20 revealed the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3-Stance latrine at Namakoko T/C was constructed with two number ramps and a vent as reported in the Fourth quarter annual report dated 15th July,2020 • Progress report for siting supervision of 21 deep wells dated 27th March 2020. • Progress report for construction of a 3-stance lined pit latrine at Namakoko T/C dated 20th May, 2020 <p>Progress report for drilling, casting and installation of 22 deep wells dated 17th June 2020.</p>	3
---	---	--	---	---

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Namutumba LG DWO collected and compiled quarterly information on sanitation facilities;</p> <p>The following were quarterly reports availed during the verification;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter one (1) report dated 30th July,2020 • Quarter two (2) report dated 17th January, 2020 • Quarter three (3) report was not seen <p>Quarter four (4) report dated 15th July,2020 but no evidence that the MIS data capture form was seen</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Namutumba LG Water Office updated the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information during FY2019/20. No any report on new WSS facilities was availed for verification</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>No evidence was availed to the assessment team</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO had budgeted for its departmental staff.</p> <p>In the Annual work plan and approved budget for FY 2019/20 page 22 and in the PBS dated 09th August, 2019, DWO had an annual budget equivalent to Ugx.30,000,000 allocated.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the FY.</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>The DWO had three staffs out of three appraised. The details of appraisals were as follows;</p> <p>Kagwa Abey, Position DWO file no. CR/D/10084 appraised for the period 1st July, 2019 to 30th June, 2020 by Babita Harriet, position; Ag. District Engineer on 03rd July, 2020 and counter signed by CAO on 10th July, 2020.</p> <p>Mukama Samuel, Position BMT, file no. CR/D/10222 appraised for the period 1st July, 2019 to 30th June, 2020 by Kagwa Abey position; DWO on 01st July, 2020 and counter signed by Ag. District Engineer on 3rd July, 2020. CAO's stamp and signature on 10th July, 2020</p> <p>Tiwowe Harriet position secretary, file no. CR/D/10032 appraised for the period 1st July, 2019 to 30th June, 2020 by Kagwa Abey position; DWO on 7th July, 2020 and counter signed by Ag. District Engineer on 3rd July, 2020.</p> <p>CAO's stamp and signature on 10th July, 2020.</p>	3

7

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 evidence that the DWO had identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities had been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training data base.

0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

- 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

According to the MWE Namutumba DLG had average safe water coverage during FY 2019/20 at 59% and in the AWP FY 2020/2021 page 24 dated 10th August, 2020 (approved budget estimates), the following sub counties were planned and budgeted with a total annual development budget of Ugx. 884,043,795 and the allocations were as below;

- Bulange sub county at 51% with Ugx.60,321,600,
- Ivukula sub county at 33% with Ugx.60,321,600
- Magada sub county at 47% with Ugx.40,214,400, giving a total development allocation to all sub counties of Ugx.522,787,200 of which Ugx.160,857,600 was to sub counties below the district average access coverage

Leading to $(160,857,600/522,787,200)*100 = 30.77\%$ budget allocation to sub counties below the district average.

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 some evidence that the district Water Office had monitored the WSS facilities at least quarterly as the assessment team observed below;

- Project monitoring and assessment report for quarter 1 dated 23rd September 2019.
- Project monitoring and assessment report for quarter 2 dated 19th December, 2019.
- Project and assessment report for quarter 3 dated 7th April, 2020.
- There was a monitoring plan budget allocation of Ugx.7,768,000 page 4 for the four (4) quarters in the annual work plan FY 2019/2020

The monitoring plan for FY 2019/2020 was not availed. The LG failed due to failure to avail the monitoring plan to enable the Assessment team calculate the percent of WSS monitored.

0

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

- If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

There was some evidence that the district Water Office had monitored the WSS facilities at least quarterly as the assessment team observed below;

- Project monitoring and assessment report for quarter 1 dated 23rd September 2019.
- Project monitoring and assessment report for quarter 2 dated 19th December, 2019.
- Project and assessment report for quarter 3 dated 7th April, 2020.
- There was a monitoring plan budget allocation of Ugx.7,768,000 page 4 for the four (4) quarters in the annual work plan FY 2019/2020

The monitoring plan for FY 2019/2020 was not availed. The LG failed due to failure to avail the monitoring plan to enable the Assessment team calculate the percent of WSS monitored.

0

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO conducted DWSCC meetings as seen below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the DWSCC meeting held on 2nd October, 2019 under minute number DCC/19-20/04 discussed on issue of poor sanitation, off budget support in the second quarter FY 2019/2020. A district advocacy meeting was held on 27th September, 2019, WATSAN status report by DWO and ADWO-SAN under minute number ADVO/2019-2005. <p>However the LG could not be scored because the DWSCC were only held for the two quarters instead of four quarters with no reasons why.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District Water Office had publicized budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties and the DWO notice board.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If funds were allocated score 3 If not score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the DWO allocated budget to the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities as follows;</p> <p>In approved Annual work plan and budget FY 2019/20 page 3 the following was observed,</p> <p>NWR was equivalent to Ugx.31,435,256,</p> <p>Software mobilization activities allocated Ugx.,12,494,189 page 3,</p> <p>DWSCC meeting allocated Ugx.2,109,000 page 2, and</p> <p>Extension staff meeting allocated Ugx. 1,184,000 page2</p> <p>Therefore, the total budget allocated was equivalent to Ugx.15,787,189 giving $(15,787,189/31,435,256)*100 = 50.2\%$.</p>	3

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on OEM of WSS facilities during FY2019/20 as was observed from the following training minutes reports;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training reports of water user committees dated 28th February 2020, by ADWO through the DWO and DCDO on their roles. • An activity reporting form FY 2019/2020 for Magada Sub County dated 10th January 2020 by the health assistant in conjunction of the CDO and DWO. <p>A report on community sensitization to fulfill the critical requirements FY 2019/2020 dated 18th November, 2019.</p>	3
----	---	--	---	---

Investment Management

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

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p>	<p>There was evidence that all water projects were derived from the LGDP and were eligible for expenditure.</p> <p>In the Namutumba district Development Plan (DDP) 2015/16 to 2019/20 the DWO planned for drilling of deep wells, maintenance of WSS facilities and construction of VIP pit latrines in RGCs with a total planned budget of Ugx.1,425,000,000 on page 79 and the funding source was DWSCG and DDEG. There was evidence on desk appraisal of investment DDEG funded projects by the District in FY 2019/2020.</p> <p>The report of the District Budget Conference held on 8th November, 2018 submitted to CAO dated 12th November, page 1, presentation and discussion of capital service delivery investments for FY 2019/2020 Page 2, the planner presented all the DDEG projects for FY 2019/2020.</p>	4
<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>			
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that all budgeted investments for FY2021/22 had complete applications from beneficiary communities as was observed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application requesting for community water source dated 15th December, 2019 for Butembo east LC1 in Ivukula sub county, • Application dated 02nd August, 2019 for Izimba village LC1 in Magada sub county requesting for boreholes, • Application dated 18th March, 2019 for Nawangisa II in Kibaale sub county requesting for borehole, <p>Application dated 08th October, 2019 for Katengerere LC1 in Magada sub county requesting for a water source.</p>	2
<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>				

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>The TPC held on 16th January 2019 presented and discussed departmental workplans / actions plans for FY 2019/2020 including water departmental workplans, Ref: Min 4/DTPC/16/01/2019, page 8.</p>	
			<p>The Budget conference report on proceedings of the District Budget conference held on 8th November 2018 presented and discussed capital service delivery investments FY 2019/2020, Ref: Budget Conference Report dated 12th November 2018, page 5.</p>	
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>For the FY 2020/2021 all water infrastructure projects were screened not subjected to ESIA's because they did not qualify for the same.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water infrastructure investments for FY 2019/20 were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan prepared on 19th June, 2019, reference CR/PRO/158/06/19 approved by PPDA on, 26th June, 2020 on page 3, supply of borehole parts and page 6 contained drilling, casting and installation of boreholes.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for FY2019/20 were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction as verified from the following Contract Committee minutes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract committee minute number, 32/NDCC/30/01/2019-20-xii on 30th January 2020 approving the evaluation report for construction of a 3 – stance lined VIP latrine in Namakoko T/C in Kibaale Sub County held on 24th January, 2020. • Contract committee minute number, 18/NDCC/06/11/2019-20-I on 6th November, 2019 approving the evaluation report for siting, drilling, casting and installation of 19 deep wells held on 21st October, 2019. <p>Contract committee minute number, 42/NDCC/02/03/2019-20-vii on 2nd March, 2020 approving the evaluation report for supply of assorted borehole parts held on 25th February, 2020.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District Water Officer established the Project Implementation team as outlined below;</p> <p>The project manager was appointed by the CAO in a letter reference CR/Adm/214/1 dated 25th September, 2019 for the WSS projects of FY2019/2020 and progress reports by the DWO were seen (report for drilling and supervision of boreholes dated 17th June, 2020) but no project implementation plans were availed for verification as specified in the Water sector guidelines hence DWO scored zero (0) on this indicator.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled at;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kapasuuli village, Nsinze Sub County had drainage channel constructed as specified in the B.O.Q and was done • Kisowozi village, Ivukula Sub County required a pedestal installed as specified in the B.O.Q and was done. • Kawesye village, Kibaale Sub county platform cast as specified in the B.O.Q and was done. • Construction of 3 stance pit latrine at Namakoke T/C in Kibaale Sub County with G28 roofing as specified in B.O.Q and was done. 	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

There was evidence that the relevant technical officers in Namutumba DLG carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects as observed from the following site reports;

- On field visits for the sampled completed projects for FY 2019/20 revealed the following;
- Fourth quarter annual report dated 15th July 2020
- Progress report for siting supervision of 21 deep wells dated 27th March 2020.
- Progress report report for construction of a 3-stance lined pit latrine at Namakoko T/C dated 20th May, 2020
- Progress report for drilling, casting and installation of 21 deep wells dated 17th June 2020.

Project and assessment report for quarter 3 dated 7th April, 2020

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 had verified works and initiated 100% payments of contractors as follows ;

- For siting, drilling test pumping, casting and installation the contractor KLR (U) LTD requisition was raised on 22nd May, 2020 by the contractor and certified by the DWO on 06th June, 2020, taking two days, IPC raised on 08th June, 2020 Voucher number 30525169.
- For the construction of 3- stance lined VIP latrine, contract constructed by MOJO General Engineering Co. Ltd, a requisition was raised on 14th May, 2020 by the contractor and certified by the DWO on 20th May, 2020, taking no day IPC raised on 20th May, 2020 voucher number 30525230.

All payment were executed within the required timeframe of thirty (30) days.

<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The assessment team was able to see the complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law as given below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For contract; Construction of 3-stance lined VIP latrine in Namakoko T/C, Kibaale sub county, date of advert was 16th December, 2019 in the New vision newspaper, bid issue on 3rd January, 2020, bid receipt date was 3rd January, 2020, bid close /Opening date was 3rd January, 2020 <p>Evaluation report on the bid was 24th January, 2020, Contract committee minutes was on 30th January, 2020 and best evaluated bidder notice placed on, 30th January, 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For contract; Siting, drilling, casting and installation of 19 deep wells, date of advert was 26th September, 2019 in the New vision newspaper, bid issue on 10th October, 2019 bid receipt date was 18th October, 2019, bid close /Opening date was 18th October, 2019 <p>Evaluation report on the bid was 21st October, 2019, Contract committee minutes was on 6th November, 2019 and best evaluated bidder notice placed on, 6th November, 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For supply of assorted borehole spare parts, date of advert was 31st January, to 14th February, 2020 in the New vision newspaper, bid issue on 14th February, 2020, bid receipt date was 14th February, 2020, bid close /Opening date was 14th February, 2020 • Evaluation report on the bid was 25th February, 2020, Contract committee minutes was on 2nd March, 2020 and best evaluated bidder notice placed on, 2nd March, 2020.
---	---	---

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><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG did not have a designated person to coordinate grievance / complaints and there was no proof of a Grievance Redress Committee therefore the LG scored zero.</p>
---	--	--

14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0	The LG DWO provided minutes of the social mobilizers meeting held on 25th September 2020 which meeting was outside the year under review. Furthermore there was no copy of attendance to determine who attended the said meeting. From the minutes provided the assessment team noted: Under minute SOC/25/09/03, communication from the chair. He informed members about the new guidelines about water source and catchment protection which the senior Environment Officer was to disseminate to the CDO on a later stage. Minute SOC/25/09/04 suggested that the Environment Officer with the DWO disseminated the water source catchment protection guidelines to the CDOs from different sub counties. However there was no documentation to prove that guidelines were disseminated. Therefore the LG scored zero.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	There was evidence that water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented for example screening forms, ESMPs, E&S Certification forms were completed and monitoring reports prepared for; Construction of deep borehole at Kisewozi village, Ivuka sub-county. Screening form endorsed by Environment Officer on 13th February 2020. ii. Construction of deep borehole at Kapasuli village, in Nsinze sub-county. Screening form endorsed by Environment Officer on 6th April 2020. iii. Construction of deep borehole at Nakyere village Kibaale sub-county. Screening form endorsed by Environment officer on 12th February 2020.	3
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0	At the time of assessment, there was no evidence to prove that the LG had proof of ownership of land where the borehole sites were proposed and drilled. Therefore the LG scored zero.	0

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	There was evidence of Environment and social certification forms completed ; dated 6th June 2020 for drilling 22 deep wells, contracted to KLR (U) Ltd. Cost of mitigation was UGX 5.606,000. Form was completed and endorsed by the CDO and Environment Officer. And Interim certificate of completion dated 16th June 2020 project ID: NAMU 574/wrks/19-20/00011 and NAMU 574/wrks/19-20/00023. Drilling casting and installation of nineteen (19) deep boreholes, revised to twenty (20). By M/s KLR Uganda Ltd P.o Box 32370, Kampala. Start date: 29th January 2020, interim completion date 16th June 2020. Defects liability period 180 day (from completion date).	2
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	There was evidence of a monitoring report on water sources sited and drilled in FY 2019/2020. The report not referenced was dated 17th June 2020 whose objectives were to monitor compliance of implemented environment and social safe guards during siting and drilling of boreholes. Some of the challenges reported were: catchment protection, each water source would have a source protection zone with a minimum of 50metre protection radius around the borehole. These criteria were designed to protect against the transmission of toxic agro-chemicals, water borne diseases and above all maintain stability of the water table. Basic environment requirements for a water source; fenced off water sources. Observance of general cleanliness and good health of the area around the water source. Ensure minimal use of Agro-chemicals in a 50 meter radius around the water source. Recommendation; Investment in feasibility studies for small scale solar powered piped water scheme to rid the district of the outdated and unsustainable borehole technology. Exploration into cheap but sustainable technologies like rain water harvesting. The Monitoring report was not endorsed by the CDO and there was no way to prove that he participated in the monitoring. Therefore the LG scored zero because the indicator required both the CDO and Environment officer to carry out the Monitoring.	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	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	Not Applicable	0
1	Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land Maximum score 4 Maximum 20 points for this performance area	b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	Not Applicable	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 4 • 60 – 69%; score 2 • Below 60%; score 0 Maximum score 4	Not Applicable	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	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	Not Applicable	0

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

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 6			

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
	Maximum score 4			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	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	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	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 Maximum score 6	c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

Human Resource Management and Development

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

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	N/A	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	N/A	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</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</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</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</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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</p>	<p>0</p>
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</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
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</p>	<p>0</p>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	N/A	0

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

Environment and Social Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation Maximum score is 70	If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.	The LG did not recruit a Senior Agriculture Officer.	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. Maximum score is 30	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.	N/A	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. Maximum score is 30	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.	N/A	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Mr. Kagwa Abey was appointed on probation the Water Officer on 29/10/2008 under Min. KLR/DSC/450/2008 and confirmed on 20/1/2011 under Min. KLR/DSC/1063(i)/2010 (2)	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	There was no evidence that the LG recruited the Assistant Water Officer for mobilization	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Mukama Samuel was appointed on probation as the Borehole Maintenance Technician on 1/3/2010 under Min. KLR/DSC/871 (j)/2010 and confirmed on 11/4/2012 under Min. KLR/DSC/028/2012 (i) 61.	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	Mr. IkaabaDauda, the Senior Environment Officer was appointed the Ag. DNRO on 30/9/2019 under Min. DSC/197/13/09/2019 (b) (2) as renewal of appointment	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG had not recruited the Environment Officer by the time of Assessment.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG appointed Mr. Bamusubire William on probation as Forestry Officer on 21/5/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/181/17/05/2019 (c) 1 and confirmed him on 26/3/2020 under Min. NTB/DSC/231/16/03/2020 (d) (20)	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 that the LG Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all water infrastructure projects for FY 2019/2020 filled and endorsed by the environment officer. There were

22 Borehole sites screened some of which were;

Construction of deep borehole at Kisewozi village, Ivuka sub-county. Screening form endorsed by Environment Officer on 13th February 2020.

ii. Construction of deep borehole at Kapasuli village, in Nsinze sub-county. Screening form endorsed by Environment Officer on 6th April 2020.

iii. Construction of deep borehole at Nakyere village Kibaale sub-county. Screening form endorsed by Environment officer on 12th February 2020.

However the CDO had not endorsed on the screening for yet it was a requirement that the CDO and Environment Officer endorsed the screening forms therefore the LG scored zero.

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

b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.

The LG had evidence of ESMPs of siting, drilling and installation of deep wells for the listed borehole site locations for example;

At Kisewozi in Ivukula sub county, Kapasuli in Nsinze sub county and Nakyere in Kibaale sub county.

Description of the ESMS under construction phase: Vegetation, soil, underground water, human beings. Environment concerns: Destruction of vegetation, occupational health hazards during construction. Increased dust levels due to removal of vegetation. Mitigation measures: concrete apron and drainage channel to prevent water from entering borehole, clearance of all construction debris from the site, fence off area around the borehole to prevent livestock intrusion, access should allow disabled users. ESMP was costed at UGX 6,000,000.

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

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

At the time of assessment, there was no evidence of abstraction permits because abstraction permits are not issued for hand pump wells. The LG had evidence of a drilling permit issued to KLR Uganda Limited P.O Box 3237 Kampala. Drilling permit No: DP101662/DW 2019. To drill boreholes in accordance with the terms and conditions of the permit granted for a period not exceeding one year which came into force on 1st July 2019 until 30th June 2020. The permit was issued on 16th May 2019 by the Director of Water Development, Eng. Kavutse Dominic.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The LG appointed Dr. Kiirya James as the DHO on promotion from SMO on 11/5/2012 under Min. KLR/DSC/038/2012 (iv) 6	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	Ms. Ssegonga Margret was appointed ADHO-MCH on transfer of service from Luuka DLG ON 21/5/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/181/17/05/2019 (b) (2)	10
1	Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions. Applicable to Districts only. Maximum score is 70	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	Ms. Nakalema Susan was appointed on transfer of service as ADHO-Environmental Health on 21/5/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/181/17/05/2019 (b) (1)	10

1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not have this position in the staffing structure of Namutumba DLG Health department on page 3 of the Customized Costed staff Establishment for Namutumba DLG endorsed by the CAO .</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Mr. Balisanyuka Ronald, was appointed the SHE on 21/5/2019 on transfer of service from Namayingo DLG under Min. NTB/DSC/181/17/05/2019 (b) (3)</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>The LG appointed Mr. Isabirye Julius as Biostatistician by Regularization of appointment on 3/7/2015 under Min. NTB/DSC/229/12/06/2015 (i)</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Mr. Napera Fredrick Robert was appointed on probation as the DCCT on 9/1/2013 under Min. NTB/DSC/55/2012 (i) and confirmed on 13/1/2014 under Min NTB/DSC/135/12/12/2013 (ii)</p>	10

1 Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.
Applicable to MCs only.
Maximum score is 70

h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.

1 Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.
Applicable to MCs only.
Maximum score is 70

i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.

1 Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.
Applicable to MCs only.
Maximum score is 70

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

Environment and Social Requirements

<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p>	<p>If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of screening forms for;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Installation of gate and Askari's room at Nsinze Health Center IV located in Nsinze sub county. Forms were filled and signed by the Environment Officer on 8th July 2019. ii. Renovation of Maternity ward at Nabisongi Health Center III in Namutumba sub county. Forms were filled and signed by the Environment Officer on 9th July 2019. iii. Renovation of Laboratory at Magada Health Center III. Forms were filled and signed by the Environment Officer on 8th July 2019. iv. Renovation of Female Ward at Nsinze Health Center IV in Namutumba sub county. Forms were filled and signed by the Environment Officer on 10th July 2019. <p>However, the CDO had not endorsed on the screening forms yet the indicator required that both CDO and Environment Officer participate in the screening. Therefore the LG scored zero.</p>
<p>Maximum score is 30</p>		

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

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

Maximum score is 30

There was evidence of ESMP reports titled Environment Plans for Health Sector Capital Development projects prepared and endorsed by the Environment Officer as follows;

i. ESMP for installation of Gate and Askari's room at Nsinze Health Centre IV in Nsinze sub county. Description of Construction Phase: Excavation, Bush clearing, construction of the master structure. Environment component affected: Vegetation, soil, underground water, human beings. Environment concerns: Erosion causing siltation of surface water. Pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Occupational health hazards during construction: increased dust levels due to removal of vegetation, construction debris generated. Mitigation measures: Restrict construction to the dry season to reduce erosion and silting of water sources. Ensure that vegetation (4 trees and grass) are replanted and that health center management, costed at UGX 300,000.

ii. Renovation of Maternity ward at Nabisongi Health Center III in Namutumba sub county. Description of Construction Phase: Excavation, Bush clearing, construction of the master structure. Environment component affected: Vegetation, soil, underground water, human beings. Environment concerns: Erosion causing siltation of surface water. Pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Occupational health hazards during construction: increased dust levels due to removal of vegetation, construction debris generated. Mitigation measures: Restrict construction to the dry season to reduce erosion and silting of water sources. Ensure that vegetation (4 trees and grass) are replanted and that health center management, costed at UGX 500,000.

iii. . Renovation of Laboratory at Magada Health Center III. Description of Construction Phase: Excavation, Bush clearing, construction of the master structure. Environment component affected: Vegetation, soil, underground water, human beings. Environment concerns: Erosion causing siltation of surface water. Pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Occupational health hazards during construction: increased dust levels due to removal of vegetation, construction debris generated. Mitigation measures: Restrict construction to the dry season to reduce erosion and silting of water sources. Ensure that vegetation (4 trees and grass) are replanted and that health center management, costed at UGX 120,000.

However the Assessment Team noted that the ESMPs for Health projects were endorsed by the Environment Officer only yet the indicator required both the CDO and Environment Officer to prepare Environmental plans jointly. Therefore the LG scored zero.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely: <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The LG appointed Mr. Isiiko Mohammed DEO on accelerated promotion from Senior Education Officer on 8/1/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/139/18/12/2018 (a) (1)	30
1	Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely: <i>The maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of: b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	1. Mr. Kalisengawa Fred was appointed Senior Inspector of Schools on transfer within service on 15/1/2013 under Min. NTB/DSC/41/2012 (d) 2. There was no evidence of a Substantive Inspector of Schools appointed at the time of Assessment	0

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.

The LG carried out screening, for example;

i. Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Namutumba primary school in Namutumba Town Council. Form endorsed by the Environment Officer on 10th July 2019.

ii. Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kiranga primary school in Kibaale sub-county. Form endorsed by the Environment Officer on 8th July 2019.

iii. Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Buwalira primary school in Nangode sub-county. Form endorsed by the Environment Officer on 9th July 2019.

iv. Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Bulimba primary school in Nabireyo sub county. Form endorsed by the Environment Officer on 10th July 2019.

v. Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Nakazinga primary school in Bulange sub county. Form endorsed by the Environment Officer on 8th July 2019.

However, the CDO had not signed on any of the screening forms yet the indicator required both The CDO and Environment Officer to sign therefore the LG scored zero.

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 had evidence of EMSP reports for example;

ESMP for Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Budaba primary school in Budaba village, Nabwego sub county. Project activity: Construction phase. Environment components like vegetation, soil, underground water. Environment concerns: Erosion, causing siltation of surface water. Pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Limit vegetation clearance to the specific area of the pit latrine. ESMP report was endorsed by the CDO and Environment Officer but not dated.

ii.ESMP for Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Kiranga primary school in, Kibaale sub county. Project activity: Construction phase. Environment components like vegetation, soil, underground water. Environment concerns: Erosion, causing siltation of surface water. Pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Limit vegetation clearance to the specific area of the pit latrine. ESMP report was endorsed by the CDO and Environment Officer but not dated.

iii. ESMP for Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Namutumba primary school in, Namutumba Town Council. Project activity: Construction phase. Environment components like vegetation, soil, underground water. Environment concerns: Erosion, causing siltation of surface water. Pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Limit vegetation clearance to the specific area of the pit latrine. ESMP report was endorsed by the CDO and Environment Officer but not dated.

iv. ESMP for Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Budaba primary school in Budaba village, Nabwego sub county. Project activity: Construction phase. Environment components like vegetation, soil, underground water. Environment concerns: Erosion, causing siltation of surface water. Pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Limit vegetation clearance to the specific area of the pit latrine. ESMP report was endorsed by the CDO and Environment Officer but not dated.

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The LG appointed Mr. Basalirwa George on accelerated promotion to CFO on 26/2/2008 under Min. 10/DSC/2008	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Naabye Henry was appointed the District Planner on 19/12/2019 under Min. NNTB/DSC/222/13/12/2019(1)	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Ms. Babita Harriet was appointed on renewal of Acting Appointment as the Ag. District Engineer on 30/9/2019 under MIN, DSC/196/13/09/2019 (a) (1)	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Mr. IkaabaDauda, the Senior Environment Officer was appointed the Ag. DNRO on 30/9/2019 under Min. DSC/197/13/09/2019 (b) (2) as renewal of appointment.	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Musita Augustus was appointed on accelerated promotion to District Production Officer on 8/1/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/139/18/12/2018 (b) (2)	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Mr. BabalandaKhalif-Al-Hadad, the Senior CDO was appointed on renewal of Acting Appointment on 26/3/2020 under Min. DSC/228/16/03/2020 (c) (3)	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Waako Stephen was appointed the Principal Commercial Officer on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/104/22/03/2018 (b) and submitted to DSC on 8/9/2020 for appointment as Ag. District Commercial Officer.	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer) score 2 or else 0.	The LG appointed Mr. Kisanafu Yusuf on transfer within service to Senior Procurement Officer on 10/4/2014 under Min. NTB/DSC/157/19/3/2014 (1) (i)	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer), score 2 or else 0	Ms. Teeffe Susan was appointed on probation as Procurement Officer on 12/3/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/170/01/03/2019 (ii) c 1 and confirmed on 26/3/2020 under Min. NTB/DSC/231/16/03/2020 (a) (13)	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	Ms. KagoyaZainabu was appointed on accelerated promotion to PHRO on 22/5/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/112/14/05/2018 (b) 5.	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Mr. IkaabaDauda was appointed the Senior Environment Officer on promotion from Environment Officer on 5/4/2012 under Min. KLR/DSC/038/2012 (iv) 3	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Samanya Paul, the Physical Pplanner was assigned the duties of Senior Land Management Officer by the CAO on 29/1/2019	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Nabangi Stephen was appointed on promotion as the Senior Accountant on 13/6/2017 under Min. NBT/DSC/44/02/06/2017 (b) (i)	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Ziraba Moses was appointed the District Internal Auditor on accelerated promotion on 6/3/2008 under Min. 15/DSC/2008	2

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Mr. Ivaibi Charles was appointed the PHRO- Sec DSC on promotion on 19/1/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/9/11/1/2017 (a)	2
Maximum score is 37.				
2	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG	If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of: a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0	<p>The LG had 9 LLGs: 1 T/council and substantively appointed 7 SAS to the S/Cs. The LG appointed;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Mugoya Ronald Alan was appointed the SAS on 4/6/2015 under Min. NTB/DSC/218/06/2015 (iv) and now deployed at Nangonde S/C 2. Mr. KwajjaBumaliHissa was appointed on promotion from CDO to SAS on 5/7/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (a) (1) and deployed at Kibaale S/C 3. Mr. Higenyi Hassan was appointed on promotion to SAS on 4/6/2015 under Min. NTB/DSC/2018/06/2015 (iii) and now deployed at Bulange S/C 4. Mr. Mugoya Daniel was appointed on probation as SAS on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (a) (3) and confirmed on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/107/22/03/2018 (a) (1) and deployed at Nsinze S/C 5. Ms. Mwemeke Juliet was appointed SAS on probation on 13/6/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/45/02/06/2017 (a) (i) and confirmed on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/96/05/03/2018 (a) (1) and deployed at Nabweyo S/C 6. Mr. Musiba Rogers was appointed SAS on probation on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/2017 (a) (2) and confirmed on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/107/22/03/2018 (a) (2) and deployed at Ivukula S/C 7. Mr. Wakabi Nathan was assigned the duties of SAS by the CAO on 8/6/2020 and deployed at Mazuba S/C. 8. Mr. Kabakubya SAMUEL was appointed the Principal Township Officer on promotion on 13/6/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/44/02/06/2017 (a) (i) and deployed at Namutumba Town Council. 9. Ms. Wegosasa Lorna was assigned the duties of SAS on 8/6/2020 by the CAO and deployed at Namutumba S/C. 	0
Maximum score is 15				

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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

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

score 5 or else 0.

The LG had 9 LLG but substantively appointed 8 CDOs.

1. Ms. Aliba Lydia was appointed on probation as CDO on 15/4/2015 under Min. NTB/DSC/198/19/3/2015 (f) 1 and confirmed on 1/4/2016 under Min. NTB/DSC/272/15/03/2016 (b) and deployed at Nsinze S/C.
2. Mr. Kwita Philip M was appointed on transfer of service as CDO on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (e) (3) and deployed at Nangonde S/C
3. Nakaziba Mary was appointed on probation as CDO on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (e) (2) and confirmed on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/96/05/03/2018 (e) (19) and deployed at Magada S/C
4. Mr. Musalirwe Hillary was appointed CDO on promotion on 13/6/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/45/02/06/2017 (b) (i) and deployed at Ivukula S/C
5. Mr. Luvunya Davis Elly was appointed CDO on attainment of higher qualifications on 18/2/2015 under Min. NTB/DSC/188/19/12/2014 (h) and now deployed at Bulange S/C
6. Mr. Sulaiman Waiswa was appointed CDO on attainment of higher Qualification on 10/4/2014 under Min. NTB/DSC/157/19/3/2014 (2) (i) and deployed at Nabweyo S/C
7. Ms. Tafari Cissy was appointed CDO on attainment of Higher Qualifications on 1/7/2016 under Min. NTB/DSC/281/08/06/2016 and deployed at Namutumba S/C
8. Mr. MugunyaEnock was appointed CDO on probation on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB.DSC/38/30/03/20`17 and confirmed on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/107/22/03/2018 (b) (9) and deployed at Nsinze S/C
9. Mr. Musana John Viany, Parish Chief, was assigned the duties of CDO on 20/4/2020 by the CAO and deployed at Mazuba S/C

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

Maximum score is 15

If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:

c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,

score 5 or else 0.

The LG provided evidence of appointment of 7a Senior Accounts Assistant (SAA) at 7out of the 9 required for each LLGs.

1. Ms. Babirye Sarah was appointed on promotion as SAA on 8/1/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/139/18/12/2018 (c) (4) and deployed at Kibaale S/C

2. Mr. Kagulire Fred was appointed by re-designation of Job Title on 8/1/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/141/18/12/2018 (b) (3) and deployed at Mazuba S/C

3. Ms. GasatuProssy was appointed a SAA on promotion on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 and deployed at Nsinze S/C

4. Ms. Nabirye Rebecca was appointed SAA on probation on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 and confirmed on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/96/05/03/2018 (d) (17) and deployed at Magada S/C

5. Ms. Kalekwa Sylvia was appointed SAA on probation on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (b) (1) and confirmed on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/96/05/03/2018 (d) (18) and deployed at Nabweyo S/C

6. Mr. Kagoma Simon Peter was appointed SAA on probation on 5/4/2017 under Min. NTB/DSC/38/30/03/2017 (b) (2) and confirmed on 5/4/2018 under Min. NTB/DSC/107/22/03/2018 (c) (10) and deployed at Namutumba S/C

7. Mr. Namwano Samuel was appointed SAA on re-designation of Job Title on 8/1/2019 under Min. NTB/DSC/141/18/12/2018 (b) (2) and deployed at Nangonde S/C

Environment and Social Requirements

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

From Financial Statement for Financial Year ended 30 June 2020, the budgeted funds for Natural Resources were Ugx.85, 468,935, (Ref; page 22 of the Final Accounts 2019/20)

The funds allocated to Natural Resources as of 30th June 2020 were Ugx. 80,127,224, (Ref; page 22 of the Final Accounts FY 2019/20)

The percentage allocated to Natural Resources was $80,127,224/85,468,935 \times 100 = 93.7\%$

Thus, the LG was non-compliant with the minimum condition as it allocated less funds to Natural Resources compared to the budget.

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>From Financial Statement for Financial Year ended 30 June 2020, the the budgeted funds for Community Services were Ugx. 613,791,810, (Ref; page 22 of the Final Accounts 2019/20)</p> <p>The funds allocated to Community Services as of 30th June 2020 were Ugx. 324,041,603 (Ref; page 22 of the Final Accounts FY 2019/20)</p> <p>The percentage allocated to Community Based Services was $324,041,603/613,791,810 \times 100 = 52.8\%$</p> <p>Thus, the LG was non-compliant to the minimum condition as it allocated less funds to Community Based Services compared to the budget.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for;</p> <p>i. Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Budaaba primary school in Budaaba village, Nabwego sub county. Endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer on 9th July 2019.</p> <p>ii. Construction of a 4 stance pit latrine at Namutumba District Head Quarters in kaiti village, Namutumba sub county. Endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer on 10th July 2019.</p> <p>iii. Construction of District Administration Block Phase 3 in Kaiti village, Nautumba Sub County. Endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer on 7th July 2019.</p> <p>However, the CDO had not endorsed on the screening forms yet the indicator required that both CDO and Environment Officer endorse therefore the LG scored zero.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

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

Maximum score is 12

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

The screened projects did not have ESIAs because they did not require according to the Environment officer. However Environment Social Management Plans were prepared for example;

i. Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Budaba primary school in Budaba village, Nabwego sub county. Project activity: Construction phase. Environment components like vegetation, soil, underground water. Environment concerns: Erosion, causing siltation of surface water. Pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Limit vegetation clearance to the specific area of the pit latrine. ESMP report was endorsed by the CDO and Environment Officer but not dated.

ii. Construction of a 4 stance pit latrine at Namutumba District Head Quarters in kaiti village, Namutumba sub county. Construction phase: Excavations, bush clearing, construction of master structure. Environment component affected, vegetation soil, underground water, human beings. Environmental concerns: Erosion causing siltation of surface of water, pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation, occupational health hazards during construction. Mitigations: Limit vegetation clearance to the specific area of construction of the pit latrine.

Replant vegetation to the specific area of the pit latrine upon completion. Restrict construction to the dry season to reduce erosion and silting of water sources.

Ensure that vegetation (4 trees and grass) is replanted and that the health center management ensures its survival. ESMP report was endorsed by the CDO and Environment Officer but not dated.

iii. Construction of District Administration Block Phase 3 in Kaiti village, Nautumba Sub County. Construction phase: Installation of doors, plastering floor and partial finishes. Environment component: Human beings, Environment concern: Occupational hazards during construction. Construction debris generated. Mitigation measures: Removal/clearance of all construction debris from the site, installation of warning signs to minimize accidents. ESMP costed at UGX 500,000.

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

The LG had a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) for example;

i. Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Budaba primary school in Nabweyo sub county. Project phase: Construction, excavation, bush clearing, construction of master structure. Environment component affected: soil, underground water, human beings. Environment concerns: Erosion causing siltation of surface water, pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Limit vegetation clearance to the site specific area of construction of the pit latrine. Replant vegetation to the specific area of the pit latrine upon completion. Ensure the vegetation (4 trees and grass) are replanted and that the health center management ensures its survival ESMP costed at UGX 300,000.

ii. Construction of a 4 stance lined pit latrine at Namutumba District Head Quarters. Project phase: Construction, excavation, bush clearing, construction of master structure. Environment component affected: soil, underground water, human beings. Environment concerns: Erosion causing siltation of surface water, pollution of underground water, destruction of vegetation. Mitigation measures: Limit vegetation clearance to the site specific area of construction of the pit latrine. Replant vegetation to the specific area of the pit latrine upon completion. Ensure the vegetation (4 trees and grass) are replanted and that the health center management ensures its survival ESMP costed at UGX 300,000.

iii. Construction of District Administration Block Phase 3 in Kaiti village, Nautumba Sub County. Construction phase: Installation of doors, plastering floor and partial finishes. Environment component: Human beings, Environment concern: Occupational hazards during construction. Construction debris generated. Mitigation measures: Removal/clearance of all construction debris from the site, installation of warning signs to minimize accidents. ESMP costed at UGX 500,000.

Financial management and reporting

Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.

Maximum score is 10

If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10; Awaits Auditor General report in January 2021

If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5

If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0

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.

- Namutumba District submitted the responses on the Internal Auditor General's report for FY 2018/19 on 12th December 2019, Ref: Fin/103/3. The responses were received by MOFPED, Accountant General, IGG, MOLG and Auditor General.

- Eight queries were raised, and all were responded to and their status clarified as detailed below:

1. Unaccounted for funds
2. Lack of contract implementation plans
3. Lack of declaration of micro procurements
4. Irregular procurement of road construction materials
5. Failure to safeguard district assets
6. Failure to record disposable assets in asset register
7. Misappropriation of funds for construction of energy stoves
8. Misappropriation of funds for signposts

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

1. Partial Implementation of key planned activities
2. Court cases and contingencies
3. Delayed execution of UgiFT
4. Damaged URF road
5. Failure to recover YLP programme funds
6. Nonfunctional water for production projects

The submission of the Auditor General's Report to PS/ST was after the deadline of February hence the LG was non-compliant.

7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had submitted the Annual performance contract for the FY 2020/2021 on 29th June 2020. The report was acknowledged by the Permanent Secretary/Secretary to the Treasury, Permanent Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister, LG Finance Commission, Municipal Mayor. Ref: PBS submission form dated 29/06/2020 signed by the Chief Administrative Officer, Namutumba District.</p> <p>This was within the acceptable time frame of 31st August 2020 hence the LG was compliant.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The annual performance report for FY 2019/20 was submitted on 18th August 2020 and received on 18th August 2020. Ref: PBS submission form dated 18/8/2020 signed by the Chief Administrative Office, Namutumba District.</p> <p>This was within the required submission deadline of 31st August 2020.</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>There was evidence that submission of the four quarterly budget performance reports were within the deadline of 31st August 2020 as per PFMA Act 2015 as indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 1 was submitted on 29th November 2019 • Quarter 2 was submitted on 11th February 2020 • Quarter 3 was submitted on 30th April 2020 • Quarter 4 was submitted on 18th August 2020. <p>Ref: PBS Namutumba District quarterly performance report FY 2019/2020 dated 18/08/2020</p> <p>All reports were submitted via PBS.</p>	4