



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Kasese District

(Vote Code: 521)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	67%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	90%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	70%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	60%
Educational Performance Measures	65%
Health Performance Measures	63%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	71%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	69%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>The construction works for the administration block financed by DDEG i.e. UGX 150,000,000 in FY2022/23 is ongoing i.e. motor works for the ground floor completed, slab for the first floor completed, window and doors fixed but structure not functional and utilized as per the purpose of project.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The LG average score in the overall LLG performance assessment for 2023 improved by 65% compared to the LLG performance assessment for 2022.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>OPAMS Data Generated by OPM</p> <p>Average Overall LLGPA Scores for 2023= 65%</p> <p>Average Overall LLGPA Scores for 2022= 50</p> <p><b>Calculation</b></p> <p>Variance Average Overall LLGPA (2023-2022)= 65-50= 15%</p>	3
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that the planned DDEG funded infrastructure project was completed at 100% as planned for the phase FY2022/23.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Support the construction of administration UGX 150,000,000 - Phase was completed as planned for FY2022/23.</p>	3

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:	A review of LG's Budget Estimates and Annual Budget Performance Reports for FY2023 revealed that LG did not budget and spend all DDEG funds within the eligible expenditures as defined in the DDEG guidelines i.e. less than the maximum 70% was spend on infrastructure investments.	0
		Score 2 or else score 0.	<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Total DDEG FY202/23 UGX 784,453,000</p> <p>Amounts budgeted and spent FY2022/23</p> <p>Transferred to LLGs UGX 461,956,857</p> <p>Retained by HLG UGX 322,496,143</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects i.e. 46.5 % (less than the maximum 70% retained at HLG for infrastructure projects)- Non</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the construction of administration UGX 150,000,000</li> </ul> <p>Performance Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff Training and Capacity Building UGX 30,000,000</li> </ul> <p>Investment servicing, Data collection, and monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feasibility Studies or Screening of Projects UGX 22,496,000</li> <li>• Procurement of Laptops, Printer &amp; Desktop UGX 36,000,000</li> <li>• Monitoring and supervision of Capital projects across the district UGX 60,000,000 i.e. 18.6% (more than the maximum of 5% allowed)</li> <li>• Travel Inland - Inspection Trips UGX 24,000,000</li> </ul>	
3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,	<p>The LG implemented only one DDEG-funded infrastructure project, that is,</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Kasese district administration block, budgeted for UGX 450,000,000/= according to the procurement plan dated 14/7/2022 and approved/received by PPDA on 5/08/2022. The works contract dated 20/02/2023 had a contract sum of UGX 291,833,175/=; Contractor: Mensa Engineering Services Limite; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00107. <b>This represented a variation of -35.148% of the LG Engineers estimates.</b></p>	0
		score 2 or else score 0		

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of the MoPS(2017) approved and adopted staff structure providing for minimum staffing standards and the staff list 2023 the information on positions filled in LLGs and notice board displays at LLGs revealed that only one station (Bugoye SC) did not have accurate information as seen in the sampled LLGs below thereby not meeting the scoring threshold.</p> <p><b>Kyondo SC</b></p> <p>The staff list obtained from the HRM Division provided for Emanuelina Nziabake - Agricultural Officer and Samuel Ndungo - Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer deployed at the SC and the same information was found posted at the LLG.</p> <p><b>Kisinga SC</b></p> <p>The staff list obtained from the HRM Division provided for Biira Joseless , Agricultural Officer, and Nyabake Hellen, Assistant Agricultural Officer deployed at the SC and the same information was found posted at the LLG.</p> <p><b>Bugoye SC</b></p> <p>The staff list obtained from the HRM Division had only one staff member John Baguma, Agricultural Officer, contrary to the deployed staff as per structure that included Itungu Sophia - Fisheries Officer and Muhindo Joachim - Animal Husbandry Officer deployed at the SC as found posted at the LLG.</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"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p>	<p>The LG produced progress reports for DDEG funded infrastructure project FY2022/23 showing the level of completion that reflected actual level of completion.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>The construction of administration UGX150,000,319 phase completed at 100% as planned FY2022/23</p>	2

5	<p>N23_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><b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b></p>	<p>The LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs for 2023 as verified by the IVA team during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p><b>Sampled LLGS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bugoye SC - DLG score was 55% and IVA score was 60%. The deviation was +5% i.e. Credible</li> <li>2. Hima TC - DLG score was 96% and IVA score was 95%. The deviation was -1% i.e. Credible</li> <li>3. Kisinga SC - DLG score was 90% and IVA score was 91%. The deviation was +1% i.e. Credible</li> <li>4. Kyondo SC - DLG score was 42% and IVA score was 50%. The deviation was +8% i.e. Credible</li> </ol>	4
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence of a performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results was provided. However, a letter dated 27th July 2023 directing Heads of Departments to produce plans was provided at the time of assessment.</p>	0
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence of implementation was made available.</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p>	<p>Kasese DLG consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, as seen in the letter to PS MoPS from the CAO dated 26th September 2023. It was received by MoLG, MoFPED and MoES on 27th September 2023.</p>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p>	<p>Kasese DLG conducted tracking and analysis of staff attendance at both the District and LLG levels as detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. July 2022, reports from Ibunda SDA PS</li> <li>2. June 2023- reports of District HQ staff.</li> <li>3. November 2023, reports of Kibugha PS.</li> </ol>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		

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

At the time of assessment not all HoDs under assessment were duly appraised by 30th June 2023. Only two HoDs were appraised within the stipulated time i.e. the District Community Development Officer and District Commercial Officer.

**1. Chief Finance Officer** - Ms Muhindo Margaret. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023 and duly signed by CAO on 17th July 2023.

**2. District Planner** - Mr. Masereka Alex. At the time of assessment, the District Planner was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.

**3. Ag. District. Engineer** - Mr. Asiimwe Ronald. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 1st July 2022.

**4. District Natural Resources Officer** - Katswera Joseph. At the time of assessment, the DNRO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.

**5. District Production Officer** - Baluku Julius. At the time of assessment, the District Production Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.

**6. District Community Development Officer** - Mr. Birungi Ben Henry. At the time of assessment, the DCDO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.

**7. District Commercial Officer** - Mr. Kasereka Yambuka Simon. At the time of assessment, the District Commercial Officer was found duly appraised for the period under review as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.

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

Kasese DLG had the Committee in place by appointment of members to the Rewards and Sanctions Committee as evidenced by a letter dated 1st July 2022 appointing Ms. Muhindo Margaret Chief Finance Officer to the committee. It was found to be functional as seen in minutes dated 15th March 2023 of R&SC of Meeting held on 7th March 2023.

7	Performance management  Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.  Score 1 or else 0	No evidence of the presence and/ or functionality of a Consultative Committee was provided during the assessment.	0
8	Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:  Score 1.	At the time of assessment data (Excel) was made available with a list of nineteen staff in the Education Department who were recruited for the period under review on transfer. Only one staff member accessed the payroll within the stipulated time as illustrated hereunder.  1. Tumuheise Getrida, Education Officer (Science), appointed 1st April 2023, accessed the payroll in May 2023.	0
9	Pension Payroll management  Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:  Score 1.	At the time of assessment data (Excel) was made available with a list of forty-eight retiring staff for the period under review. However, four staff did not access the payroll within the stipulated time as shown hereunder.  1. Aloysius Mutibiti, Assistant Education Officer (Grade V Teacher), retired 13th October 2022 and accessed the payroll in January 2023.  2. Mbusa Charles, Assistant Education Officer, retired 15th July 2020 and accessed the payroll in December 2022.  3. Milton Baluku Masereka, Head Teacher Primary School, retirement date was not provided, accessed the payroll in August 2022.  4. Deo Thembo, Assistant Education Officer, retired 30th November 2022, accessed the payroll in August 2022.	0

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:  Score 2 or else score 0	A review of the FY2022/23 Annual Budget Estimates and LG Cost Centre List & LLG allocation release for FY2022/23 provided by MoFPED revealed that the LG transferred DDEG for FY2022/23 to LLGs in full.  <b>Evidence</b>  Bugoye Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 27,516,956  Buhuhira Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 20,259,170  Bwera Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 19,526,060  Bwesumbu Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 22,678,432  Hima Town Council - Budgeted amount received in	2
----	--	--	---	---



full UGX 17,751,753

Ibanda-Kyanya Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 2,425,271

Ihandiro Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 15,860,512

Isango Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 11,461,853

Kabatunda-Kirabaho Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 2,425,271

Kahokya - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 4,277,378

Karambi Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 26,783,846

Karusandara Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 14,687,536

Katwe-Kabatoro Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 9,892,019

Kilembe Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 11,095,298

Kinyamaseke Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 4,390,205

Kisinga Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 25,610,871

Kisinga Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 21,190,387

Kitabu - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 4,277,378

Kitholhu Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 9,995,634

Kithoma-Kanyatsi Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 2,425,271

Kitswamba Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 17,253,420

Kitswamba Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 2,425,271

Kyabarungira Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 10,362,189

Kyarumba Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 18,866,261

Kyarumba Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 2,425,271

Kyondo Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 25,171,005

Lake Katwe Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 11,755,097

Mahango Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 21,652,078

Maliba Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in

full UGX 36,754,138

Maliba Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 2,425,271

Mbunga - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 4,277,378

Mpondwe-Lhubiriha Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 62,453,993

Mubuku Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 2,425,271

Muhokya Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 15,860,512

Muhokya Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 2,425,271

Mukunyu Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 32,135,547

Nyakabingo - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 4,277,378

Nyakatonzi Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 8,602,726

Nyakiyumbu Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 30,889,260

Rugendabara-Kikongo Town Council - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 12,544,679

Rukoki Subcounty - Budgeted amount received in full UGX 10,068,945

10

N23\_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:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).

Score: 2 or else score 0

A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions revealed that in the FY2022/23, the LG warranted LLG Direct DDEG transfers more than 5 working days after cash limits for the LG were communicated by the PS/ST.

**Evidence**

Q2 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 30 Sept 2022. LG warranted on 13 October 2022 i.e. 5+ working days

Q3 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 29 Dec 2022. LG warranted on 25 April 2023 i.e. 5+ working days

**Note:** cash limits uploaded in the PBS by MoFPED were not accessible.

0

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG did not provide evidence of communication of DDEG transfers to the LLGs and as such the compliance with the five working days requirement could not be verified. However, the cash limit communication dates were obtained as follows: (i) Q2 FY2022/23, cash limit communication on 30 Sept 2022; (ii) Q3 FY2022/23, cash limit communication on 29 Dec 2022.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that all LLGs were supervised and mentored at least once per quarter in FY2022/23 consistent with guidelines.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Q1 FY2022/23</p> <p>Report on Mentoring of District Level Departments and LLG for the Period July- Sept 2022. Dated 30 Sept 2022.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disseminate sector-specific grant and program implementation guidelines and policies</li> <li>• Share implementation challenges and strategies for performance improvement</li> <li>• Kickstart the budgeting and planning circle for the FY 2023/24</li> <li>• Disseminate District assessment results for 2021</li> </ul> <p>Q2 FY2022/23</p> <p>Mentoring Report for the Period Oct-Dec 2022 for District level departments and LLGs Q2. Dated 30 December 2022.</p> <p>Objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orient departments and LLGs on the annual planning and budgeting circle</li> <li>• Orient District and LLGs TPCs on the roles and responsibilities of the planning structures including council, DTPC/STPC, DEC/SEC, Parish/Ward development committee</li> <li>• To disseminate budgeting formats and IPFs for FY2023/24 to departments and LLGs (Format for BFPs)</li> <li>• Highlight the Local Government Participatory planning circle to District Departments and LLG actors.</li> </ul> <p>Q3 FY2022/23</p> <p>Mentorship Report for the Period January – March 2023 Q3 date 31 March 2023</p> <p>Objectives</p>	2

- Orient District and LLGs on revenue enhancement

- Disseminate second call circular

- Disseminate and review District level assessment manual

Q4 FY2022/23

Quarter four mentoring of District level and LLGs

Objective

- Disseminate the updated LLG assessment manual

- Orient LLG actors on the Integrated Revenue Administration system

- Orient participants on effective monitoring and evaluation system including disseminating the monitoring tool

- Disseminate policy guidelines in the third budget call circular

- Orient participants on capacity needs assessment including the development of staff and institutional improvement plans.

11

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

The LG provided evidence confirming that the TPC discussed the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits for FY2022/23 and used these results/reports to make recommendations for corrective actions.

Evidence

Q1 FY2022/23

Minutes of the District Technical Planning Committee meeting held on 10 September 2022 at the District Council Hall.

MIN 13/09/2022/23: Discussion of Multi-Sector Monitoring Reports for Q FY2021/22.

- Upgrade of Kabingo HCII. TPC recommended quickening the procurement process.

- Rehabilitation of Kabatunda HCII Maternity ward completed. TPC recommended commissioning completed works to ensure that the facility is quickly put to use.

Q2 FY2022/23

District Technical Planning Committee Sitting of 10 October 2022 in the District Multi-purpose Hall

MIN 27/10/2022/23: Presentation and Discussion of Quarterly Monitoring Report

- Isango Animal holding ground. It was observed that the construction of the market structures was not prioritized. The MoLG was contacted and agreed construction and standardization of the market.

2

- Ongoing construction of Nyakakindo mini-irrigation scheme in Hima Town Council. TPC requested the contractor to furnish stakeholders with critical project information and meet with farmers and landowners to mitigate outstanding issues
- Functionality of Nyakamasa HCIII in Bwera Subcounty and Kyempara HCIII in Sub County. The facilities needed to be fenced, titled, and registers updated. Govt should procure assorted medical equipment. Requests of required equipment had been made to the Ministry of Health and DHO.

Q3 FY2022/23

TPC Meeting of 31 March 2023

MIN 52/04/2022/23 Presentation and Discussion of Comprehensive Payroll Monitoring Reports for Schools and Health Centres

- High rate of absenteeism. TPC recommended staff deployment to consider hard-to-reach areas
- Poor record keeping. TPC recommended prioritizing capacity building for record-keeping

Q4 FY2022/23

Extended DPTC of 4 April 2023

MIN61/04/2022/2023 Presentation of Joint Monitoring Report

- Ongoing construction works of a Doctors House and Theatre at Nyabirongo HCIII. It was observed that Doctors House has stalled because of delayed payment to contractor. TPC recommended the payment to the contractor be expedited to ensure that works is completed works on time
- Ongoing construction of Buhunga GFS Phase I. It was observed there was uncontrolled water flow over on the tank. TPC recommended completing the pressure breaks to avoid the overflow.
- Completed grading on Karambi-Kisolholho Road 4.7km. It was observed that deep pit had developed at Kanyamunyu bridge due to heavy floods which required urgent attention. TPC considered planning for an emergency intervention.

## **Investment Management**

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

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

A review of the Fixed Assets Register revealed that the LG did not maintain an up-to-date Fixed Asset Register at the time of Assessment.

**Evidence**

Additions of fixed assets made in FY2022/23 (i.e. Draft Final A/Cs Page 42) not updated in fixed asset register.

- Cultivated Assets UGX 134,499,935
- Non Residential Buildings UGX 1,745,484,807

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that the Board of Survey FY2021/22 was used as a source of guidance for making asset management decisions.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>VIDE: CR 101/1. Submission of Board of Survey Report FY2021/22 Recommendations dated 31 August 2022.</p> <p>Recommendations to dispose of assets i.e.</p> <p>Page No. 168- 3 cracked solar panels for disposal</p> <p>Page No. 182- Pick Up UG407S</p> <p>Actions taken so far</p> <p>Minutes of the District Contracts Committee Meeting Held on 25 September 2023 in Procurement and Disposal Unit Boardroom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KSE/DCC/42/2023-2024- Approval of bidding document for procurement for of auctioneering services for boarding off of assets recommended for disposal in Kasese District.</li> <li>• KSE/DCC/43/2023-2024- Approval of procurement method for procurement of auctioneering services for boarding off of assets recommended for disposal in Kasese District (Selective Bidding)</li> <li>• KSE/DCC/44/2023-2024: Approval of companies for the procurement of auctioneering services for boarding off of assets recommended for disposal in Kasese District.</li> <li>• KSE/DCC/45/2023-2024: Approval of evaluation committee for the procurement of auctioneering services for boarding off of assets recommended for disposal in Kasese District.</li> </ul>
----	---	---	--

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that the Physical Planning Committee was functional and submitted at least a set of minutes of the Physical Planning Committee meetings held in each quarter of FY2022/23 to MoLHUD.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p><b>Appointment of Members- VIDE: CR/1207</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Tembo Hilali Abdu - Physical Planner on 7 December 2020</li> <li>2. Mr. Asiimwe Ronald - Senior Civil Engineer on 7 December 2020</li> <li>3. Mr. Birungi Ben Henry – District Community Development Officer on 16 October 2018</li> <li>4. Mr Rukara Julius – District Agricultural Officer on 16 October 2018</li> <li>5. Mr Mugisa Kithula Francis - District Staff Surveyor on 16 October 2018</li> </ol>
----	---	--	--

6. Mr Joseph Katswera - District Natural Resource Officer on 16 December 2018

7. Mr. Rujumba David - District Road Engineer 16 October 2018

8. Mr Mugisa Moses - Town Clerk Mpondwe Lhubiriha Town Council on 16 October 2018

9. Mr Baluku Bosco - Town Clerk Kisinga Town Council on 16 October 2018

10. Ms. Mbambu Catherine - Town Clerk Rugendabara- Kikong Town Council on 16 October 2018

11. Ms. Bwambale T. Alice - Town Clerk Kyarumba Town Council on 16 October 2018

12. Mr Bihanikire M. J. Godwin - Town Clerk Katwe on 16 October 2018

13. Mr Kooli Augustine Senior Environment Officer on 16 October 2018

14. Mr Muhairwe Sezi- Town Clerk Hima Town Clerk on 16 October 2018

15. Mr Bithekere Robert - Town Clerk Mubuku Town Council on 16 October 2018

16. Mr. Murongo Easu - Town Clerk Ibanda- Kyanya Town Council on 16 October 2018

#### **Submission of Minutes to MoLHUD**

Q1 FY2022/23. VIDE: CR 1207. The meeting was held on 25 July 2022 at the Kasese District Environment and Natural Resources Board Room- Rukoki and submission of the minutes to MoLHUD was made on 7 October 2022.

Q2 FY2022/23. The meeting was held on 20 December 2022 at the Kasese District Environment and Natural Resources Board Room- Rukoki and submission of the minutes to MoLHUD was made on 25 April 2023.

Q3 FY2022/23. The meeting was held on 9 January 2023 at the Kasese District Environment and Natural Resources Board Room- Rukoki and submission of the minutes to MoLHUD was made on 25 April 2023.

Q4 FY2022/23. The meeting was held on 29 June 2023 at the Kasese District Environment and Natural Resources Board Room- Rukoki and submission of the minutes to MoLHUD was made on 11 October 2023.



12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized 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>The LG provided evidence confirming that desk appraisals were conducted for all DDEG financed projects in the budget FY2023/24, prioritized projects were derived from the LG DP III and are eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Construction of District Administration Block derived from DP III Page No. 166 and desk appraisal completed on 08 June 2021.</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:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that field appraisals for DDEG financed projects implemented in FY2022/23 were conducted to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Field appraisal for the construction of District Administration Block was conducted on 08 June 2021</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that project profiles with costing for all investments in the AWP for FY2023/24 were developed and discussed in the TPC as per the LG planning and DDEG guidelines.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>TPC meeting held on 11 May 2023 at the Council Hall.</p> <p>MIN 68/05/2022/2023. Presentation and Discussion of District Project Profiles for FY2023/24.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction and Upgrade of Health Centres across the District Estimated Cost UGX 1.6 B</li> <li>• Construction of Water Supply Systems across the District Estimated Cost UGX 1.2B</li> <li>• Design and Rehabilitation of Water Supply System UGX 486M</li> </ul>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kasese LG had screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists for DDEG-funded projects for the current FY.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG funds were incorporated in the LG-approved procurement plan. These were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;&gt;&gt; Design of Kabingo GFS in Munkunyu S/C, at a budget of UGX 69,000,000/=.</li> <li>&gt;&gt;&gt; Extension of Kalhughuta GFS in Ihandiro S/C, at a budget of UGX 100,000,000/=.</li> <li>&gt;&gt;&gt; Extension of Neotal ward at Bwera hospital, at a budget of UGX 234,862,000/=.</li> <li>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of an administration block, Phase III, at a budget of UGX 450,000,000/=.</li> </ul> <p>The procurement plan for the current FY is as per regulations and it covers all investments.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the previous FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before the commencement of construction, that is,</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Kasese district administration block, the Contracts Committee sat on 21/12/2022, and approved the contract under Minute number: KASE/DCC/92/2022-2023. All 5 contracts committee members signed the minutes.</p> <p><i>Note: the LG had only one DDEG-funded infrastructure project in the previous FY.</i></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	<p><i>Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines for all projects was not availed.</i></p> <p>For health sector projects,</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a staff house at Nyabirongo HC IV, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, principal internal auditor, district health officer, district engineer, senior procurement officer, <b>and labour officer.</b></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a theatre at Bugoye HC III, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, deputy CAO, and district engineer <b>and labour officer. However, the district health officer was not appointed.</b></p> <p><b>For the education sector projects,</b></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kibuga P/S, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, inspector of schools, district education officer, internal auditor, district engineer, procurement officer, and labour officer.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero P/S, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, inspector of schools, district education officer, internal auditor, district engineer, procurement officer and labour officer.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block with an office at Nyamutswa P/S, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, inspector of schools, district education officer, internal auditor, district engineer, procurement officer and labour officer.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Buhuhira Seed School <b>PIT not availed.</b></p> <p><b>For water projects,</b></p>	0

>>> Construction of Bitere GFS, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: community development officer, senior environmental officer, internal auditor, district water officer district engineer, and senior procurement officer. **The labour officer was not appointed.**

>>> Construction of Buhunga GFS, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: community development officer, senior environmental officer, internal auditor, district water officer district engineer, and senior procurement officer. **The labour officer was not appointed.**

>>> Construction of Kyangwe GFS, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: community development officer, senior environmental officer, internal auditor, district water officer district engineer, and senior procurement officer. **The labour officer was not appointed.**

**For DDEG-funded infrastructure projects,** the PIT was not availed; Specifically, the construction of the district administration block.

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

There was evidence that the infrastructure project implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer.

Note: The LG had one (01) infrastructure project, that is, construction of Kasese district administration block,

*The block exhibited no defects such as surface cracks in floor screed and masonry works, etc.*

1

13

Procurement, contract management/execution  
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

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

There was evidence that the LG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to the verification and certification of works in the previous FY. The technical officers, that is, DE, environmental officer, and CDO supervised each project (**site meetings with contractors**) prior to verification and certification of works. The sampled projects were as follows:

>>> Construction of Kasese administration block, roofing Phase I, specifically, payment certificate number 1, issued on 13/03/2023, site meeting and monitoring was done on 13/03/2023, and the technical team signed the attendance list and minutes (with contractor part of the meeting) prior to verification and certification of the payment certificate number 1. All the technical team members verified the work and provided a comprehensive report as shown in the '*construction works inspection/monitoring form*'.

>>> Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero P/S, specifically, payment certificate number 2, issued on 31/05/2023, site meeting and monitoring was done on 30/05/2023, and the technical team (assistant engineering officer, senior environmental officer, and senior community development officer) signed the attendance list and minutes (with contractor part of the meeting) prior to verification and certification of the payment certificate number 2. All the technical team members verified the work and provided a comprehensive report as shown in the '*construction works inspection/monitoring form*'.

>>> Upgrade Nyabirongo HC II to HC III (Construction of a theatre block and Dr's house), specifically, payment certificate number 1, issued on 11/05/2023, site meeting and monitoring was done on 10/05/2023, and the technical team (district engineer, senior environmental officer, and senior community development officer) signed the attendance list and minutes (with contractor part of the meeting) prior to verification and certification of the payment certificate number 1. All the technical team members verified the work and provided a comprehensive report as shown in the '*construction works inspection/monitoring form*'.

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

There was evidence that the LG verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames as per the contract (within 2 months if no agreement).

All the works procurement files for the previous FY were availed and they were appropriately certified i.e. interim and completion certificates issued for all projects based on technical supervision and the contracts were paid within the specified time.

Three certificates with their corresponding

1

score 0

vouchers and monitoring reports were recorded to support the scoring of this indicator; that is,

>>> For the construction of the Kasese administration block, roofing Phase I, under General Conditions of Contract (GCC) No. 52, **'the procurement and disposing entity shall pay the contractor the amount certified by the project manager within thirty (30) days from the date of each certificate.** Specifically, payment certificate number 1, **issued on 13/03/2023**, site meeting and monitoring was done on 13/03/2023, and the technical team signed the attendance list and minutes (with contractor part of the meeting) prior to verification and certification of payment certificate number 1. All the technical team members verified the work and provided a comprehensive report as shown in the 'construction works inspection/monitoring form'. *The payment voucher dated number 4759971, for certificate number 1, payment was 14/04/2023 which was within 31 days (a one day past 30 days required).*

>>> Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero P/S, under General Conditions of Contract (GCC) No. 52, **'the procurement and disposing entity shall pay the contractor the amount certified by the project manager within thirty (30) days from the date of each certificate. Specifically,** payment certificate number 2, issued on 31/05/2023, site meeting and monitoring was done on 30/05/2023, and the technical team (assistant engineering officer, senior environmental officer, and senior community development officer) signed the attendance list and minutes (with contractor part of the meeting) prior to verification and certification of the payment certificate number 2. All the technical team members verified the work and provided a comprehensive report as shown in the 'construction works inspection/monitoring form'. *The payment voucher number 6205483, for certificate number 2, payment date was 23/06/2023 which was within 30 days.*

>>> Upgrade Nyabirongo HC II to HC III (Construction of a theatre block and Dr's house), under General Conditions of Contract (GCC) No. 52, **'the procurement and disposing entity shall pay the contractor the amount certified by the project manager within thirty (30) days from the date of each certificate.** Specifically, payment certificate number 1, issued on 11/05/2023, site meeting and monitoring was done on 10/05/2023, and the technical team (district engineer, senior environmental officer, and senior community development officer) signed the attendance list and minutes (with contractor part of the meeting) prior to verification and certification of the payment certificate number 1. All the technical team members verified the work and provided a comprehensive report as shown in the 'construction works inspection/monitoring form'. *The payment voucher number 5868124, for certificate number 1, payment date was 15/06/2023 which was within 30 days.*

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p><i>From the contracts register, the following projects were sampled:</i></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Kasese district administration block; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00107; evaluation report availed dated 13/12/2022; Contracts Committee meeting minutes availed, approved the contract on 21/12/2022, under minute number: KASE/DCC/92/2022-2023(15); Contract agreement was availed and was signed on 20/02/2023; Contractor: Mensa Engineering Services Limited</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero P/S; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00136; evaluation report availed dated 13/12/2022; Contracts Committee approved the contract on 21/12/2022, under minute number: KASE/DCC/92/2022-2023(1); Contract agreement was availed and was signed on 24/01/2023.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block with an officer; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00001; evaluation report availed dated 13/12/2022; Contracts Committee approved the contract on 21/12/2022, under minute number: KASE/DCC/92/2022-2023(2); Contract agreement was availed and was signed on 24/01/2023.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>The LG had a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law.</p>
----	---	--	--

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Kasese LG communication officer- Kabugho Sharon was appointed as the focal person for a functional district grievance redress mechanism per the appointment letter dated 17/11/2022 by the CAO Byamungu Elias.</p> <p>The Grievance Redress Committee was established per an appointment letter dated 17/11/2022 by the CAO- Byamungu Elias. The members of the committee included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mbambu Catherine- PAS- Chairperson.</li> <li>2. Masiuka Kulthum Mosh - Senior Education Officer.</li> <li>3. Rukara Julius - Principal Agricultural Officer.</li> <li>4. Kabugho Sharon- Communication Officer.</li> <li>5. Rughumyo Robert - Assistant Town Clerk.</li> <li>6. Bukalyaya Yorokam - TB- Leprosy focal petrson.</li> <li>7. Kobusingye Ketty- CDO.</li> </ol>
----	---	---	---

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The district had in place a complaints log book for registering grievances with options of date, complaint, Action, and comment.</p> <p>There were also minutes of the GRC dated 06/03/2023, 23/03/2023, 23/11/2022 and 16/05/2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese district had displayed on its public notice board the grievance redress pathway dated 18/11/2022 with the contact person of the GRM focal person. The district GRM including guidelines was uploaded on the district website- Kasese.go.ug.</p>	<b>1</b>



15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that environment, social, and climate change interventions were integrated into the LG DP/III, AWP/ FY2023/24, and budget FY2023/24.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LG DP/III <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 255- Maintenance of District Tree Nursery Bed</li> <li>• Page 256- Community Members participating in Tree Planting Days</li> <li>• Page 256- Training Community Members Forestry Management</li> <li>• Page 256- Wetlands Inspection and Compliance Monitoring undertaken.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. AWP FY2022/23 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support, Supply and Planting of 110,000 Tree seedlings to farmers</li> <li>• Conduct training 100 Community Members in Forestry management</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Budget FY2022/23- Page..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 131 Training and Workshop UGX 2,100,00</li> <li>• Page 70 Cultivated Plant Acquisition UGX 134,000,000</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
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>The LG provided evidence confirming that the enhanced DDEG guidelines to LLGs and adaptation and social risk management were disseminated to the LLGs.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of the District Technical Planning Committee Meeting held on 10 September 2022 at the District Council Hall with Town Clerks, SAS and Sub Accountants in attendance.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	There was no evidence that Kasese LG had screened for E&S for the DDEG-funded project to guide in costing mitigation measures to incorporate in the BoQs. The project under DDEG project for the previous FY was the Construction of Kasese district administration block.	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There were no projects that required costing due to the additional impact of climate change.	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that all DDEG projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access, and availability;  Construction of the district administration block was implemented on the district headquarters land- Certificate of title-Freehold register, volume KBO309FOLIO24 dated 25/10/2023 by the registrar of titles.	<b>1</b>

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 1 or else score 0	The environmental officer and CDO did not conduct monthly support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for all projects.	0
----	--	--	---	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO before payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at the interim and final stages of projects.	0
----	--	---	---	---

**Financial management**

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	The LG did not maintain up-to-date bank reconciliations up to the time of the assessment.  <b>Evidence</b>  Stanbic Bank Uganda Ltd, A/c No. 9030006382354. Bank Reconciliation Statement for June 2023. Report Date 16 November 2023. i.e. reconciled within 30 days.  Bank of Uganda, A/c No. 005210168000000. Bank Reconciliation Statement for June 2023. Report Date 16 November 2023. i.e. reconciled 30+ days.  Stanbic Bank Uganda Ltd, A/c No. 9030006382354. Bank Reconciliation Statement for October 2023. Report Date 16 November 2023. i.e. reconciled within 30 days.	0
----	---	--	--	---

17

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

The LG provided evidence confirming that the Internal Auditor produced 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY2022/23.

**Evidence**

Q1 FY2022/23. Produced on 31 October 2022 with 9 issues. Submitted to District Chair, Chairperson PAC & Central Registry on 31 October 2022.

Q2 FY2022/23. Produced on 30 January 2023. Follow up on 23 issues from previous recommendations and 7 issues in the current quarter.

Q3 FY2022/23. Produced on 28 April 2023. Follow up on 24 issues from previous audit recommendations and 13 issues in the current quarter.

Q4 FY2022/23. Produced on 31 July 2023. Follow up on 28 issues from previous audit recommendations and 14 issues in the current quarter.

17

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.

Score 1 or else score 0

Information on the status of the implementation of findings from all internal audit quarterly reports for FY2022/23 was not provided to the Council Chairperson and LG PAC.

**Evidence**

The status of implementation of internal audit findings for Q1 FY2022/23 was reported in the Q2 FY2022/23 internal audit report produced on 30 January 2023. i.e. follow up on previous recommendations with 23 outstanding issues. Submitted to District Chairperson, District Speaker, Central Registry, and DPAC on 30 January 2023

The status of implementation of internal audit findings for Q1-Q2 FY2022/23 was reported in the Q3 FY2022/23 internal audit report produced on 28 April 2023 i.e. follow up on previous audit recommendations with 24 outstanding issues. Submitted to Speaker, Chairperson DPAC, and Central Registry on 28 April 2023.

The status of implementation of internal audit findings for Q1-Q3 FY2022/23 was reported in the Q4 FY2022/23 internal audit report produced on 31 July 2023 i.e. follow up on previous audit recommendations with 28 outstanding issues. Submitted to Chairperson Council, Chairperson PAC and Central Registry on 31 July 2023

No status of implementation of recommendations from findings in Q4 FY2022/23 Internal Audit Report was provided at time of assessment. Report was still in draft form awaiting responses from the LG.

0

17 LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90  
  
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:  
  
Score 1 or else score 0

The LG provided evidence that the quarterly internal audit reports for FY2022/23 were submitted to the LG Accounting Officer and LG PAC and that the reports were reviewed and follow-ups made by LG PAC.

**Evidence**

Q1 FY2022/23

DPAC Meeting Districts Head of Departments to Review Queries raised in the Internal Audit Reports Financial Year 2020/21 and 2022/23 1st Quarter on 9 November 2022 in the District Council Hall.

Q2- Q4 FY2022/23

DPAC Meeting to Discuss the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Quarter Internal Audit Reports for the Financial Year 2022/23 on 12 September 2023 in the Office of the DPAC Chairperson.

**Local Revenues**

18 LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)  
  
Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.

A review of LG Annual Budget Estimates FY2022/23 and LG Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 revealed that the local revenue collected by the LG for FY2022/23 was less than budget by 66% (i.e. not within the +/-10% threshold).

**Evidence**

Annual Budget Estimates FY2022/23. Page No. 35

Local revenue amount budgeted was UGX 3,913,546,049

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23

Local revenue amount collected was UGX 1,341,407,251

**Calculation**

(Amount Collected-Amount Budgeted)/Amount Budgeted\*100=

(1,341,407,251-3,913,546,049)/ 3,913,546,049\*100 = -65.7%

The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.

a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY

- If more than 10 %: score 2.

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

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

A review of the LG's Draft Final Accounts for FY2022/23 disclosed that the LG's OSR collection improved by 48% between FY2021/22 and FY2022/23.

#### **Evidence**

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 Page No. 10

OSR Collection FY2022/23 was UGX  
 $188,251,598 + 1,153,155,653 = 1,341,407,251$

OSR Collection FY2021/22 was UGX  
 $232,907,640 + 440,513,766 + 234,328,670 = 907,750,076$

#### **Calculations**

Change in OSR in %age

$(\text{OSR FY2022/23} - \text{OSR FY2021/22}) / \text{OSR FY2021/22} * 100$

$(1,341,407,251 - 907,750,076) / 907,750,076 * 100 = 47.8\%$

Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0

A review of the LG's Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 and remittances to LLGs for FY2022/23 disclosed that the LG remitted less than the 65% mandatory LLG share of local revenues FY2022/23, as mandated in Section 85 of the LG Act CAP 243.

#### **Evidence**

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 Page No. 35

Amount of local revenue collections subject to share with LLGs UGX 1,341,407,251

Remittances made during the FY2022/23

26 June 2023 - UGX 3,223,482

23 June 2023 - UGX 3,722,410

21 June 2023 - UGX 47,441,082

14 June 2023 - UGX 330,850

12 June 2023 - UGX 2,704,564

14 June 2023 - UGX 75,173,515

09 May 2023 - UGX 8,089,745

03 April 2023 - UGX 35,048,000

31 March 2023 - UGX 90,271,700

20 March 2023 - UGX 8,589,500

09 March 2023 - UGX 76,170,400

21 February 2023- UGX 11,053,000

13 February 2023 - UGX 86,484,000

24 January 2023 - UGX 10,882,167

31 January 2023 - UGX 15,490,759

20 December 2022 - UGX 10,229,500

12 December 2022 - UGX 55,942,132

01 November 2022 - UGX 20,729,222

08 November 2022 - UGX 4,971,500

12 September 2022 - UGX 91,582,642

20 September 2022 - UGX 11,510,987

20 August 2022 - UGX 63,344,600

**Total UGX 732,985,757**

.....

#### **Calculations**

Remittances/Total Local Revenue Mandatory for Sharing\*100=

732,985,757/1,341,407,251\*100= 54.6%

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>There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts were published.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; The procurement plan was displayed on the noticeboard on....</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of 2-classroom block at Nyamutswa P/S, best evaluated bidder (BEB) was M/S Byaruhanga Kaida Construction Co., Limited, award amount UGX 103,502,520/=; Contract reference number: KASE856/WRKS/20222-2023/00001; display date: 21/12/2022, removal date: 6/01/2023.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of 2-classroom block at Kahendero P/S, best evaluated bidder (BEB) was M/S Mwimu Engineering Works Limited, award amount UGX 116,996,410/=; Contract reference number: KASE856/WRKS/20222-2023/00136; display date: 21/12/2022, removal date: 6/01/2023.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HC III, best-evaluated bidder (BEB) was M/S Mariam &amp; Brothers Trading Co., Ltd, award amount UGX 2,774,809,430/=; Contract reference number: MoH-UgIFT/WRKS/2022-2023/00001 Lot 20; display date: 24/10/2022, removal date: 4/11/2022.</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>The LG provided evidence confirming that results for performance assessment 2022 and their implications were widely published.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Displayed on Notice Board</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>The LG provided evidence that discussions were conducted with the public during FY2022/23 to provide feedback on the status of activity implementation.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Report on Radio Talk shows on Government Programs- 6 August 2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakdown of Revenues/Grants FY2022/23</li> <li>• All completed and Ongoing projects FY2022/23 and planned projects for FY2023/24</li> </ul> <p>Schedule for Government Airtime allocated by the Office of the RDC for discussions on performance per sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Production on 2 August 2023</li> <li>• Education on 3 August 2023</li> <li>• Health on 3 August 2023</li> <li>• Water, Roads, and Engineering on 3 August 2023</li> <li>• Progress on PDM and Emyooga on 19-20 August 2023.</li> </ul>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that information on Tax Rates, Collection Procedures, and Procedures for Appeal was made public at the time of assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Pinned at the CFO and CAO's Notice Board.</p>	1
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>The LG did not provide evidence to establish whether the status of implementation of issues and recommendations made in the IGG's correspondences FY2022/23.</p> <p>Examples of IGGs issues with no information on actions taken by the LG to address the issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPT/17/09/2022. Date 30 March 2023: Dual Employment of George Bwambale, Senior Auditor, Kasese District.</li> <li>• HQT/CO/790/2019 Dated 21 November 2022. HQT/CO/790/2019: Alleged Corruption and Abuse of Office in the Procurement and Disposal Unit of Kasese District Local Government</li> </ul>	0

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We reviewed PLE results released by UNEB in 2020 and 2022 for Kasese District and we noted the following:</p> <p>In 2020, the district performed as follows; Div. I:961 ; Div. II:6162 ; and Div. III:2188 ; totalling to 9311 pupils against 11015 candidates in (233 primary schools) that sat for PLE that year. This translates to 84.5 % pass rate (9311/11015).</p> <p>In 2022, Kasese District performed as follows; Div. I: 778 ; Div. II:6542 and Div.III:1233 totalling to 8553 pupils against 12846 candidates in ( 233) primary schools) that sat for PLE that year. This translates to 66.5 % pass rate (8553/12846)</p> <p>There was a decline in performance of 18 % (66.5% - 84.5 %).</p> <p>Due to the COVID 19 pandemic, UNEB did not conduct PLE in 2021 hence the comparison between school years, 2020 and 2022 instead of 2021 and 2022 as guided by MoES.</p> <p><b>It should be noted that the UNEB results released for Kasese District included those of Kasese Municipal Council that have been removed</b></p>	<b>0</b>

1

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

Maximum 7 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

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

We reviewed UCE results released by  
UNEB in 2020 and 2022 for USE  
schools for Kasese District and we  
noted the following:

In 2020 Kasese District performed as  
follows; Div.1: 220 ; Div. II:670 and  
Div. III: 1090 totalling to 1980 pupils  
against 5092 candidates (in three (3)  
USE schools) that sat for UCE that  
year. This translates to 38.8% pass  
rate (1980/5092).

In 2022, Kasese District performed as  
follows; Div. I:221 ; Div. II:726 ; and  
Div. III:1287 totalling to 2234 pupils  
against 5263 candidates in (three (3)  
USE schools) that sat for UCE that  
year. This translates to 44.2 % pass  
rate (2234/5263)

There was an improvement in  
performance of 5.4 % (44.2% -  
38.8%).

Due to COVID 19 pandemic, UNEB did  
not conduct UCE Exams in 2021.  
Hence the comparison between school  
years 2020 and 2022, instead of 2021  
and 2022 as guided by MoES.

**It should be noted that the UNEB  
results released for Kasese  
District included those of Kasese  
Municipal Council that have been  
removed**

2

2

N23\_Service Delivery  
Performance: Increase  
in the average score in  
the education LLG  
performance  
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

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

- By more than 5%, score 2
- Between 1 and 5%, score 1
- No Improvement, score 0

NB: If the previous average  
score was 95% and above,  
Score 2 for any increase.

The LG average score in the Education  
LLG performance assessment for 2023  
increased by 20% compared to the  
results of the assessment for 2022.

#### **Evidence**

Education LLGPA Scores for 2023 was  
70%

Education LLGPA Scores for 2022 was  
50%

#### **Calculation**

Education LLGPAS (2023-2022)= 70-  
50=20%

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

We obtained and reviewed the Education Sector, Planning Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments FY 2022/2023 to determine eligible activities and the Q4 budget performance report.

We established evidence that, the development grant was used in accordance with sector guidelines i.e. supply of desks, construction of latrines, construction of classrooms/renovation and construction of teacher's houses. The activities conducted were;

— Construction of three (3) five (5) stance lined latrines at; Nyamutsua, Kaswa and Bulimi Primary schools.

— Construction of 8 classrooms two (2) classrooms each school for; Kisabu. Nyamutsua (with an office), Kibuga and Kahendero Primary Schools

- Construction of a Seed secondary school at Bwesumbu

— Supply of 620, three - seater desks, and distributed to primary schools as follows; Kihyo 36, Kithoma CoU 36, Nyamutsua 36, Kibuga 36, KKiraro 36, Kabatunda 36, Rusese 36, Nyamirami 36, Mughete Quaran 36, Kanyuhuny 36, Bikone 36, Kisabu 36, Kasanga 36 and Bwera CoU 36 desks.

-

According to the Q4 performance report page 107 the district spent UGX 1, 978,583.000 against a budget of UGX 1,978,483,000 implying a 100% performance rate.

2

3

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

We obtained payment vouchers for all education construction projects contracts for the previous FY 2022/2023 in Bunyangabo District, to establish whether the completion certificates were signed by the CDO and the Environment officer

We established the following details;

1. Payment of UGX 1,024,383,849 was made, vide voucher No 640919 dated 27 June 2023, for construction of a Seed Secondary school at Bwesumba. This payment was not certified by the CDO and Environment officer

2. Payment of UGX 41,475,318 was made vide voucher No 4264807 dated

0

16th March 2023 and UGX 59,827,227 vide voucher No 6411518 dated 27th June 2023 respectively, for construction of a two (2) classroom block with an office at Kyarumba P/S was certified by the; SCDO on 17/02/2023 and 09/05/2023 and by the Environment Officer, on 17/02/2023 and 09/05/2023, respectively.

3. Payment of UGX 52,054,754 was made vide voucher No 988118 dated 27/04/2023 and UGX 33,363,202 dated 15/06/2023 for construction of a classroom block at Kibuga P/S. The certificate of works was certified by the SDCO on 09/03/2023 and 09/05/2023 the Environment officer 09/03/2023 and 09/05/2023, respectively.

5. Payment of UGX 54,152,147 vide voucher No 4280036 dated 16 March 2023 for construction of a 5 stance lined latrine at Nyamustwa P/S), was certified by the SDCO on 13/02/2023 and Environment Officer on 13/02/2023.

6. Payment of UGX 23,506,248 Vide Voucher No 4264807 dated 17th March 2023 . The certification by the SDCO was on 02/03/2023 and Environment officer. 02/03/2023

7. Payment of UGX 52,128,017 vide voucher No 6205483 dated 23 June 2023 for construction of a two classroom block at Kahendero P/S. Certification was made by CDO on 15/06/2023 and Environment Officer on 15/06/2023.

Since the voucher for Bwesumba Seed School was not certified by CDO and Environment Officer, Kasese District was not compliant

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	The sampled projects/contracts were as follows:	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kibuga P/S in Karusandara S/C, budgeted at UGX 90,000,000/= according to procurement plan 2022/2023FY. The Contractor was M/S Kule William &amp; Sons Limited; Works contract amount: UGX 89,913,640/=; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00002. <b>This represented a variation of - 0.096% of the MoWT estimate.</b></p>	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block with an office at Nyamutswa P/S in Kyarumba S/C, budgeted atr UGX 105,000,000/=. The Contractor was M/S Byaruhanga Kaida Construction Co., Limited; Works contract amount: UGX 103,502,520/=; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00001. <b>This represented a variation of - 1.426% of the MoWT estimate.</b></p>	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block Kahendero P/S in Muhokya TC, budgeted atr UGX 120,000,000/=. The Contractor was M/S Mwimu Engineering Works Limited; Works contract amount: UGX 116,996,410/=; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00136. <b>This represented a variation of - 2.503% of the MoWT estimate.</b></p>	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools)were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	As per the contracts and work schedule; and the budget performance report for the previous FY, education projects were not completed as per the work plan in the previous FY.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Bwesumbu Seed School in Bwesumbu S/C; Contract signing was 22/12/2022, site handover: 28/12/2022; Contract period: 18 Calendar months.</p>	
			<p><i>By the end of the financial year, 33.33% completion would be achieved, but only 5% was achieved as shown in a monitoring report ....</i></p>	
			Note:	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; The LG had one seed school under construction in the previous FY.</p>	
			<p>&gt;&gt;&gt; The budget performance report was not availed.</p>	

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"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We reviewed the staffing structure of primary school teachers from HRM and noted that Kasese district had recruited 2933 (110%) staff in position against a staff ceiling of 2660 teachers as per the guidelines prescribed by MoES i.e. at 1:53 (teacher: pupil ratio) and a teacher per class plus a head teacher for a P7 school.</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"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>We reviewed a list of registered 233 UPE and 22 USE schools and their consolidated schools asset registers for FYs 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 from the DEO which revealed evidence that, none of the 233 UPE schools or (0%) and none of the 22 USE schools or (0%) respectively, met the Basic requirements and minimum standards.</p> <p>All schools required extra classrooms/renovation, latrines, teacher's house and/or desks.</p> <p>The LG therefore, failed to meet the minimum Basic requirements as per DES guidelines.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>We reviewed the teacher deployment list from the District education office and noted that Kasese District had accurately reported on 2933 (100%) staff in position, including where they were deployed.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; Mughete P/S (semi- urban) there were 13 teachers, in Bugoye P/S (rural) there were 23 teachers and in Hima P/S (urban), there were 19 teachers.</p> <p>This information was collated with the teacher's arrival books at the three schools, the staff lists for 2022/23 from the education office and the staff lists found at the sampled schools. The three sources of information were accordant.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

We reviewed the school asset registers of the three sampled schools and verified the information at the sampled schools, which revealed evidence that Kasese District had a consolidated school asset register accurately reporting on infrastructure in all the three (3) sampled schools (100% accuracy).

In the three sampled schools, we noted the information below;

— Bugoye P/S (rural) there were three (3) classroom blocks with nine (9) classrooms; one (1) latrine blocks with eight (8) stances, 100 three-seater desks and two (2) teachers houses in permanent material, accommodating four (4) teacher's families.

— In Hima P/S (urban), there were, three (3) classroom blocks with 18 classrooms, one (1) latrine blocks with 18 stances, 320, three-seater desks and no teacher's house.

— In Mughete P/S (semi-urban) there were four (4) classroom blocks with 14 classrooms, three (3) latrine blocks with 17 stances, 168, three-seater desks and no teachers house.

This information was corroborated with the consolidated Asset register at the Education Department office and both were in tandem.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

The education department did not avail a full set of copies of the annual school reports and budgets submitted in the previous FY 2022/2023. What was availed, lacked the reconciled cash flow statements, the annual budget and expenditure report. They also lacked evidence of being signed by the Chair SMC and head teacher, let alone evidence of them being submitted on/or before 30 January of 2023

Therefore, there was no evidence that schools had complied with the requirement of all registered primary schools (UPE) submitting the Annual School Report to the District Education Office within the timeline of on/or before 30 January 2022.



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"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30– 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We reviewed inspection reports for; Term III, 2022 dated 10 September 2022, Term 11, 2023 dated 13 June 2023 and Term 1, 2023, dated 1 April 2023 of FY 2022/2032 to identify the schools that had submitted the SIPs. The findings were that 112 out of 233 (48%) schools had submitted SIPs.</p> <p>All the three sampled schools i.e. (Mughete) semi-urban P/S,Hima (urban) P/S and Bugoye (rural) had a copy of the SIP displayed on the schools notice boards.</p> <p>There was therefore evidence that schools were supported to develop SIPS .</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

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"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the OTIMS extract from MOES and noted that Kasese District submitted data (140.981) pupils) for 233 primary schools.</p> <p>We reviewed the LG performance contract for FY 2022/23 signed and noted a list of 233 schools. Therefore, the LG collected and compiled data for all registered schools (UPE) in the district and submitted it accordingly.</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 Kasese District budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of seven teachers for 233 schools with P7, to the tune of UGX 25,120,784,000 for FY 2022/2023 as per the approved budget estimates pg 75 of FY 2023/2024</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

We obtained and reviewed the teacher's staff list and there was evidence that Kasese education department had deployed 2933 staff in position as per sector guidelines, i.e. a head teacher and a teacher per class for a P7 school and a head teacher and one teacher for each class for a school below P7, in 233 primary schools.

In the three sampled schools, we noted the following;

— Mughete P/S (semi-urban) - 13 teachers;

— Hima P/S Urban) - 19 teachers; and

— BugoyeP/S (rural) - 23 teachers.

This information was corroborated with staff lists at school, teacher's arrival books and staff lists from the education department office, hence found in sync.

3

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

We reviewed the teacher deployment list and inspected the notice board at the DEO's office and those in the three sampled schools.

We established evidence that the teacher deployment had been displayed at both the DEO's office and on the school notice boards of the three sampled schools i.e. Mughete P/S (semi -urban). Bugoye P/S (rural) and Hima P/S (urban).

1

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The following Head Teacher files were provided for review during assessment and only two as highlighted below were duly appraised.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Baluku Yokonia, HT St. Peters Bulemera, appraised 31st December 2022.</b></li> <li>2. Boosi Masereka Jophes, HT Kitooko PS, appraised 2018.</li> <li>3. <b>Baluku Moses Birungi, HT Muzahura COU PS, appraised 25th August 2022.</b></li> <li>4. Baluku Juma HT Buhyoka PS, appraised 18th January 2022.</li> <li>5. Bright Saidi, HT Katwe Quaran PS, appraised 2021.</li> </ol>	0
---	--	--	--	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the following files were provided and only three were found appraised. However, all three were appraised beyond the stipulated timeline of 31st December 2022 thereby not meeting the score threshold as shown here under.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mugisa James, HT Mutanywana Secondary School, appraised 7th March 2022</li> <li>2. Nzukwa Jospheh, HT Kuruhe High School, appraised 6th February 2022</li> <li>3. Baluku Semei Tsongo, HT Karambi Secondary School, appraised 6th February 2022</li> <li>4. Wanzalha Kiiza Simplisio, HT Uganda Martyrs College Kyondoo Secondary School no appraisal information provided.</li> </ol>	0
---	--	---	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>Only three staff in the LG Education Department were appraised against their performance plans as shown below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Ag. District Education Officer</b> - Thabugha Bwambale Ernest. At the time of assessment, the Ag. DEO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</li> <li>2. <b>Principal Inspector of Schools</b> - Thabugha Bwambale Ernest At the time of assessment, the PIS was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</li> <li>3. <b>Inspectors of schools</b> - Kabinga Moses, no appraisal information provided.</li> <li>4. <b>Inspectors of schools</b> - Muhindo Rosemary, no appraisal information provided.</li> <li>5. <b>Inspectors of schools</b> - Kule Erisania, appraised 31st July 2023.</li> <li>6. <b>Inspectors of schools</b> - Masika Harriet, appraised 31st July 2023.</li> </ol>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kasese District had a training plan dated 05/07/2022. Some of the activities therein were training head teachers on performance management and appraisal and supporting head teachers on the development of School Improvement Plans (SIPs).</p>	2

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>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>Kasese District did not write to MoES, regarding the list of schools and enrolment because all data had been captured correctly.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>		
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>We reviewed the MoES sector budgeting and implementation guidelines for Local Governments FY 2022/2023, the approved budget estimates FY 2022/2023 and annual performance report for FY 2022/23.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Review of the performance contract revealed evidence that Kasese district allocated UGX 80,352,000 towards inspection and monitoring.</p>	
			<p>Review of the annual performance report on page 109 revealed an expenditure of UGX 72,922,000 (90.8 %) on inspection and monitoring activities including the following;</p>	
			<p>— Conducting inspections, thrice for each school</p>	
			<p>— Conducting follow up inspections to establish whether recommendations were implemented.</p>	
			<p>— Discussion of findings and dissemination of findings</p>	
			<p>We established that the inspection and monitoring activities conducted complied to sector guidelines.</p>	

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions for school capitation grants revealed that the LG in FY2022/23, warranted more than 5 working days after cash limits were communicated by the PS/ST.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Q3 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 29 December 2022. LG warranted on 18 January 2023 i.e. 5+ working days.</p> <p>Q4 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 06 April 2023. LG warranted on 25 April 2023 i.e. 5+ working days.</p> <p>Q1 FY2023/24. Cash limit communication on 06 July 2023. LG warranted on 31 July 2023 i.e 5+ working days</p>	
			<p><b>Note:</b> Information on cash limit uploaded in the PBS by MoFPED could not be accessed.</p>	
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED. If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Review of copies of MoFPED release circulars for the last three quarters indicated the following dates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— 2022/23 Q3: 10 January 2023</li> <li>— 2022/23 Q4: 24 April 2022 and</li> <li>— 2023/24 Q1: 25 July 2022</li> </ul>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>The education department did not provide evidence that Kasese District made release circulars and invoices of capitation to schools for the last three (3) quarters.</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"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained a copy of the inspection plan for FY 2022/23, dated 09th July 2022. It detailed; Specific activity, objectives, input, verifiable indicators, outputs and timeframe</p> <p>There was evidence that the DIS had held inspection planning meetings for Term III of 2022 dated, 29/09/2022 under Min/06/2022, term I, dated 16/01/2023 under Min o6/2023 and term II of 2023, dated, 30/06/2023 under Min 03/0/06/2023</p>	2

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

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

We obtained the Kasese district inspection and monitoring reports for the three terms; Term III of 2022 dated 10 September 2022, Term II of 2023 dated, 13th June 2023 and Term I of 2023, dated, 10th May 2023 respectively.

We established that the 233 schools had been inspected thrice each, in FY 2022/23.

This information on the list of schools from PBS was corroborated with that in the inspection reports and, it rhymed

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

We obtained departmental minutes from the DIS dated as follows; Term III of 2022 dated 10 September 2022, Term II of 2023 dated 13th June 2023 and Term I of 2023, dated, 10th May 2023 respectively, to determine whether school inspection reports were discussed and used to make corrective actions for FY 2022/2023.

In the three sampled schools;

— Mughete P/S-(semi-urban) from a report dated 18/07/2023 by Kabinga Moses, a recommendation was made for the school to mitigate rain water harvesting. At the time of assessment, the school had gotten a 10.000 litre tank donated by Unicef to manage water shortage and rainwater harvesting. In another report dated 12/10.2022 by, Kule Phenahas, a recommendation was made to improve on littering behind one of the classroom blocks. This had been sorted out by the administration.

— In Hima P/S (urban) a report dated 07/08/2023 by Kato Herbert was available, a recommendation to have learning Aids displayed was made, and this had been done at the time of inspection.

— In Bugoye P/S (rural) a report dated 07/03/2023 by Kahyana Jerom made recommendations thus; the sitting environment needs improvement by having more desks. The head had since contacted the Chair SMC and had equally written to DEO, in regard to the shortage of furniture, seeking to be considered for supply and was still expecting response.

— There was evidence that schools had implemented the recommendations made in the inspection reports.



Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES):  
Score 2 or else score: 0

We obtained a list of schools and sampled three schools and established as follows in the schools;

— In Mughete P/S (semi -urban) reports dated 12 October 2022 and 18 July 2023 were left behind

— In Hima P/S (urban), an inspection dated 11 October 2022 and 07 August 2023, were left at the school. and in

— Bugoye P/S an inspection report dated 07 March 2022 was on file.

There was evidence that Kasese DEO had submitted the three reports for Term 111 2022 , Term 1 and Term 11 2023 on 10th July 2023 and were acknowledged received by DES

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

The LG provided evidence confirming that the Social Services Standing Committee met and discussed service delivery issues in FY2022/23.

#### **Evidence**

Social Services Standing Committee Report to Council Sitting of 30 May 2023.

Social Services Committee Sitting Minutes of 16 May 2023. Minutes 17/KDLG/SOCIAL SERV. COMT/MAY/2023 and Minutes 18/KDLG/SOCIAL SERV. COMT/MAY/2023

- The Committee learned that 2 model primary schools were not creating impact. LLG with model primary school should set steering committee to oversee and support. Establish more model schools in Busongora North to put other schools in a position to borrow a leaf.

- Most Secondary and Primary Schools close term before the official closing date. Inspection monitoring and supervision of school operations should be carried out up to the closing date by technical staff and political leaders.

Social Services Standing Committee Report to Council Sitting on the 31 March 2023.

Social Services Sitting Minutes as on 23 March 2023 in the District Council Hall. Minute 10/KDLG/SOCIAL SERV./MARCH/ 2023:

- Gap in performance in PLE- Financial support from DEO is recommended to boost monitoring of the worst performing schools for the identification of the root causes and setting remedies to end challenges.

- Most schools in hard-to-reach areas experience challenges of non-reporting to duty by staff and adequacy of female teachers. Recruitment of teachers based on affirmative action is recommended.

11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,	There was evidence that the LG education department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school. This was done by mobilizing all stakeholders (Parents, PTS, SMC. Opinion leaders, Religious leaders and Local leaders on their roles to ensuring that children attend school daily, are free from abuse and have a meal at lunch time. This was done at Centre Coordinating Centres (CCTs). A total number of 264 attendees were recorded	2
	<i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	<i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>		

**Investment Management**

12	Planning and budgeting for investments	a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	We reviewed the school asset registers which sets out the school facilities and equipment relative to basic education standards. We verified the information at the sampled schools, which revealed evidence that Kasese District had a consolidated school asset register accurately reporting on infrastructure in all the three (3) sampled schools (100% accuracy).  In the three sampled schools, we noted the information below;  — Bugoye P/S (rural) there were three (3) classroom blocks with nine (9) classrooms; one (1) latrine blocks with eight (8) stances, 100 three-seater desks and two (2) teachers houses in permanent material, accommodating four (4) teacher’s families.  — In Hima P/S (urban), there were, three (3) classroom blocks with 18 classrooms, one (1) latrine blocks with 18 stances , 320, three-seater desks and no teacher’s house.  — In Mughete P/S (semi-urban) there were four (4) classroom blocks with 14 classrooms, three (3) latrine blocks with 17 stances, 168, three-seater desks and no teachers house.  This information was corroborated with the consolidated Asset register at the Education Department office and both were in tandem.	2
	<i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>			

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (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>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that the LG TPC conducted desk appraisals of all sector projects in the budget FY2022/23, prioritized projects were derived from the LG DP III and eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Construction of Bwesumbu Seed Secondary School in Bwesumbu Sub County derived from DP III Page 137 and desk appraisal completed on 4 May 2021.</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Bikone Primary School in Ibanda-Kyanya Sub County derived from DP III Page 137 and desk appraisal completed on 5 May 2021.</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block and admin office at Kisabu Primary School at Kitholu derived from DP III Page 137 and desk appraisal completed on 5 May 2021.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that field appraisals of sector projects in FY2022/23 were conducted to establish their technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs to suit site conditions.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Field appraisal for the construction of Bwesumbu Seed Secondary School in Bwesumbu Sub County completed on 8 June 2021.</p> <p>Field appraisal for the construction of 2 classroom block at Bikone Primary School in Ibanda-Kyanya Sub County completed on 5 June 2021</p> <p>Field appraisal for the construction of 2 classroom block and admin office at Kisabu Primary School at Kitholu completed on 8 June 2021</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education department budgeted for and ensured that planned education sector infrastructure projects (seed secondary school) have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, that is,</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Rukoki Seed School, budgeted for UGX 1,061,690,159/=.</p> <p>The current FY procurement plan is dated and signed by CAO on 24/07/2023, and received by PPDA on 21/08/2023.</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>There was 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. Three (03) projects were recorded as evidence to support the scoring of this indicator:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a Bwesumbu Seed School; Contract reference number: MoH-UgIFT/WRKS/2021-2022/0002; evaluation report availed dated 13/12/2022; <b>Contracts Committee approved the contract on 19/04/2022, under minute number: CC245; Solicitor General approved on 2/11/2022, reference number: ADM.7/176/01; Contract amount UGX 3,632,584,570/=.</b></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero P/S; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00136; evaluation report availed dated 13/12/2022; <b>Contracts Committee approved the contract on 21/12/2022, under minute number: KASE/DCC/92/2022-2023(1).</b></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a 2-classroom block with an officer; Contract reference number: KASE/856/WRKS/2022-2023/00001; evaluation report availed dated 13/12/2022; <b>Contracts Committee approved the contract on 21/12/2022, under minute number: KASE/DCC/92/2022-2023(2).</b></p>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

There was no evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for all school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. The projects were as follows:

>>> Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kibuga P/S, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, inspector of schools, district education officer, internal auditor, district engineer, procurement officer, and labour officer.

>>> Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero P/S, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, inspector of schools, district education officer, internal auditor, district engineer, procurement officer, and labour officer.

>>> Construction of a 2-classroom block with an office at Nyamutswa P/S, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, inspector of schools, district education officer, internal auditor, district engineer, procurement officer and labour officer.

>>> However, the Construction of Buhuhira Seed School PIT was not availed.

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else, score: 0*

There was evidence that the school infrastructure (seed secondary school) followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES.

>>> *Construction of Bwesumbu Seed School in Bwesumbu S/C; Contract signing was 22/12/2022, site handover: 28/12/2022; Contract period: 18 Calendar months.*

The contractor followed the technical designs issued by MoES.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects (seed secondary schools) planned in the previous FY due to the slow progress from the contractor.  <b>Note:</b>  <i>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Bwesumbu Seed School in Bwesumbu S/C; Contract signing was 22/12/2022, site handover: 28/12/2022; Contract period: 18 Calendar months. By the end of the financial year, 33.33% completion would be achieved, but only 5% was achieved according to the report dated 30/06/2023.</i>	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no 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 .., was conducted.	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>A review of AWP and a sample of LG's payment vouchers for payments to 3 contractors for education Infrastructure projects implemented in FY2022/23 revealed that the LG did not initiate and make timely payments to contractors as per contract and implementation results.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Recommended days of payments after certification is 30 days.</p> <p>1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Kambezi Investments Limited on 24 April 2023 for the construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Bulimi Primary School for UGX 26,945,300. The District Education Officer forwarded payment on 27 April 2023. Payment Certificate No.1 was prepared and signed off on 24 April 2023. The payment was made on 15 June 2023 EFT NO. 5899908 i.e. 51 days after certification of works.</p> <p>2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Byaruhanga Kaida Construction Company Ltd on 12 June 2023 for the completion of 2 classroom blocks at Kamabwe Primary School in Maliba Sub County for UGX 24,700,000. The District Education Officer forwarded payment on 14 June 2023. Payment Certificate No. 1 was prepared on 13 June 2023. The payment was made on 27 June 2023 EFT NO. 6411518 i.e. within 13 days from certification of works.</p> <p>3. Request for Payment was made by M/s Byaruhanga Kaida Construction Company Ltd on 15 May 2023 for the completion of 2 classroom blocks and an office at Nyamutswa Primary School in Kyarumba Sub County for UGX 62,470,882. The District Education Officer forwarded payment on 1 June 2023. Payment Certificate No. 2 was prepared on 19 May 2023. The payment was made on 27 June 2023 EFT NO. 6411518 i.e. 39 days after certification of works.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Education Department timely submitted a procurement plan for the previous FY in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, that is, 12/4/2022. The plan was signed and stamped by district education officer (DEO) and received by head PDU.</p>	1



13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. Only one seed school was contracted in the previous FY:  >>> Construction of a Bwesumbu Seed School; Contract reference number: MoH-UgIFT/WRKS/2021-2022/0002; evaluation report availed dated 13/12/2022; Contracts Committee approved the contract on 19/04/2022, under minute number: CC245; Solicitor General approved on 2/11/2022, reference number: ADM.7/176/01; Works contracted availed dated 22/12/2022, contract amount UGX 3,632,584,570/=.  The procurement file was complete with all documents.	<b>1</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0	There was evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to, and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework;  On 06/03/2023, the sub-county grievance redress mechanism reported rain-washing soil of the construction site of Bwesumbu Seed Secondary School into the neighbors' land and gardens downstream of the site. The district engineer on orders of the district GRC contacted the contractor who installed the perimeter wall along the site.	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation  <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that Kasese LG disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrances) proper citing of schools, green schools and energy and water conservation. This was done on 10th May 2023 with an attendance of 140 head teachers.	<b>3</b>

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG had in place a costed ESMP and this was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual document for Education projects;  Construction of a two-classroom block and a latrine at Nyamutswa primary school had a costed ESMP of UGX: 4,810,000 in the BoQs.  Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero primary school had a costed ESMP of UGX: 7,850,000 in the BoQs.  Construction of a two-classroom block at Kibuga Primary School had a costed ESMP of UGX: 6,750,000 in the BoQs.	<b>2</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was no evidence that Education projects were constructed on land where the district had proof of ownership. The sampled schools included; Nyamutswa Primary School, Kamabwe Primary School, Kibuga Primary School, and Kahendero Primary School.	<b>0</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted monthly supervision and monitoring of projects under Education for the Previous FY.	<b>0</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments  <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	The environment Officer and CDO had not carried out monthly monitoring of projects and developed E&S certification forms to inform approval and signing of E&S payment certificates of contractors.	<b>0</b>

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no increment in deliveries as the LG did not register more than 20% increase in utilization of health care services in deliveries.</p> <p>The sampling done from all the Health facilities conducting deliveries from the health unit annual reports (HMIS 107) for financial years 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 indicated a 11% increment.</p> <p>In the financial year 2021-2022, total deliveries amounted to 26693.</p> <p>In the financial year 2022-2023, total deliveries amounted to 23504.</p> <p>(23504-26693) divided by 26693, and then multiplied by 100, which equaled 11%.</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG average score in the Health LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 76%.</p>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The indicator was not applicable</p>	<b>0</b>

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of the LG's Annual Budget Performance Report and Annual Budget Estimates for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG Health Development Grant was budgeted and spent on eligible activities as per the Health Grant and Budget Guidelines.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Budget Estimates FY2022/23</p> <p>Building and Facility Maintenance -Civil Works at Nyabirongo UGX 253,814,000</p> <p>Construction and upgrade of Nyabirongo HCIII UGX 920,000,000</p> <p>Staff house construction at Buhuhira Hc III UGX 170,000,000</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that the LG Health Officer, Engineer, Community Development Officer, and Environment Officer certified works implemented by the LG's Health Department in FY2022/23 before payments were made to contractors.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Mariam and Brothers Trading Company Ltd on 19 April 2023 for the upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HCIII for UGX 286,467,693. Payment Certificate No.1 was prepared on 11 May 2023 and signed by the District Health Officer, District Engineer, District Community Development Officer, and Environment Officer. The payment was made on EFT No. 5868124 on 15 June 2023.</p> <p>2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Robtex Kasese Enterprises Ltd on 10 May 2023 for the construction of the Theatre at Bugoye HCIII Phase 1 in Bigoye for UGX 129,553,970. Payment Certificate was prepared on 11 May 2023 and signed by the District Health Officer, District Engineer, District Community Development Officer, and Environment Officer. The payment was made on EFT No. 5868293 on 15 June 2023.</p> <p>3. Request for Payment was made by M/s P &amp; D Traders &amp; Contractors on 12 June 2023 for the upgrading of Buhuhira HCII to HC III for UGX 227,547,974. Payment Certificate No. 3 was prepared on 26 June 2023 and signed by the District Health Officer, District Engineer, District Community Development Officer, and Environment Officer. The payment was made on EFT No. 6411520 on 27 June 2023.</p>	2

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had two projects under health:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HC III; M/S Mariam &amp; Brothers Trading Co., Ltd, award amount UGX 954,892,310/=. The procurement plan dated 14/07/2022 had a budget of UGX 1,090,000,000/=. <b>This represented a variation of -12.395% of the MoWT Engineers estimate.</b></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a theatre at Bugoye HC III, works contract amount was UGX 247,879,060/=. The procurement plan dated had a budget of UGX 253,814,103/=. <b>This represented a variation of -2.338% of the MoWT Engineers estimate.</b></p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY.</p> <p>Specifically, the upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HC III; by M/S Mariam &amp; Brothers Trading Co., Ltd, award amount UGX 954,892,310/= was behind schedule with a scope of Dr's house and theatre block. A visit to this site found the contractor not on site (in the current FY).</p> <p><i>The annual budget performance report for the previous FY was not availed to determine whether health projects where contracts were signed were completed.</i></p>	0

Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure

- If above 90% score 2
- If 75% - 90%: score 1
- Below 75 %: score 0

The approved structure for HCIV and HC III facilities provides for staffing levels as follows: (i) HC IIIs – 19 and (ii) HC IVs – 49. A review of the data provided revealed that Kasese DLG has one HC IV and twenty two HC IIIs. The staffing levels at facilities at the time of assessment was found to be on average 73.1%.

**HC IV:**

1. Nyamirami HC IV - 44/49 (89%)

**HC III:**

1. Mukokya HC III - 18/19 (94%)
2. Buhuhira HC III - 6/19 (31%)
3. Kalibu HC III - 13/19 (68%)
4. Kitcwamba HC III - 17/19 (89%)
5. Isule HC III - 11/19 (57%)
6. Karusanda HC III - 12/19 (63%)
7. Mukathi HC III - 14/19 (73%)
8. Kabatunda HC III - 16/19 (84%)
9. Katew HC III - 15/19 (78%)
10. Muhanga HC III - 12/19 (63%)
11. Bwesumbu HC III - 10/19 (52%)
12. Kinyabwamba HC III - 14/19 (73%)
12. Bugoye HC III - 29/19 (152%)
14. Kitholhu HC III - 7/19 (36%)
15. Kyempara HC III - 11/19 (57%)
16. Nyaakimasa HC III - 12/19 (63%)
17. Karambi HC III - 19/19 (100%)
18. Ihandiro HC III - 11/19 (57%)
19. Kyarumba HC III - 14/19 (73%)
20. Kyondo HC III - 11/19 (57%)
21. Nyakirongo HC III - 24/19 (126%)
22. Hima HC III - 23/19 (121% )

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <p><i>Form the inventory of existing and newly constructed health facilities, all facilities conformed to the approved MoH designs.</i></p> <p><i>Specifically in the previous FY,</i></p> <p><i>&gt;&gt;&gt; Upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HC III; M/S Mariam &amp; Brothers Trading Co., Ltd; this included the Dr's house, and theatre block.</i></p> <p><i>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a theatre at Bugoye HC III.</i></p> <p><i>All facilities conformed to the approved MoH designs.</i></p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled was accurate. This was evidenced on the deployment staff lists from the DHO of 5th October 2023 and that on the staff lists and attendance registers at the 3 sampled health facilities of Hima Health centre III, Kabatunda Health centre III and Bugoye Health centre III as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At Hima Health center III, 23 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the staff list of July 2023.</li> <li>2. At Kabatunda Health center III, 16 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 16 staff list of 13th May 2023</li> <li>3. At Bugoye Health center III, 29 out of 19 staff was indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 29 staff list dated 30th September 2023.</li> </ol>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health sector had upgrades under the financial year assessed.</p> <p>Buhuhira HC II was upgraded to HC III, Nyabirungo HC III and Bugoye HC III were upgraded to Heath centre IV as evidenced on the PBS report</p>	2

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

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:

- Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Work plans and budgets to the DHO for the previous financial year.

The sampled health facilities of Hima HC III, Kabatunda HC III and Bugoye HC III Health facilities submitted as follows;

1. Hima Health center III submitted on 29th March 2022 as endorsed by the DHO and approved by the CAO on 30th March 2022

2. Kabatunda health center III submitted on 16th March 2022 as endorsed by the DHO and approved by the CAO on 18th March 2022 and;

3. Bugoye Health center III submitted on 30th March 2022 as endorsed by the DHO and approved by the CAO.

All the submissions were by 31st March which was within the timeline and also conformed to the prescribed formats.

2

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

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

- Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the sampled Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY.

1. Hima HC III submitted on 9th July 2023 signed by the in-charge, HUMC chairman and approved by the DHO

2. Bugoye HC III submitted on 30th June 2023 signed by the in-charge and HUMC chairman and;

3. Kabatunda HC III submitted on 30th April 2023 signed by the HUMC chairman and in-charge

The submissions complied to The timeline submission by July 15th of the current FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines

2



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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the health facilities developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporated performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports

These performance issues were identified from the facility PIPs included leadership/governance where the plan was conducting capacity building. Under human resources, the plans were conducting capacity building, CMEs and staff appraisals. Under medicines/supplies, the plans were routine supervision and training of dispensers.

The samples and visited health facilities submitted their annual comprehensive work plans (HMIS 001) which replaced the improvement plans as the MOH rolled out nationally. The submissions were as follows;

1. Hima HC III submitted on 29th March 2023.
2. Kabatunda HC III submitted on 30th March 2023 and;
3. Bugoye HC III submitted on 30th March 2023

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>	<p>Despite the fact that the health facilities submitted HMIS 105 monthly reports, they were not 100% up to date and timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter).</p>	0
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Monthly and quarterly reports for the 3 sampled health facilities of Hima, Kabatunda and Bugoye health facilities were indicated as below;</p>	
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Hima health facility submitted as follows; 7th August, 7th September, 6th October, <b>(October report missing)</b>, 5th December, 5th January, 7th February, 5th March, 5th April, <b>8th June</b> and 7th July</p>	
			<p>Kabatunda health facility submitted as follows; 5th August, 6th September, 7th October, 7th November, 7th December, 5th January, 2nd February, 7th March, 5th April, 5th May, <b>8th June</b> and 7th July.</p>	
			<p>Bugoye Health facility submitted as follows; 7th August, 6th September, 7th October, 7th November, 6th December, 6th January, 7th February, 7th March, 7th April, 7th May, 7th June and 6th July</p>	
			<p>The submissions of the 2 facilities (Hima and Kabatunda) months of May were not timely as they were submitted after the 7th date of the next month. The October report of Hima was not captured during the assessment as it was missing.</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>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>This indicator was not applicable</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>		

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>This indicator was not applicable</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Health Department compiled and submitted timely Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY2022/23 to the Planner for consolidation.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Q1 FY2022/23. Submission within 30 days after end of quarter i.e. 4 Oct 2022</p> <p>Q2 FY2022/23. Submission within 30 days after end of quarter i.e. 3 Jan 2023</p> <p>Q2 FY2022/23. Submission within 30 days after end of quarter i.e 4 April 2023</p> <p>Q4 FY2022/23. Submission within 30 days after end of quarter i.e 4 July 2023</p>	1
---	--	---	---	---

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

h) Evidence that the LG has:

i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that the LG developed a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). This was evidenced from the annual comprehensive work plan (HMIS 001) which was rolled out by MOH to replace the PIP as directed by the Permanent secretary MOH. The submission of the PIP/Annual comprehensive work plan was 15th July 2023 as signed by the DHO and approved by the CAO.

The improvement plans and the PIP implementation reports indicated 28 facilities as the weak performing health facilities;

Bikunya HC II, Bubotho HC II, Bughendero HC II, Buhungamuyagha HC II, Busunga HC II, Ibanda-Bugoyr HC II, Ihandiro HC III, Kabirizi Lower HC II, Kabirizi Upper HC II, Kahendero HC II, Kalibu HC III, Kamasasa HC II, Kamukumbi HC II, Kasenyi HC II, Kasese 307 brigade (Kavera-UPDF) HC III, Kasese Kayanja HC II, Kibiri HC II, Kabirizi HC II, Kigoro/Kasika HC II, Kilembe HC II, Kisolholholho HC II, Kyabikere HC II, Kyempara HC II, Mbunga HC II, Mubuku Irrigation HC II, Mubuku Kisojo HC II, Muhokya HC III and Nyakimasa HC II.

The facilities were identified as weak performing health facilities in the indicators below,

1. Poor immunization coverage and response as noted from the database of DHIS2 on integrated child health days. This was followed upon by the ADHO-environmental health.
2. The accumulated yellow fever vaccines which were to expire soon. This was followed up by the EPI focal person to strategize on utilizing the vaccines at the facilities.
3. Decline in the maternal health indicators as a result of RBF pull out. The DHO followed up by guiding the in-charges to use PHC to conduct outreaches.
4. Increased cases of malnutrition in the communities especially among children below 5 years. All facility in-charges and nutrition focal persons intensified screening at community level.

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG implemented Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities</p> <p>The improvement plans and the PIP implementation reports indicated Bikunya HC II, Bubocho HC II, Bughendero HC II, Buhungamuyagha HC II, Busunga HC II, Ibanda-Bugoyr HC II, Ihandiro HC III, Kabirizi Lower HC II, Kabirizi Upper HC II, Kahendero HC II, Kalibu HC III, Kamasasa HC II, Kamukumbi HC II, Kasenyi HC II, Kasese 307 brigade (Kavera-UPDF) HC III, Kasese Kyanja HC II, Kibiri HC II, Kabirizi HC II, Kigoro/Kasika HC II, Kilembe HC II, Kisolholholho HC II, Kyabikere HC II, Kyempara HC II, Mbunga HC II, Mubuku Irrigation HC II, Mubuku Kisojo HC II, Muhokya HC III and Nyakimasa HC II as the weak performing health facilities.</p> <p>These health facilities were put on performance improvement plan as evidenced from the performance report of 15th July 2023 mainly in the areas of governance/leadership, human resource, finance, health management information system, medicines and equipment.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The evidence indicated that the LG did not budget for health workers following guidelines / staffing norms.</p> <p>Under vote 856 of the LG approved estimates, the LG budgeted for the 880 health workers at 19,049,144,952/=.</p> <p>This was evidenced on the submission of wage estimates letter to PS Ministry of public service dated 28th September 2023</p> <p>The total number of staff on the approved was 716 on the approved structure. The budget amounted to 4,503,538,000/=. This indicated that (880-716)=164 staff who were not budgeted for.</p> <p>The staffing norms included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DHOs office staff deployed=16</li> <li>2. 1 HC IV staff deployed=44</li> <li>3. 22 HC IIIs staff deployed =319</li> <li>4. 53 HC IIs staff deployed=17</li> </ol> <p>Total deployed =716 staff.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Not all health facilities had the required 75% of the health staff required in accordance with the staffing norms.

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

1. Nyamirami HC IV had 44/49=89%
2. Mukokya HC III had 18/19=94%
3. Buhuhira HC III had 6/19=31%
4. Kalibu HC III had 13/19=68%
5. Kitcwamba HC III had 17/19=89%
6. Isule HC III had 11/19=57%
7. Karusanda HC III had 12/19=63%
8. Mukathi HC III had 14/19=73%
9. Kabatunda HC III had 16/19=84%
10. Katew HC III had 15/19=78%
11. Muhanga HC III had 12/19=63%
12. Bwesumbu HC III had 10/19=52%
13. Kinyabwamba HC III had 14/19=73%
14. Bugoye HC III had 29/19=152%
15. Kitholhu HC III had 7/19=36%
16. Kyempara HC III had 11/19=57%
17. Nyaakimasa HC III had 12/19=63%
18. Karambi HC III had 19/19=100%
19. Ihandiro HC III had 11/19=57%
20. Kyarumba HC III had 14/19=73%
21. Kyondo HC III had 11/19=57%
22. Nyakirongo HC III had 24/19=126%
23. Hima HC III had 23/19=121%

Buhuhira, Kalibu, Kitcwamba, Isule, Karusanda, Mukathi, Muhango, Bwesumbu, Kitholhu, Kyempara, Nyakimasa, Ihando, Kyarumba and Kyondo staffing did not conform to the 75% guidelines.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the health workers were working in health facilities where they were deployed. The reviewed Health workers' staff lists, facility attendance book/register (DHMT supervision/ monitoring reports; Automated Attendance Analysis (AAA) indicated that the health workers were working where they were deployed as reflected from the 3 sampled facilities below;

This was evidenced on the deployment staff lists from the DHO of 5th October 2023 and that on the staff lists and attendance registers at the 3 sampled health facilities of Kabatunda Health centre III, Hima Health centre III and Bugoye Health centre III as indicated below;

1. At Kabatunda Health center III , 16 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponded to the 16 staff list of 13th May 2023 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility

4. At Hima Health center III, 23 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office which corresponded to the 23 staff list of July 2023 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit.

5. At Bugoye Health center III, 29 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the DHO's office corresponding to the 29 staff list dated 30th September 2023 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that the LG had publicized health worker's deployment and disseminated as evidenced by the display of the list of deployed health workers on health facilities notice boards.

The displayed lists of the health facilities visited indicated the name of the facility, name of the staff, cadre, and gender among others as they appeared on the health facility notice boards

1. At Kabatunda Health center III, the 16 staff list of 13th May 2023 was pinned on the notice board at the facility

2. At Hima Health center III, the 23 staff list of July 2023 was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit.

3. At Bugoye Health center III, the 29 staff list dated 30th September 2023 was pinned at the Health facility notice board

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

Kasese DLG has the following Health Facility in-charges who were found duly appraised:

1. Mubunga Julius, Kyarumba HC III, 30th June 2023
2. Muhindo Patrick, HC Katwe HC III, 30th June 2023
3. Baluku M. Raphael, Mahango HCIII, appraised 30th June 2023
4. Bahitya M. Rogers, Bwesumbu HC III, appraised, 30th June 2023.
5. Muthebuli Violet, Kisojo HCIII, appraised 30th June 2023.
6. Bwambale Samson, Nyabirongo HCIII, appraised 30th June 2023.
7. Bwambale Basisa Wilson, Kinyamaseke HC III appraised 30th June 2023.
8. Makwano Joseph, Musyenene HCIII, appraised 30th June 2023
9. Babirye Susan, ISule HCIII, appraised 30th June 2023.
10. Baseme Evelyn, Mukhati HCIII, appraised 30th June 2023



8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	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	At the time of assessment, ten sampled files were reviewed, all were appraised by Health Facility In-Charges and one beyond the stipulated time as shown hereunder.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Asiimwe Aminah, Enrolled Nurse, Kasangali HCII, appraised 30th June 2023</li> <li>2. <b>Agaba Judith Enrolled Midwife, Bwera General Hospital, appraised by Medical Superintendent 16th September 2023.</b></li> <li>3. Marahi Edison, Lab Technician, Rwesande HC IV, appraised by IC, 30th June 2023.</li> <li>4. Masereka Johnson, Lab Assistant, Nyabirongo HCIII, appointed 28th October 2020, vide Min No.94/2020, appraised 30th June 2020.</li> <li>5. Kato Paul, Nursing Officer, Mwsyenene HC III, appraised 30th June 2023.</li> <li>6. Tusiime Rahab, Enrolled Nurse, Bwera Hospital, appraised 30th June 2023.</li> <li>7. Biira Gorret, Assistant Nursing Officer, Karambi HCIII, appraised 30th June 2023.</li> <li>8. Ngunule BwambaleZac, Senior Nursing Officer, Kinyabwaba HC III, appraised 30th June 2023.</li> <li>9. Baluku Moris, Lab Assistant, Kyempara HC III, appraised 30th June 2023</li> <li>10. Turyahebwa Christine, Enrolled Nurse, Kitswamba HC III, appraised 30th June 2023.</li> </ol>	
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	No evidence that corrective actions based on appraisal reports was accessed at the time of assesment.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District.  The Health department had a CPD plan dated 12th August 2022. The conducted trainings were evidenced from the training reports as implemented below;  1. Training report on ambulance teams dated 30th April 2023  2. Training report on family concept for improved maternal child health dated 14th April 2023  3. Training report on adolescent responsive health services dated 30th January 2023	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG documented the implemented the CPD trainings in the training data base dated 5th July 2023	1
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure				

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

9	N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the CAO confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th as there were 9 Health facilities that did not received PHC  This was evidenced from the letter dated 9th September 2022 reference: CR/353/1 from CAO to the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health confirming the incorrectness of the 9 Health facilities. This confirmation was received and acknowledged at MOH on 20th September 2023.  The nine health facilities included; Bwethe HC II, Kinyabwamba HC III, Kalingwe HC II, Kyabikere HC II, Rusese HC II, Buhathiro HC II, Kikorongo HC II, Lhakirema HC II and Bunuandiko HC II.	2
Maximum 9 points on this performance measure				

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of Budget Estimates FY2022/23 revealed that the LG allocated more than 15% of PHC NWR Grant for Lower Level Facilities FY2022/23 towards monitoring service delivery and management of LG Health services.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>PHC NWR UGX 218,420,006+27,880,019= UGX 246,300,025</p> <p>Budget Estimates Page 10- Quality Assurance (i.e. monitoring service delivery) UGX 53,458,000</p>	
			<p><b>Calculation</b></p> <p>DHO Allocation for monitoring service delivery/PHC NWR*100</p> <p><math>53,458,000/246,300,025*100= 21.7\%</math> (i.e. this is above the 15% maximum allowed in Sector Grant Guidelines)</p>	
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions of PHC NWR to Health Facilities revealed that the LG in FY2022/23, warranted more than 5 working days after cash limits for the LG were communicated by the PS/ST.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Q1 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 08 July 2022. LG warranted on 8 August 2022 i.e. 5+ working days.</p> <p>Q2 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 30 Sept 2022. LG warranted on 13 October 2022 i.e. 5+ working days.</p> <p>Q3 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 29 Dec 2022. LG warranted on 18 January 2023 i.e. 5+ working days.</p> <p>Q4 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 06 April 2023. LG warranted on 25 April 2023 i.e. 5+ working days</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Information on cash limit uploads by MoFPED could not accessed.</p>	
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A review of transfers to 3 health facilities sampled from the LG Cost Centre List &amp; LLG allocation release provided by MoFPED revealed that the LG released and communicated PHC NWR grant releases for FY2022/23 to health facilities prior to the release of funds.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance</p>		<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Bikone HC II</p>	

measure

Q1 FY2022/23. EFT No. 678586 was dated 25 August 2022. Communication made on 10 August 2022 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

Q2 FY2022/23. EFT No. 2052761 was dated 11 November 2022. Communication made on 2 November 2022 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

Q3 FY2022/23. EFT No. 3731010 was dated 20 February 2023. Communication made on 20 January 2023 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

Q4 FY2022/23. EFT No. 585583 was dated 15 June 2023. Communication made on 5 May 2023 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

### **Bugoye HC III**

Q1 FY2022/23. EFT No. 675081 was dated 25 August 2022. Communication made on 10 August 2022 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

Q2 FY2022/23. EFT No. 2052434 was dated 11 November 2022. Communication made on 2 November 2022 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

Q3 FY2022/23. EFT No. 3727214 was dated 20 February 2023. Communication made on 20 January 2023 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

Q4 FY2022/23. EFT No. 5291621 was dated 17 May 2023. Communication made on 5 May 2023 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

### **Nyamirami HC IV**

Q1 FY2022/23. EFT No. 675077 was dated 25 August 2022. Communication made on 10 August 2022 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

Q2 FY2022/23. EFT No. 2052430 was dated 11 November 2022. Communication made on 2 November 2022 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

Q3 FY2022/23. EFT No. 3727210 was dated 20 February 2023. Communication made on 20 January 2023 i.e. Communication made prior to the release of funds.

N23\_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0

Despite the fact that the LG publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities, the 2nd and 4th quarters were beyond the 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED. These were posted on DHOs and the visited health facility notice boards as indicated below;

Q1 released on 8th August, communicated and publicized on 10th August 2022,

Q2 released on 12th October 2022, communicated and publicized on 2nd November 2022 (+5 days),

Q3 released on 18th January 2023, communicated and publicized on 20th January 2023 and

Q4 released on 25th April 2023, communicated and publicized on 5th May 2023(+5 days)

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG health department implemented the actions recommended by the DHMT quarterly performance review meetings held during the previous FY. The recommendations and follow up actions as extracted from the 29th June 2023 implementation report included among others;

1. The recommendation for decline in maternal child health indicators under minute 4: indicated pulling out of the RBF scheme. The action taken was writing a circular to the health facility in-charges to use PHC funds to conduct outreaches to improve maternal child health indicators.
2. The recommendation for the increasing malnutrition cases of the under 5 years in the community. The action was UNICEF to support intensified screening of children to reduce the malnutrition component.
3. The recommendation for lack of transport means for community health work mainly the hard to reach. The action was that the DHO and CAO followed up by lobbying from the partners to provide vehicles and motorcycles..

These recommendations were implemented as evidenced from the quarterly review meeting minutes and implementation reports dated;

1. Q1 dated 22nd August 2022
2. Q2 dated 13th December 2022
3. Q3 dated 29th March 2023 and
4. Q4 dated 29th June 2023

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that the LG performance review meetings involved all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs and key LG departments.

This was evidenced from the attached attendances of the minutes of the meetings held on;

1. Q1 dated 22nd August 2022 list had 60 participants
2. Q2 dated 13th December 2022 list had 59 participants
3. Q3 dated 29th March 2023 list had 58 participants and
4. Q4 dated 29th June 2023 list had 39 participants

The participants included all Health Facility In-charges, focal persons, Implementing partners and the District Health Team

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0

If not applicable, provide the score

There was evidence that the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY

The one government hospital (Bwera Hospital), one PNFP hospital (Kagando Hospital), one Health center IV (Nyamirami HC IV) and the 10 PNFPs were supervised at least once every quarter in the previous FY

This was evidenced from the quarterly support supervision reports as indicted below;

1. Quarter one supervision report dated 30th September 2022
2. Quarter two supervision report dated 25th November 2022
3. Quarter three report dated 13th February 2023 and ;
4. Quarter four report dated 29th June 2023

Some of the recommendations sited at Kagando Hospital during quarter one supervision included;

1. Provision of disinfectant for IPC management as it was observed that there was poor infection practices in the facility departments
2. Timely submission of the 2022/2023 work plan to the DHO as the annual work plan was neither displayed nor submitted.
3. Request for all the missing registers at the district as it was observed that the facility missed
4. Analyse the data for proper planning as observed that limited data analysis.

These gaps were discussed and actions implemented as noted from the DHT minutes dated 30th September 2022



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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that DHT ensured that the 4 Health Sub Districts (HSDs) of Busongora North, Busongora South, Bukonjo East and Bukonjo West carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY</p> <p>This was evidenced from the HSD Support Supervision and Monitoring visit reports of Bukonjo East health sub district in the LG as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Q1 report dated 10th October 2022</li> <li>2. Q2 report dated 10th January 2023</li> <li>3. Q3 report dated 5th April 2023 and,</li> <li>4. Q4 report dated 4th July 2023</li> </ol> <p>The feedback from the LG Health department to HSDs as noted from the quarter three supervision included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fully stocking of the ambulances with appropriate PPE for emergency preparedness</li> <li>2. Roll out a training on family connect in the regions to effectively manage data</li> <li>3. Strategise the male involvement component into antenatal care services</li> <li>4. Poor monitoring of the EPI fridge at Kasenyi HC II, EPI focal person took action</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that corrective actions were made as evidenced from the HSD supervision reports. These included,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fully stocking of the ambulances with appropriate PPE for emergency preparedness to respond to the inadequate protective gear for quality infection prevention and control measures</li> <li>2. Roll out a training on family connect in the regions to effectively manage data to respond to the gap in poor data and documentation at the health facilities.</li> <li>3. Strategize the male involvement component into antenatal care services to respond to the low turn up of mothers attending antenatal clinics due to the males who refuse the to attend for the services.</li> <li>4. Poor monitoring of the EPI fridge at Kasenyi HC II, EPI focal person took action by ensuring daily monitoring</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies in FY 2022/2023.

These reports indicated that guidance was given to health facility in-charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies

The feedback and guidance given to the in-charges included;

1. Poor storage of the drugs and medicines. Mentorship was done to ensure proper medicine storage
2. Irregular calculation of the average monthly consumption. Mentorship was done
3. Expiry of the medicine supervision system (SPARS). The CAO to write to MOH for guidance as in-charges were told to adhere to sustainability
4. Stock outs of essential drugs. In-charges oriented to order timely

This was evidenced from the quarterly medicine management, supervision and monitoring reports of ;

1. Q1 dated 6th October 2022
2. Q2 dated 3rd January 2023
3. Q3 dated 1st April 2023
4. Q4 dated 14th July 2023

Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

A review of LG's Annual Budget Estimates for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG allocated more than 30% of

the Health office budget for health promotion, education, and prevention (Community Health) activities.

### Evidence

DHO Budget UGX 53,530,251

DHO Budget FY2022/23 allocated to health promotion and prevention activities

EFT No. 2486466 Amount UGX 2,160,000

EFT No. 31226344 Amount UGX 1,470,000

EFT No. 2932133 Amount UGX 3,400,000

EFT No. 2484029 Amount UGX 548,000

EFT No. 2484029 Amount UGX 490,000

EFT No. 5295365 Amount UGX 4,536,000

EFT No. 5293892 Amount UGX 3,260,000

EFT No.2484923 Amount UGX 1,348,000

EFT No. 3737830 Amount UGX 1,397,000

EFT No. 4264945 Amount UGX 2,530,000

EFT No. 2484052 Amount UGX 2,260,000

EFT No. 3126344 Amount UGX 1,470,000

EFT No. 4495105 Amount UGX 2,756,000

EFT No. 3070302 Amount UGX 1,000,000

EFT No. 5905193 Amount UGX 755,200

EFT No. 4314806 Amount UGX 660,000

EFT No. 5296069 Amount UGX 3,391,200

Total UGX 33,431,400

Allocations- Promotion and Prevention/DHO Budget\*100=

$33,431,400/53,530,251*100= 62.5\%$  ( i.e. guidelines recommend at least 30%)

11

Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DHT implemented health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities.

This was evidenced from the Health promotion reports of the previous financial year below;

1. Sensitization of teachers on adolescent health responsive services report dated 30th January 2023
2. Supported 5 health facilities on prevention and management of malaria report dated 30th June 2023
3. Conducted 3 radio talk shows on risk communication report dated 30th March 2023
4. Distribution of 12745 polio information, education and communication materials as dated on the report of 30th September 2022
5. Conducted an integrated child health day plus sensitization and awareness campaign as noted on the report dated 30th September 2022
6. Conducted Polio awareness, Ebola Virus disease awareness and emergency preparedness as noted in the report of 30th December 2022

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District health team followed up the actions on health promotion and disease prevention from the progress reports and minutes of the conducted health promotion activities.</p> <p>The follow up actions included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sensitization of teachers on adolescent health responsive services created awareness on HIV and teenage pregnancy.</li> <li>2. Supported 5 health facilities on prevention and management of malaria contributed to low malaria prevalence</li> <li>3. Conducted 3 radio talk shows on risk communication created awareness and behavioral change attitude</li> <li>4. Distribution of 12745 polio information, education and communication materials for community attitude change</li> <li>5. Conducted an integrated child health day plus sensitization and awareness campaign to mobilize for response towards immunization</li> <li>6. Conducted Polio awareness, Ebola Virus disease awareness and emergency preparedness for risk awareness</li> </ol>	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had an updated asset register that set out the health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards as per the format.</p> <p>The asset register for the financial year 2022/2023 was dated 4th July 2023. This asset register detailed health facilities and equipment in the LG, relative to the medical equipment list and service standards.</p> <p>The standard list of medical equipment for Health Facilities and service standards were availed</p>	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that desk appraisals for all Health sector projects implemented in FY2022/23 were conducted, the prioritized projects were derived from the LG DPIII and eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p>	<p><b>Evidence</b></p>	
		<p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p>	<p>Upgrade and Construction of Kabingo HCII derived from DPIII Page 133. Desk appraisal completed on 8 June 2021</p>	
			<p>Upgrade and Construction of Nyabirongo HCIII derived from DPIII Page 133. Desk appraisal completed on 08 June 2021</p>	
		<p>score 1 or else score 0</p>		
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that field appraisals for the Health sector projects implemented in FY2022/23 were conducted to establish their technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>		<p><b>Evidence</b></p>	
			<p>Field appraisal for Upgrade and Construction of Kabingo HCII completed on 8 June 2021</p>	
			<p>Field appraisal for Upgrade and Construction of Nyabirongo HCIII completed on 08 June 2021</p>	
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist;</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Construction of the maternity ward at Nyabirongo HCIII was screened on 18/02/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 35,500,000 prepared on 18/08/2022.</p>	
			<p>Construction of a maternity ward at Buhuhira HCIII was screened on 18/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 35,000,000 prepared on 18/08/2022.</p>	
			<p>Construction of a theatre at Bugoye HCIII was screened on 18/08/2022 with an ESMP prepared on 18/08/2022.</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>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>There was 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. The submission was done on 25/04/2023; the plan was stamped and signed by the DHO, and received by the head PDU.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Health Department submitted a procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY dated 18/08/2023:</p> <p>Items:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Completion of a theatre at Bugoye HC III, amounting to UGX 235,097,000/=.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a paediatric hostel/ward at Bwera hospital, amounting to UGX 234,862,000/=</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction. Specifically, the Solicitor General cleared the contract for the Upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HC III by M/S Mariam &amp; Brothers Trading Co., Ltd, award amount UGX 954,892,310/= on 30/11/2022, letter reference number: DLAS/MBR/120/2022. All other health infrastructure investments were approved by the contracts committee.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p><b>For health sector projects, the CAO appointed the PITs as follows:</b></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a staff house at Nyabirongo HC IV, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, principal internal auditor, district health officer, district engineer, senior procurement officer, and labour officer.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of a theatre at Bugoye HC III, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: senior community development officer, senior environmental officer, deputy CAO, and district engineer and labour officer. <b>However, the district health officer was not appointed.</b></p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH. A visit to the following sites revealed conformance to the technical designs issued by MoH:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; <i>Upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HC III; scope (Dr's house and theatre block) - conformed to the technical designs (foundation, walling and room sizes conformed the specifications and size on the plans).</i></p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; <i>Construction of a theatre block at Bugoye HC III conformed to the technical designs issued by MoH.</i></p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project.</p> <p><i>Note: Clerk of works reports were not availed.</i></p>	<b>0</b>



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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

If there is no project, provide the score

The following site meetings reports/minutes were availed:

>>> On 24/05/2023, a site meeting was held on the site for upgrading Buhuhira HC II to HC III in Buhuhira SC. The meeting chairperson was the 'project manager'. According to the report the district engineer is the project manager. The contractor, CDO, and environment officer attended the meeting, and them, together with the engineer are mentioned in the meeting minutes.

>>> On 17/04/2023, a site meeting was held on the site for construction of a theatre block at Bugoye HC in Bugoye S/C, and the meeting was chaired by the 'project manager'. According to the report the district engineer is the project manager. The contractor, DHO, CDO, and environment officer attended the meeting, and together with the district engineer are mentioned in the meeting.

>>> Upgrade Nyabirongo HC II to HC III (Construction of a theatre block and Dr's house), site meeting and monitoring was done on 10/05/2023, and the technical team (district engineer, senior environmental officer, and senior community development officer) signed the attendance list and minutes (with contractor part of the meeting) prior to verification and certification of the payment certificate number 1. *Specifically, the technical team members verified the work and provided a comprehensive report as shown in the '**construction works inspection/monitoring form**'. This meeting was more of a technical meeting (for the technical team).*

### Conclusion

The above three (03) site meetings were the evidence availed to score the indicator. Therefore, there was no evidence that the LG held **monthly site meetings by project site committee**: chaired by the CAO 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.

**The three (03) evidence availed did not conform to the stipulated guidelines, neither.** All the **monthly site meeting minutes/reports** for the upgrade of HC IIs to HC IIIs were not availed.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at <b>all health infrastructure projects</b> at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction.</p> <p><i>This was especially confirmed with a visit to the site for the upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HC III, where the 'site instructions book had no single instruction'. There was an effort to issue instructions in the visitors' book which is not good practice, because the issuer ideally remains with a copy.</i></p>	0
----	--	---	--	---

**Conclusion**

*From the visitors' books, there was an effort to supervise projects but not monthly.*

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that the LG Health Officer certified and recommended payments to contractors implementing Health Projects in FY2022/23 more than 14 days after the request for payment was made by contractors.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

**Evidence**

1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Mariam and Brothers Trading Company Ltd on 19 April 2023 for the upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HCIII for UGX 286,467,693. District Health Officer recommended payment and certified works on 12 May 2023 i.e. after 23 days.

2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Robtex Kasese Enterprises Ltd on 10 May 2023 for the construction of the Theatre at Bugoye HCIII Phase 1 in Bigoye for UGX 129,553,970. District Health Officer recommended payment and certified works on 12 May 2023 i.e. after 2 days.

1. Request for Payment was made by M/s P & D Traders & Contractors on 12 June 2023 for the upgrading of Buhuhira HCII to HC III for UGX 227,547,974. District Health Officer recommended payment on 16 June 2023 after 4 days and signed Payment Certificate No. 3 on 26 June 2026 after 14 days from the time contractor requested for payments.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law.</p> <p><i>Specifically, the minutes of contracts committee decisions for the upgrade of Nyabirongo HC II to HC III by M/S Mariam &amp; Brothers Trading Co., Ltd, award amount UGX 954,892,310/= were not on file.</i></p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Local Government had recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework under Health;</p> <p>On 21/ 03/2023 the landowner on which Buhuhira maternity ward is located complained of encroachment on his land, the land on intervention of the District GRC was demarcated and fenced off.</p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG issued guidelines on medical waste management and followed up on the implementation of the health care waste management guidelines by HCs. This was evidenced from the dissemination report at the DHOs office which indicated that the Health care waste management guidelines were disseminated on 4th April 2022, 13th December 2022 and 10th August 2022</p>	<b>2</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management and a local infrastructure for managing medical waste. Green label services ltd was the service provider contracted to manage medical waste. This was evidenced from the Memorandum of Understanding dated 1st October 2022 and signed by the DHO and CAO on 2nd October 2022.</p>	<b>2</b>
----	--	---	--	----------

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Health care waste management trainings were conducted. This was evidenced from the training reports of 21st October 2022 and 31st March 2023.</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>There was evidence that costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY;</p> <p>Construction of a maternity ward at Nyabirongo HCIII had a costed ESMP of UGX: 35,000,000 incorporated into the BoQs.</p> <p>Construction of a theatre at Bugoye HC III had a coted ESMP of UGX: 1,000,000 incorporated in the BoQs.</p> <p>Construction of a maternity ward at Buhuhira HCIII had a coted ESMP of UGX: 455,000 incorporated in the BoQs.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability;</p> <p>Nyabirongo HCIII- Freehold offer for Nyabirongo HCIII on Wednesday of October 2023 by the senior land management of officer.</p> <p>Bugoye HCIII- Freehold offer for Bugoye HCIII dated Tuesday 07/12/2021 signed by the senior land management officer.</p> <p>Buhuhira HCIII- Land agreement between Mr. Milton Kyoya Edison and Buhuhira HCIII management dated 09/02/2022.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provide monthly reports</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, before payments of contractor invoices/certificates at the interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE) Management Information Systems (MIS) Kasese District LG had rural water sources functionality of 83% hence the awarded score.</p>	<b>1</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Review of the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS report, it was established that the LG had a 95% functionality of water and sanitation committees.</p>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG average score of water and environment in LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 52%. This was below threshold for an award of score.</p>	<b>0</b>

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

There was no evidence that a substantive percentage of implemented water and sanitation projects targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average.

According to the MoWE MIS report, Kasese District had an average safe water coverage of 58%. The sub-counties of Kyondo at 18%, Makunyu at 20%, Kyarumba at 30%, Muhokya at 37%, Bwesumbu at 42%, Buhuhira at 43%, Maliba at 47%, Nyakatonzi at 55% and Rukoki at 56% were reported below district average in FY 2022/2023.

Review of the Annual Budget and the Annual Performance reports FY 2022/23 the LG implemented the following WSS projects;

a) Construction and extension of Butale stream in Mahango sub-county (to boost Nyamusuule, Mbulamasi, Kyibiri GFS) in Muhokya sub-county with coverage of 37% at a cost of UGX 155,000,000/=

b) Extension of Kyangwe Mini-GFS in Mahango sub-county with coverage at 95% at a cost of UGX 92,000,000/=

c) Construction of Makongote GFS in Maliba sub-county at a cost of UGX 92,000,000/=

d) Extension of Kyangende GFS in Kyabalungi sub-county at UGX 30,000,000/=

e) Construction of Buhunga GFS phase II in Kilembe sub-county (74%) at UGX 100,000,000/=

f) Construction of Bitere GFS in Bugoye sub-county at UGX 98,800,000/=

It was established that only 33% of the WSS projects were implemented in sub-counties below district average. A number of WSS projects were implemented in LLGs whose coverage was far beyond the district average.

N23\_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

There was evidence that variations in the contract price of sampled contracts were within the range of +/- 20% of engineers estimates. The sampled contracts included;

a) Construction of Makongote GFS in Maliba sub-county. The project had engineer's estimates of UGX 150,000,000/=. Review of the contract agreement signed between Kasese District LG and M/S Butini Associates Ltd dated 24th/01/2023 Ref. Kse/856/wrks/2022-2023/00013 the contract price was UGX 148,744,091/=. The price variation was 0.8%

b) Construction of Butere GFS Phase II in Bugoya sub-county with engineer's estimates of UGX 98,000,000/=. It was established from review of signed contract agreement between the LG and M/S Robtex Kasese Enterprise Ltd Ref.Kse/856/wrks/2022-2023/00021 that the contract price was UGX 98,000,000/=. There was no variation in prices.

c) Construction and extension of Butale stream source in Mahango sub-county with engineer's estimates of UGX 140,000,000/=. Review of the signed agreement between Kasese LG and M/S Elon Water and Construction Engineering Ltd dated 24th/01/2023 the contract price was UGX 140,069,457/= representing 0 price variation.

N23\_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

Review of the annual performance report FY 2022/2023, it was established all Water Supply and Sanitation infrastructure projects were completed within FY 2022/23 as per the annual work plan. The reported completed projects included the construction and extension of Butale stream in Mahango sub-county, extension of Kyangwe Mini-GFS in Mahango sub-county, construction of Makongote GFS in Maliba sub-county, extension of Kyangende GFS in Kyabalungira sub-county, construction of Buhunga GFS phase II in Kirembe sub-county, construction of Bitere GFS in Bugoye sub-county and rehabilitation of 15 boreholes in Karusandala, Kyarumba, Lake katwe and Nyakatonzi sub-counties.



3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>According to the MoWE MIS report, Kasese LG registered percentage increase in functionality of water sources. The report indicated that functionality was at 79% in FY 2021/2022 and increased to 83% in the subsequent FY. There was an increase of 4%.</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of increase in functionality of WSCs from 93% in FY 2021/2022 to 95% in the subsequent FY. The LG registered a 2% increased.</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 the LG Water Office accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in FY 2022/2023 and performance of the facilities. All implemented WSS projects were well captured in the APR. Field visits to the sub-counties of Mahango for Butaale GFS and Maliba for Makongote GFS it was established that the projects were constructed as reported and functional.</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 evidence that the LG collected and compiled quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs and community involvement. Presented for review was first quarter report dated 14th/10/2022 that had information of functionality of facilities, WSCs and percentages of safe water access in sub-county. The report equally captured issues of sanitation and compliance to Environment and social Safeguards.</p> <p>Quarter two report was dated 14th/12/2022. The report captured issues of safe water accessibility, rural water functionality, issues of equity reported at 98%, management at 89%, gender participation at 98%, sanitation, hygiene and community involvement.</p> <p>Third quarter report dated 12th/03/2023 captured information regarding functionality of facilities, committees, issues of gender participation, equity, hygiene and sanitation.</p> <p>Fourth quarter report dated 14th/07/2023 captured sub-county information including respective LLG safe water accessibility levels, functionality of facilities and committees, gender participation, equity, hygiene and sanitation.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG Water Office updated the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water and sanitation information including new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and facilities. The update and information capture was done using Ministry of Water and Environment rural water supply database-Form 1. The collected data was used to inform selection of LLGs for budget allocations in FY 2023/2024 (sub-counties below district average were considered).</p>	3

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the LG Water Officer developed Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for the lowest performing LLGs in water and environment thematic area during LLG assessment.</p> <p>The District Conducted LLG performance assessment with water and environment having an average score of 57%. The sub-counties of Kyondo, Mbunga, Lake Katwe, Mahango, Nyakatonzi, Muhokya and Maliba comprised the 25% lowest performing LLGs. Presented was PIPs dated 2nd/10/2023 developed by the Ag.LG Water Engineer addressed to CAO detailing the specific areas where different LLGs required support from the LG Water Office and the period of the intervention.</p>	2
---	--	--	--	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>A review of the Kasese District Local Government Budget Estimates for FY 2023/24(Vote 856), the Water Officer budgeted for the critical staff as found at page 89 sub-programme water.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>A review of the Kasese District Local Government Budget Estimates for FY 2023/24(Vote 856), the District Natural Resources Officer budgeted for the critical staff as found at page 94 sub-programme Natural Resources.</p>	2

7 Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans. a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3 The DWO appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY as shown hereunder. However, one staff member was appraised beyond 30th June 2023. 0

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

**1. Assistant Water Officer (Mobilization)** - Ms. Kobusingye Kate. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.

**2. Borehole Maintenance Technician** - Mr. Rubale Solace. At the time of assessment, the BMO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 12th July 2023.

7 Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans. b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3 The LG Water Officer appraised Office staff against agreed performance measures. Staff were appraised using staff performance appraisal form for public service-PS Form5. From the reviewed Capacity Needs Assessment (CNA) report the staff below had the following capacity gaps. 0

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

a) Muhindo Asha- Assistant Engineering Officer had gaps in designing water projects using softwares like EPANET

b) Patrick Ndungu Syayipuma- Civil Engineer with capacity gaps in hydrological modeling, project management and design programme. Interventions like training in EPANET and AUTO CARD proposed.

c) Kobusingye Jenina Kate- CDO with capacity gaps in new Operations and Maintenance framework

d) Rubale Solance-Borehole Technician, identified gaps in pipe finishing, fabrication, borehole surveying and drilling.

However, there was no evidence that the staff in the Water Office had capacity building despite the identified respective capacity gaps. The LG equated capacity building to only training yet it entails more than that. This was discussed whilst mentoring the LG Water staff, captured in the departmental evidence form and communicated during exit meeting.

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

There was no evidence the LG Water Office prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that had safe water coverage below that of the district.

According to the MoWE MIS the LG had a safe water average of 58%. The sub-counties of Kyondo with 18%, Makungu with 20%, Kyarumba with 30% Muhokya with 37%, Bwesumba with 42%, Buhuhira with 43%, Maliba with 47%, Nyakatonzi with 55% and Rukoki with 56% were reported below district average in FY 2023/2024.

Review of the annual work plan and budget FY 2023/2024, the LG had a total development grant of UGX 984,060,000/= of which UGX 547,200,000/= allocated to capital investment water projects, UGX 240,000,000 for rehabilitation and 10% of the total budget for Investment Servicing Costs. Capital Investment projects were prioritized in the following sub-counties.

a) Construction of Makongote GFS Phase II in Maliba sub-county with 47% coverage at UGX 150,000,000/=

b) Construction of Buhanga phase III in Kilembe sub-county with 74% coverage at UGX 60,000,000/=

c) Construction of Kalibu Reservoir in Kilembe sub-county with 74% at UGX 30,000,000/=

d) Construction of Muliki and Mupika water sources in Bwesumba sub-county at UGX 31,919,000/=

e) Design of Rwigho (Mbata) GFS in Bwesumba sub-county with coverage at 42% at UGX 200,000,000/=

f) Design of Nyakiyumbu Solar powered supply system at UGX 30,000,000/=in Nakiyumbu sub-county.

g) Extension of Kyangende GFS phase II in Kyabarungira sub-county with 64% at UGX 50,000,000/=

h) Rehabilitation and extension of Kalhughutha GFS in Inandiro sub-county with 95% at UGX 100,000,000/=

i) Rehabilitation and extension of Kahokya solar powered supply system in Kahokya sub-county at a cost of UGX 80,000,000/=

j) Rehabilitation of 20 boreholes at UGX 60,000,000/= in Karusandala, Kicwamba, Lake Katwe and Nyakatonzi and Maliba sub-counties

From the above planned and budgeted WSS projects, it was established that projects prioritized in sub-counties below district average only accounted for 39% of the total budget for capital investment. This was below the threshold for award of score. The Grant guidelines are explicitly clear on the utilization of funds with emphasis on targeting water stressed sub-counties.

8

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence the LG Water Officer communicated to LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in FY 2023/2024. Presented as evidence was a circular dated 10th/08/2023 addressed to LLGs notifying their respective budget allocations and location of planned WSS projects. There was proof of receipt of communication as evidenced by acknowledgement by recipient LLGs Senior Assistant Secretaries (SAS).

3

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

- If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4
- If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2
- If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0

There was evidence the LG Water Office monitored all water and sanitation facilities in the district at least once on a quarterly basis. Presented for review was a list of all water and sanitation facilities. The LG had a total of 4624 facilities ranging from boreholes, springs, Rainwater Harvesting Tanks (RWHTs) solar powered water supply systems and Gravity Flow Schemes.

Presented was a monitoring plan dated 1st/07/2022. The plan detailed sub-counties where facilities were located, frequency of visit, personnel responsible to monitor, specifics to monitor (O&M, functionality, water quality) and period of monitoring.

Reviewed was quarter one monitoring report dated 3rd/10/2022 addressed to CAO. Monitoring was conducted between July-September 2022 for selected sub-counties of Bwera, Isango, Karambi, Kinyamaseke and Kisinga. Report captured water accessibility, rural functionality, equity, management and compliance to E&S.

Quarter two monitoring report dated 6th/01/2023. Monitoring activities were conducted between October to December 2022 in the sub-counties of Kitholhu, Kyarumba, Kyondo, Munkuyu, Nyakatonzi and Nyakiyumba

Quarter three monitoring report dated 4th/04/2023 was presented for review. It was established that monitoring was conducted between January to March 2023 in the sub-counties of Buhuhira, Bwesumbu, Karusandara, Katwe-Kabatooro, Kilembe and Kitwamba sub-counties

Quarter four report that covered the period of April-June 2023. Monitoring of WSS facilities was conducted in the sub-counties of Kyabarungira, Lake Katwe, Mahango, Maliba, Muhokya, Rugendabara, Kikongo and Rukoki.

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings. Presented for review was minutes of quarter one meeting held on 13th/10/2022 under minute 7/2022/23: Discussion and Way forward; environment and social safeguards at each WSS facility was discussed. The need to sensitize communities to pay for safe water was equally discussed after it was discovered during monitoring that communities wanted to freely consume water. In the plan of FY 2023/204 handing over completed WSS facilities to Mid-Western Umbrella for operation and management was adopted.

Second quarter DWSCC meeting held on 21st/12/2022 under minute 14/2022/23: Discussion and Way forward. The meeting discussed the issue of Buhaghura GFS that was destroyed during road construction under CAIP. Meeting resolved the need to compile a technical report regarding the status of the facility to the Ministry of Water and Environment.

Quarter three DWSCC meeting held on 15th/02/2023-minute 18/2023; Communication from the District Water Officer (DWO). The LG Water Officer put to the attention of stakeholders that it was established during monitoring that most water sources had water quality issues. Meeting resolved that atleast 20% of water sources be tested and feedback given to communities. The subsequent budget allocation was given to quality testing of sources.

Quarter four DWSCC meeting held on 13th/10/2022 under minute 18/2/2023: Communication from DWO. The LG Water Officer reported concerns by communities regarding poor management of facilities by Mid-Western Umbrella. Efforts to bring National Water and Sewerage Cooperation (NWSC) to manage facilities was explored in FY 2023/2024.

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

There was evidence the LG Water Officer publicized budget allocations for FY 2023/2024 to LLGs with coverage below district average. Observed was circular addressed to SAS displayed at the district notice board.



10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence the LG allocated 40.1% of the Non-Wage Recurrent rural water and sanitation budget as per grant guidelines towards mobilization activities. Review of the annual workplan for FY 2022/2023 the total NWR budget was UGX 125,300,923/=, the allocation towards mobilization activities was UGX 50,366,643/=.</p>	3
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence the LG Water Officer in liaison with the CDO trained WSCs on their roles on O&amp;M of WSS facilities. Presented as evidence was training report prepared by both Officers. The content of the training captured topics including roles of the committee members, O&amp;M strategy, user fees collection and usage and grivance handling.</p>	3

### Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence the LG Water Office had an up-to-date LG Water Asset register that sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location in LLGs. It was last updated on 20th/07/2023 and WSS projects of FY 2022/2023 well captured.</p>	4
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 (LGDPIII) 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>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that desk appraisals for all WSS projects to be implemented in FY2023/24 were conducted, the prioritized projects were derived from the LG DPIII and eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Borehole Rehabilitation in Karosandara Sub County derived from the DPIII. Desk appraisal completed on 2 June 2022</p> <p>Kyangwe GFS in Mahango Sub County derived from DPIII. Desk appraisal completed on 2 June 2022</p> <p>Buthale GSF in Mahango Sub County derived from DPIII. Desk appraisal completed on 2 June 2022</p>	4

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence all budgeted investments for FY 2023/2024 had completed applications from beneficiary communities. Presented for review was completed application letter from the community of Kyanya upper cell, Maliba sub-county. Attached was a list of applicants witnessed by LC1 Chairperson. Review of the AWP&amp;B FY 2023/24 construction of Makongote source was prioritized to serve the area.</p> <p>Community of Ibuga village, Kitwamba parish applied for safe water on 25th/08/2021.</p> <p>The community of pf Kihondo village in Ihandiro sub-county applied for a water source on 7th/08/2020. In the AWP&amp;B FY 2023/24 the construction of Kalhughutha Break Pressure tank was prioritized to serve the community.</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that field appraisals for WSS Projects to be implemented in FY2023/24 were conducted to establish their technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Field appraisal for Borehole Rehabilitation in Karosandara Sub County was completed on 7 June 2022</p> <p>Field appraisal for Kyangwe GFS in Mahango Sub County was completed on 7 June 2022</p> <p>Field appraisal for Buthale GSF in Mahango Sub County was completed on 7 June 2022</p>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>Kasese DLG did not conduct screening for environmental and social safeguards for the water projects for the previous FY. Examples of projects included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of Makongothe GFS in Ibanda- Kyanja.</li> <li>2. Construction of Bitere GFS phase 3.</li> <li>3. Construction and extension of Buthale water stream source in Mahango sub country.</li> <li>4. Construction of Buhunga GFS Phase III</li> </ol>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>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 were incorporated in the LG-approved procurement plan. Some of the projects incorporated were as follows:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Makongote GFS in Maliba S/C, at a budget of UGX 150,000,000/=; this project was executed in the previous FY.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Extension of Kyangwe mini-gravity flow scheme, at a budget of UGX 70,000,000/=; this project was executed in the previous FY.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Extension of Kyangende/Kyabikongolo spring in Kyabarungira S/C; at a budget of 30,000,000/=; this project was executed in the previous FY.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>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 Contracts Committee approved the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY before the commencement of construction. Three contracts were recorded to support the scoring of this indicator:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Extension of Kyangwe GFS, contracts committee approved on 21/12/2022; minute number KASE/856/DCC/92/2022-2023(11)</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Makongote GFS, Contracts committee approved on 21/12/2022; minute number: KASE/856/DCC/92/2022-2023(08)</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Extension of Kyangende/Kyabikongolo GFS, Contracts committee approved on 21/12/2022; minute number: KASE/856/DCC/92/2022-2023(12)</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The water PIT presented lacked a labour officer as outline below:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Bitere GFS, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: community development officer, senior environmental officer, internal auditor, district water officer district engineer, and senior procurement officer. The labour officer was not appointed.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Buhunga GFS, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: community development officer, senior environmental officer, internal auditor, district water officer district engineer, and senior procurement officer. The labour officer was not appointed.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Kyangwe GFS, the PIT was established on 24/10/2022 by the CAO, members appointed: community development officer, senior environmental officer, internal auditor, district water officer district engineer, and senior procurement officer. The labour officer was not appointed.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the sampled WSS projects were constructed in conformity to the technical designs' specifications. The sampled contracts were for construction of Magongote GFS in Maliba sub-county and the construction of Bitere Gravity Flow Scheme in Mahango sub-county.</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			

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

The LG provided evidence establishing that the LG Water Officer did not verify, certify, and initiate payments to contractors implementing water projects in FY2022/23 within the recommended timeframe for payments.

#### **Evidence**

The recommended timeframe for payments to contractors- 30 days from certification of works.

1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Tobis Technical Services Limited on 30 March 2023 for the construction of Buhunga GFS Phase 2 in Kilembe Sub County for UGX 58,000,000. Payment Certificate No. 1 was prepared on 3 April 2023. The payment was made on 26 May 2023 EFT NO. 5668129 i.e. 53 days after certification of works.

2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Maribaya Limited on 31 March 2023 for the extension of Kyangwe gravity flow scheme for UGX 83,962,770. Payment Certificate No. 2 was prepared on 12 April 2023. The payment was made on 15 June 2023 EFT NO. 5858688 i.e. 63 days after certification of works.

3. Request for Payment was made by M/s Mupala Agency Ltd on 19 October 2022 for the extension of water to Kyibiri Village in Muhokya Sub County for UGX 20,590,000. Payment Certificate was prepared on 6 December 2022. The payment was made on 20 February 2023 EFT NO. 3735770, i.e. 76 days after certification of works.

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>2</p> <p>There was 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. Three projects were recorded to support the scoring of this indicator:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Extension of Kyangwe GFS, contracts committee minutes available approved on 21/12/2022; minute number KASE/856/DCC/92/2022-2023(11); Works contract available dated 8/02/2023; evaluation report dated 13/12/2022.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Construction of Makongote GFS, Contracts committee approved on 21/12/2022; minute number: KASE/856/DCC/92/2022-2023(08); works contract dated 24/01/2023; evaluation report dated 13/12/2022.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Extension of Kyangende/Kyabikongolo GFS, Contracts committee approved on 21/12/2022; minute number: KASE/856/DCC/92/2022-2023(12) works contract dated 08/02/2023; evaluation report dated 13/12/2022.</p>
----	---	---	---

**Environment and Social Requirements**

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>3</p> <p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>On 23/11/2022, workers at the Kaswa GFS reported delayed payment which led to destruction of the pipeline by disgruntled workers. The contractor was contacted by the DWO and settled the grievance amicably. The contractor repaired the vandalised water pipe and also cleared the wages of the workers</p>
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>3</p> <p>There was evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs as per minutes with extension workers dated 16/05/2022 under which minute 13/2022/2023 was presentation and dissemination of guidelines to CDOs.</p>

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS infrastructure projects constructed during the previous FY were prepared and implemented.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership land. Presented for review was land consent forms signed between the LG and landlords where the infrastructures were constructed. These included among others the consent signed between Masereka Julius of Buwatha village in Kilembe sub-county and Kasese District LG. The agreement was signed on 12th/12/2022.</p> <p>Land consent agreement signed between Bwambale Zabedayo of Kitwa village in Kyabarangira and the LG dated 14th/04/2023. Land consent agreement signed between John Baryeze John of B uhing village and the LG dated 12th/12/2022.</p> <p>Land consent agreement signed between Muhindo Samson of Kamakabi village in Ihandiro sub-county and the LG dated 8th/03/2023 for the construction of Kathughutha Break Pressure Tank.</p>	3

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p>	<p>The LG did not provide evidence to establish whether the LG Environment Officer and Community Development Officer completed and signed E&amp;S Certification forms prior to payments being made to Contractors for Water Projects implemented in FY2022/23.</p>	0
		<p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p><b>Example</b></p> <p>1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Tobis Technical Services Limited on 30 March 2023 for the construction of Buhunga GFS Phase 2 in Kilembe Sub County for UGX 58,000,000. The payment was made on 26 May 2023 EFT NO. 5668129. DWO recommended payment on 20 April 2023. No E &amp; S Compliance Certification Forms were adduced at the time of assessment.</p> <p>2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Maribaya Limited on 31 March 2023 for the extension of Kyangwe gravity flow scheme for UGX 83,962,770. DWO recommended payment on 20 April 2023. The payment was made on 15 June 2023 EFT NO. 5858688. No E &amp; S Compliance Certification Forms were adduced at the time of assessment.</p> <p>3. Request for Payment was made by M/s Mupala Agency Ltd on 19 October 2022 for the extension of water to Kyibiri Village in Muhokya Sub County for UGX 20,590,000. DWO recommended payment on 5 December 2022. The payment was made on 20 February 2023 EFT NO. 3735770. No E &amp; S Compliance Certification Forms were adduced at the time of assessment.</p>	
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the CDO and environment Officer undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports:</p>	0
		<p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>		



**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Yes, there was evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs.</p> <p>As per a report titled “Kasese District irrigated land acreage data collection” for FY 2022/2023 total land under irrigation was 3,514.1 acres, of which 9 acres was under micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and 3,505.1 acres under micro-scale irrigation non beneficiaries.</p> <p>According to the same report for FY 2021/2022 there was no land under micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and 3,155.1 acres under micro-scale irrigation non beneficiaries</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, there was evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous fiscal year.</p> <p>In the fiscal year 2022/2023, the total land under irrigation was 3,514.1 acres, whereas in the fiscal year 2021/2022, the total land under irrigation was 3,155.1 acres. Therefore increased acreage of newly irrigated land was 359 acres, hence more than 5% increase.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG average score in the Micro-scale Irrigation LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 77%.</p>	4

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	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	As per the grant guidelines of previous FY, the LG was allocated a total of 530,685,252/-, of which 159,205,576/- (30%) was meant for establishment of micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites.	2
	Maximum score 6		And as per the budget performance report for 2022-2023, 159,205,576/- (30%) was used for establishment of six micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites.	
			Therefore, the LG used the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant in accordance with the grant guidelines	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	The LG paid suppliers before farmers signed an acceptance form to confirm that the equipment was working well.	0
	Maximum score 6		<b>Example</b>	
			Request for Payment was made by M/s Hydroline Irrigation Co. Ltd on 30 April 2023 for the procurement of Irrigation Equipment for the Establishment of Demonstration Farms for UGX 159,205,572. The payment was made on EFT No. 6205082 on 23 June 2023. The Farmers signed the Approved Acceptance Form after payments were made to the Supplier i.e.	
			o Mr Tumusiime Yonah Maate signed on 31 July 2023.	
			o Mr Mohamad Amuri signed on 31 July 2023	
			o Mr Bengehania Patrick signed on 31 July 2023	
			o Mr Muserero M. Augustine signed on 20 July 2023	
			o Mr Mutswanga Samson signed on 31 July 2023	
			o Ms Sanyu Esther signed on 31 July 2023	

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	1
		<p>M/S Hydroline irrigation Co. ltd (the irrigation equipment supplier) signed a contract to install six irrigation demonstration sites at a total cost of 159,205,752/-.</p> <p>There was no breakdown of 159,205,752/- indicating the cost of each demonstration site.</p> <p>As per the agricultural engineer's cost estimates, the cost of installing the six demonstration sites were as follows:</p> <p>Sanyu Esther site; = 6,698,900/-.</p> <p>Amori Mohammed site = 23,151,900/-</p> <p>Masereru Augustine site = 31,483,750/-</p> <p>Samson Mutswanga site = 24,657,800/-</p> <p>Yona Tumusiime site = 32,653,970/-</p> <p>Biira Hallen site = 21,553,600/-</p> <p>Therefore, the total for agricultural engineers cost estimates =140,199,920/-, hence the percentage variation in the contract price = -13.56%, hence within +/-20%.</p>	

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	0
		<p>As per the supplier contracts the installation of six micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites started on 15th April 2023 and it was completed on 15th July 2023.</p> <p>Completion certificate was not signed by the Chief Administrative Officer at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Therefore, the planned irrigation demonstration sites where contracts were signed during the previous FY were not installed/completed within the previous FY since the contract was completed on 15th July 2023 (not previous FY).</p>	

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

Kasese DLG as per its staff establishment structure approved by MoPS provided for the following extension staff at the LLGs. (i) Assistant animal husbandry officer, (ii) Assistant agricultural officer, (iii) Fisheries Officer, (iv) Agricultural Officer, and (v) Assistant Fisheries Development officer. A review of the staff deployment /in post lists at the time of assessment revealed that the average staffing levels for the three sampled LLGs was 47% thereby not meeting the scoring threshold as detailed below.

#### **Kyondo SC - 2/5**

Out of the five extension staff positions provided for, in post were two staff namely, Emanuelina Nziabake, Agricultural Officer and Samuel Ndungo, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer representing 40% staffing.

#### **Kisinga SC - 2/5**

Out of the five extension staff positions provided for, in post were two staff namely, Biira Joseless , Agricultural Officer, and Nyabake Hellen, Assistant Agricultural Officer representing 40% staffing.

#### **Bugoye SC - 3/5**

Out of the five extension staff positions provided for, in post were three staff, namely, John Baguma, Agricultural Officer, Itungu Sophia, Fisheries Officer and Muhindo Joachim, Animal husbandry Officer representing 60% staffing.

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

Key items observed at the three sampled irrigation demonstration sites installed included:

At Yona Tumusiime site: Solar powered drip system (solar water pump (50m head, pump discharge is 45 liters/min); 5,000lts HDPE water tank placed up on a stand at a height of 1m; GI pipe DN 40mm; Main delivery line (HDPE PN10 50mm OD); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD); Drip lines 16mm and 20-30cm emitter spacing; 6 hydrants for drag hose pipe irrigation (0.75in hose pipe); Riser pipe ¾" PVC.

At Sanyu Esther site: semi movable sprinkler irrigation system, (7HP, 18m<sup>3</sup> per hour, 72m head high pressure pump; 1 Rain gun sprinklers; 63mm PE pipes (100), 63mm PE elbows (1); 63mm PE Tees (2); Sprinklers of 1/2" and 15m radius; flow control devices (flow meter, pressure gauge and release valves).

Biira Hallen site:

Solar powered drip irrigation system (90m head solar water pump (1); solar panels (8); 6 PVC pump sleeving pipe (6m long); 32mm PE pipes; solar power controller unit (1); 10m<sup>3</sup> plastic water tank; 63mm PVC FTA (3); 63mm PVC elbows (4); 63mm PVC pipes (20); 63mm PVC Tees (11); 63x40mm PVC R/Bs (11); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD);

These features were in conformity with the technical designs and the inventory (list of irrigation equipment or items installed)

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The three sampled installed irrigation demonstration sites had the following irrigation systems:</p> <p>Yona Tumusiime site; Solar powered drip and drag hose pipe systems.</p> <p>Sanyu Esther site: semi movable sprinkler irrigation system.</p> <p>Biira Hallen site: Solar powered drip irrigation system.</p> <p>Every irrigation system was switched on and was functioning, field photos were captured at the time of assessment.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The positions of extension workers filled were not accurate as seen hereunder. Two LLGs (Kyondo and Bugoye) were found to have more staff than provided for in the staff establishment list.</p> <p><b>Kyondo SC - 2/1(200%)</b></p> <p>One staff was provided for in the staff list while two staff were deployed according to the production deployment list namely, Emanuelina Nziabake, Agricultural Officer and Samuel Ndungo, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer.</p> <p><b>Kisinga SC - 2/2(100%)</b></p> <p>Two staff were provided for in the staff list while two staff were deployed according to the production deployment list namely, Biira Joseless , Agricultural Officer, and Nyabake Hellen, Assistant Agricultural Officer</p> <p><b>Bugoye SC - 3/2(150%)</b></p> <p>Two staff were provided for in the staff list while three staff were deployed according to the production deployment list namely, John Baguma, Agricultural Officer, Itungu Sophia, Fisheries Officer and Muhindo Joachim, Animal husbandry Officer.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information

Maximum score 4

b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

The key information obtained from the three sampled sites were:

At Yona Tumusiime site: Solar powered drip system (solar water pump (50m head, pump discharge is 45 liters/min); 5,000lts HDPE water tank placed up on a stand at a height of 1m; GI pipe DN 40mm; Main delivery line (HDPE PN10 50mm OD); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD); Drip lines 16mm and 20-30cm emitter spacing; 6 hydrants for drag hose pipe irrigation (0.75in hose pipe); Riser pipe  $\frac{3}{4}$ " PVC.

At Sanyu Esther site: semi movable sprinkler irrigation system, (7HP, 18m<sup>3</sup> per hour, 72m head high pressure pump; 1 Rain gun sprinklers; 63mm PE pipes (100), 63mm PE elbows (1); 63mm PE Tees (2); Sprinklers of 1/2" and 15m radius; flow control devices (flow meter, pressure gauge and release valves).

Biira Hallen site:

Solar powered drip irrigation system (90m head solar water pump (1); solar panels (8); 6 PVC pump sleeving pipe (6m long); 32mm PE pipes; solar power controller unit (1); 10m<sup>3</sup> plastic water tank; 63mm PVC FTA (3); 63mm PVC elbows (4); 63mm PVC pipes (20); 63mm PVC Tees (11); 63x40mm PVC R/Bs (11); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD);

These observed features at the three sites were complete, functioning and conforms to technical designs and the inventory reports.

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter one and two reports dated 15th October 2022 and 15th January 2023, the LG did not provide complementary services, no farmer EOIs were captured and micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites not yet installed.</p> <p>However as per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter three activity report dated 15th April 2023, there was awareness raising events carried out and it captured 3,482 attendees. 484 farmer EOIs collected, no farm visits conducted and information collection on newly irrigated land was still on-going.</p> <p>In quarter four report dated 15 July 2023, the LG had captured a total of 615 EOIs, 150 farm visits conducted and six micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites were installed but pending testing for functionality.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG collected information quarterly on; functionality of irrigation equipment installed, provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest (EOI).</p>	2
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, MIS/Irritrack information contained 1,165 farmer EOIs and 213 farm visits conducted as compared to 615 EOIs and 150 farm visits in the previous FY. Screenshot of MIS/Irritrack was captured.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG had entered up to-date LLG information into MIS/Irritrack.</p>	1



6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter one and two reports dated 15th October 2022 and 15th January 2023, the LG did not have any information compiled from LLGs in the MIS/Irritrack. The key reason availed at the time of assessment was that there were no funds released.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>However as per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter three activity report dated 15th April 2023, there was awareness raising events carried out and it captured 3,482 attendees. 484 farmer EOIs collected, no farm visits conducted.</p>	
			<p>In quarter four report dated 15 July 2023, the LG had captured a total of 615 EOIs and 150 farm visits conducted.</p>	
			<p>Therefore, the LG had prepared quarterly reports using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS/Irritrack.</p>	
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG developed and approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs (Kilembe, Kithoma Kanyatsi, Kitabu, Kahokya and Ihandiro). The Plan was to train extension workers who should later train farmers as required in the LLG National Assessment Manual Performance measure 38.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>The key activities in the plan were: providing mentoring to extension staffs on extension approaches and report writing; posting extension staffs at Kilembe and Ihandiro sub-counties; providing a motorcycle to ease field movements of extension worker at Mahaongo sub-county, etc.</p>	

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the implementation of Performance Improvement Plan report dated 30th July 2023, LG implemented the Performance Improvement Plans. Some of the key items captured in the report included: Mentoring extension workers on how to deliver better services to farmers, Mahaongo sub-county was given a new motorcycle to ease field movements of extension workers, 1 Veterinary Officer and 1 Fisheries officer deployed at Lake Katwe sub-county, A new agricultural Officer was deployed at Kilembe, etc</p>	<b>1</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the approved Budget for production Department FY 2023/2024, there was Ugx 1,577,844,916/- allocated for general staff salaries, which incorporates 63 extension staffs deployed at 42 LLGs in addition to the other 9 staffs who sit at the District Head quarter.</p> <p>This means that approximately one to two extension workers were deployed per LLG, yet the guideline requires three extension workers deployed per LLG.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG budget for extension workers was not in accordance with staffing norm.</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	--	--	----------

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum score 6

ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0

As per the production Department deployment register, deployment of extension workers was as follows;

26 Agricultural Officers, 8 Assistant Agricultural Officers, 1 Fisheries Officer, 7 Assistant Fisheries Officers, 17 Assistant Animal Husbandry Officers, and 2 Animal Husbandry Officers.

Therefore 63 extension workers were deployed and currently engaged in implementation activities across 42 LLGs.

This means that approximately one to two extension workers were deployed per LLG, yet the guideline requires three extension workers deployed per LLG, hence the deployment was not in accordance with the guidelines.

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

An inspection of the staff lists as displayed at the LLGs hereunder showed that extension workers were working at the stations they were deployed at.

#### **Kyondo SC**

Emanuelina Nziabake, Agricultural Officer was found working at the station as deployed.

#### **Kisinga SC**

Biira Joseless , Agricultural Officer and Nyabake Hellen, Assistant Agricultural Officer were found working at the station as deployed.

#### **Bugoye SC**

John Baguma, Agricultural Officer, Itungu Sophia, Fisheries Officer and Muhindo Joachim, Animal husbandry Officer.

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The LG had publicized and disseminated to LLGs notice boards extension workers deployment. The following information was obtained from the three LLGs visited.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>		<p>Lake Katwe sub-county (AFO is Kiiza Wilson Nzaghale, AO is Kabindo Enock and AAHO is Kajuna Yona).</p>	
			<p>Mubuku town council (AAHO is Musoki Fortunate)</p>	
			<p>Mbunga sub-county (AAO is Mbambu Scovia and AO is Mbusa Matatiya)</p>	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0</p>	<p>All files were reviewed and evidence that the DPO had been appraised the staff was established as illustrated hereunder.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 4</p>		<p>1. Masereka Johnson, Assistant fisheries officer, Nyakyumbu sub-county appraised 30th June 2023 by Julius Rukara DPO.</p>	
			<p>2. Mwahulhwa Wilson, Maliba SC &amp; TC, appraised 30th June 2023 by DPO.</p>	
			<p>3. Rusubika Joel, Agricultural Officer, Kyabarungira SC &amp; Kabatunda -Kirabaho TC, appraised 30th June 2023.</p>	
			<p>4. Masereka Johnson, Assistant fisheries officer, Nyakyumbu sub-county, appraised 30th June 2023 by Julius Rukara DPO.</p>	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence was accessible at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 4</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the production Department work plan for FY 2022/2023, the LG mainly planned the following:</p> <p>Support extension workers to promote and strengthen extension service delivery under the PDM arrangement, support and build capacity of the honey enterprise groups, conducting technical backstopping visits to apiary farmers, etc.</p> <p>As per a training report about training of extension workers on extension service delivery approaches held on 29th September 2022, a total of 57 participants attended the training. Training attendance provided.</p> <p>The approaches included; the use of the private sector and CSO extension works under the single spine extension delivery system, the use of the nucleus-out-grower system, the village agent model system, the 4-acre model farmers as learning points, and the farmer field school approach.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG conducted training activities as per the plans at the District level.</p>	<b>1</b>
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have any training database at the time of assessment.</p>	<b>0</b>

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

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

The LG was a phase 2 LG that received Micro-Scale Irrigation Grant for the first time in FY2022/23 and allocated 100% of the fund appropriately to complimentary services.

#### **Evidence**

Raise Awareness Local Leaders was budgeted at UGX 47,761,673

Procurement & Monitoring was budgeted at UGX 31,841,116

Raising Awareness Farmers was budgeted at UGX 212,274,100

Farm Visits was budgeted at UGX 81,802,788

Irrigation Demo. The budget was UGX 159,205,576

Total Complimentary Services UGX 532,885,253

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

The LG made budget allocations towards complimentary services in line with sector guidelines for implementation in FY2022/23.

#### **Evidence**

Raise Awareness Local Leaders was budgeted at UGX 47,761,673 (i.e. 9% within the maximum 15% allowed in guidelines)

Procurement & Monitoring was budgeted at UGX 31,841,116 (i.e. 6% within the maximum 10% allowed in guidelines)

Raising Awareness Farmers was budgeted at UGX 212,274,100 (i.e. 40% as per guidelines)

Farm Visits was budgeted at UGX 81,802,788 (i.e. 15% as per guidelines)

Irrigation Demo was budgeted at UGX 159,205,576 (i.e. 30% as per guidelines)

Total Complimentary Services UGX 532,885,253

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG made estimates of UGX 20,000,000 (i.e. local revenue) as farmers co-funding in the Budget FY2023/24.</p>	2
<p>Maximum score 10</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG is a phase 2 LG that received micro scale irrigation grant for the first time in FY2022/23. The LG was not required to provide for the component of farmers co-funding in FY2022/23.</p>	0
<p>Maximum score 10</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the activity reports on awareness creation on micro-scale irrigation program dated 13th March 2023 and 30th June 2023, the LG disseminated information on the use of farmer co-funding (cost sharing of the irrigation equipment where by a farmer contributes 25% of the total cost), brochures were given out to the leaders and farmers.</p>	2
<p>Maximum score 10</p>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites technical supervision report dated 4th September 2023, LG did monitoring and supervision during installation of the irrigation demonstration sites in the month of June, July and August 2023.</p> <p>Key findings included; trenching for the irrigation pipelines, water tank base constructions on-going, water source not adequate at Yona Tumusiime site, equipment installation on-going etc. The report did not capture any information on environment and social safeguards.</p> <p>Therefore, DPO monitored on a monthly basis (June, July and August 2023) all the six micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites.</p>	2
<p>Maximum score 8</p>				

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the report on technical training of host farmers by the contractor on operation and maintenance of micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites dated 15th June 2023, the LG did oversee approved farmer training and support to the micro-scale irrigation demonstration site host farmers.</p> <p>The training included; techniques of connecting and disconnecting pipes, techniques of aligning drip lines in straight direction, technique of operating the irrigation systems, etc.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The extension workers were trained on the use of Irritrack App to capture farmers' expression of interest for micro-scale irrigation, farm visits, awareness raising events, etc. This was according to the quarter three and four reports dated 15th April 2023<sup>15</sup> and July 2023 respectively.</p> <p>The hands on-support was confirmed from the three LLGs (Lake Katwe sub-county and Mubuku town council and Mbunga sub-county) sampled.</p> <p>Some of the respondents were; Kajuna Yona AAHO at Lake Katwe sub-county, Mbambu Scovia AAO at Mbunga sub-county.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG did provide hands-on support to LLGs as confirmed from the above respondents which resulted into up-to-date database of EOIs in the MIS/Irritrack.</p>	2



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the farmer field school reports dated 2nd and 24th June 2023, LG established and run two farmer field schools. The first school was at Yona Tumusiime's micro-scale irrigation demonstration site (host farmer) and the second school was at Katholhu min-irrigation scheme owned by local community in Kayanja parish, Nyakiyumbu sub-county.</p> <p>Some of the key content captured in the reports included; benefits of practicing irrigation, various types of irrigation and their operation, etc.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the awareness raising on micro-scale irrigation report dated 13th March 2023 and 30th June 2023, LG sensitized farmers on micro-scale irrigation programme. Key information shared included; the need for irrigation due to unpredicted rains, how one would register for the program, establishment of three demonstration sites for learning, farmer co-funding for irrigation equipment etc.</p> <p>Attendance lists were attached to the report.</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the two reports on sensitization of District technical staff and District council on UgIFT micro-scale irrigation program dated 17th and 13th January 2023 respectively, the LG did train staff and sensitized political leaders at District and LLG levels (mobilizing farmers to participate on irrigation and irrigated agriculture).</p> <p>Some of the key information captured included; farmers and staffs encouraged to join SACCOs from which they could be able to co-fund for acquiring irrigation equipment, benefits of practicing irrigation, etc. key participants included; District chairperson, District speaker, District councilors, RDC, CAO, PAS, DISO and LLGs</p>	2

## Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines

Maximum score 8

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

The register of micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment supplied to the host farmers were as follows;

At Yona Tumusiime site: Solar powered drip system (solar water pump (50m head, pump discharge is 45 liters/min); 5,000lts HDPE water tank placed up on a stand at a height of 1m; GI pipe DN 40mm; Main delivery line (HDPE PN10 50mm OD); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD); Drip lines 16mm and 20-30cm emitter spacing; 6 hydrants for drag hose pipe irrigation (0.75in hose pipe); Riser pipe ¾" PVC.

At Sanyu Esther site: semi movable sprinkler irrigation system, (7HP, 18m<sup>3</sup> per hour, 72m head high pressure pump; 1 Rain gun sprinklers; 63mm PE pipes (100), 63mm PE elbows (1); 63mm PE Tees (2); Sprinklers of 1/2" and 15m radius; flow control devices (flow meter, pressure gauge and release valves).

Biira Hallen site:

Solar powered drip irrigation system (90m head solar water pump (1); solar panels (8); 6 PVC pump sleeving pipe (6m long); 32mm PE pipes; solar power controller unit (1); 10m<sup>3</sup> plastic water tank; 63mm PVC FTA (3); 63mm PVC elbows (4); 63mm PVC pipes (20); 63mm PVC Tees (11); 63x40mm PVC R/Bs (11); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD);

Amari Muhammed site,

Solar powered irrigation system: solar water pump (1); 6 inch PvC pump sleeving pipe (6m ling); 32mm PE pipes (100); 10m<sup>3</sup> plastic tank (1); 32mm PvC tank connector; 32mm PE female elbow; 63mm PvC FTAs (3); 63mm PvC elbow; 63mm PvC UBVs; 63mm PvC pipes (10); 63mm PvC Tees (7); 63x40mm PVC R/Bs (7); 40mm PVC elbow (30); 40mm PvC UBVs (7).

Samson Matswanga site.

Solar powered irrigation system: solar water pump (1); solar panels (4); 25mm PE pipes (120); solar power controller unit (1); 10m<sup>3</sup> plastic tank (1); 32mm PE female elbow; 63mm PvC FTAs (3); 63mm PvC elbow; 63mm PvC UBVs; 63mm PvC pipes (10); 63mm PvC Tees (7); 63x40mm PVC R/Bs

(7);40mm PVC elbow (30); 40mm PVC UBVs.

Musereru Augustine site.

Solar powered drip irrigation system (90m head solar water pump (1); solar panels (8); 6 PVC pump sleeving pipe (6m long); 32mm PE pipes; solar power controller unit (1); 10m<sup>3</sup> plastic water tank; 63mm PVC FTA (3); 63mm PVC elbows (4); 63mm PVC pipes (20); 63mm PVC Tees (11); 63x40mm PVC R/Bs (11); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD).

Therefore, LG had an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to the six host farmers in the previous FY.

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	The database of applications for EOIs for current and previous FYs in the MIS was up-to-date. At the end of previous FY, 615 EOIs were captured in the database and 150 were visited whereas at the time of assessment 1,165 EOIs were captured in the database and 213 were visited.  Therefore the LG keeps up-to-date database of applications (EOIs) in the MIS/Irritrack for the current and previous FYs at the time of the assessment.	2
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	As per the micro-scale irrigation sub-grant quarter four activity report dated 15 July 2023, a total of 150 farm visits were made out of 615 EOIs captured in the data base.  Therefore, LG didn't visit all farmers who submitted complete EOIs and had no signed Agreement to proceed for quotation forms.	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	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	The DLG Agricultural Engineer did not publicize eligible farmers on the District production notice board and at LLGs (Lake Katwe town council, Mbunga sub-county and Mubuku town council) notice boards.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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.	There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the previous FY as follows:  >>> Procurement of equipment for establishment of demonstrations of micro-scale irrigation, budgeted for UGX 159,205,576/=.	1
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was no evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). It was national open bidding. However, there was no evidence that being prequalified by MAAIF was part of the evaluation criteria.	0
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria. The criteria stated in the bid documents is outlined below:  Stage I: The preliminary stage saw two (02) out of three (3) bidders fail because they lacked bid security, certificate of registration, and income tax clearance (ITC). The bidders were as follows:  >>> Hydroline Irrigation Company Limited with an offer of UGX 196,634,180/= >>> Nyumbani agro-farm limited, with an offer of UGX 258,880,948/= >>> Shadrarc Engineering Company Limited, with an offer of UGX 237,242,463/=	2
Maximum score 18			Note: Nyumbani and Shadrarc did not have bid security, certificate of registration, and ITC	
			Stage II: The technical evaluation	
			Stage III: Financial evaluation	
			<i>Note: Hydroline passed the technical, had experience, and was within budget.</i>	

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee:	1
	Maximum score 18		>>> Contracts committee approved on 29/03/2023, under minute number: KASE/856/DCC167/2022-2023.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier before the commencement of installation. However, the farmer did not witness the contract.	0
	Maximum score 18		>>> Contract signed on 18/04/2023; reference no. KASE/856/SUPPLIES/2022-2023/00023.	
			Note: The LG had one contract in the previous FY.	

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

Key items observed at the three sampled irrigation demonstration sites installed included:

At Yona Tumusiime site: Solar powered drip system (solar water pump (50m head, pump discharge is 45 liters/min); 5,000lts HDPE water tank placed up on a stand at a height of 1m; GI pipe DN 40mm; Main delivery line (HDPE PN10 50mm OD); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD); Drip lines 16mm and 20-30cm emitter spacing; 6 hydrants for drag hose pipe irrigation (0.75in hose pipe); Riser pipe ¾" PVC.

At Sanyu Esther site: semi movable sprinkler irrigation system, (7HP, 18m<sup>3</sup> per hour, 72m head high pressure pump; 1 Rain gun sprinklers; 63mm PE pipes (100), 63mm PE elbows (1); 63mm PE Tees (2); Sprinklers of 1/2" and 15m radius; flow control devices (flow meter, pressure gauge and release valves).

Biira Hallen site:

Solar powered drip irrigation system (90m head solar water pump (1); solar panels (8); 6 PVC pump sleeving pipe (6m long); 32mm PE pipes; solar power controller unit (1); 10m<sup>3</sup> plastic water tank; 63mm PVC FTA (3); 63mm PVC elbows (4); 63mm PVC pipes (20); 63mm PVC Tees (11); 63x40mm PVC R/Bs (11); Sub-main line (HDPE PN6 40mm OD);

These features were in conformity with the technical designs and the inventory.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites technical supervision report dated 4th September 2023, Senior Agricultural Engineer did monitoring and supervision during installation of the irrigation demonstration sites in the months of June, July and August 2023. Key findings included; trenching for the irrigation pipelines, water tank base constructions on-going, water source not adequate at Yona Tumusiime site, equipment installation on-going etc.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG conducted regular (monthly) technical supervision of the micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had only overseen the supply and installation of irrigation demonstration equipment as per the micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites technical supervision report dated 4th September 2023. The report did not capture any information about the testing for functionality of the irrigation demonstration sites installed.</p> <p>Also as per the micro-scale irrigation quarter four report dated 15 July 2023, six micro-scale irrigation demonstration sites were installed, pending testing since the host farmers had not prepared their fields.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG only oversaw the supply and installation but did not oversee the testing for functionality of the irrigation demonstration sites installed.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG had overseen handover of irrigation demonstration sites to the host farmer as there were no handover reports availed at the time of assessment.</p>	0

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

The LG made payments to suppliers in FY2022/23 before farmers signed the acceptance form confirming that the equipment was working well beyond the recommended timeframe for payments to suppliers.

#### **Evidence**

Request for Payment was made by M/s Hydroline Irrigation Co. Ltd on 30 April 2023 for the procurement of Irrigation Equipment for the Establishment of Demonstration Farms for UGX 159,205,572. The payment was made on EFT No. 6205082 on 23 June 2023 i.e. 54 days after supplier requested for payments.

The Farmers signed the Approved Acceptance Form after payments were made to the Supplier i.e.

o Mr Tumusiime Yonah Maate signed on 31 July 2023.

o Mr Mohamad Amuri signed on 31 July 2023

o Mr Bengehania Patrick signed on 31 July 2023

o Mr Muserero M. Augustine signed on 20 July 2023

o Mr Mutswanga Samson signed on 31 July 2023

o Ms Sanyu Esther signed on 31 July 2023

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

A complete file was available; evaluation report dated 7/03/2023; contracts committee approval dated 29/03/2023, under minute number: KASE/856/DCC167/2022-2023; and contract agreement dated 18/04/2023.

Contractor: Hydroline Irrigation Company Limited; contract amount UGX 196,634,180/=

Name of the procurement: Procurement of equipment for the establishment of demonstrations of micro-scale irrigation in Kasese district.



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	LG did display on the District Production Department notice board and LLGs the details of the nature and avenues to address grievance at the time of assessment. The notice boards of the three LLGs (Lake Katwe sub-county and Mubuku town councils, and Mbunga sub-county) were visited.	<b>2</b>
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	Kasese District Local Government had a functional Grievance redress mechanism which entailed appointment of focal person and committee, publicization of the grievance redress referral pathway, a log book and minutes of the grievance redress committee, however no grievance under microscale irrigation had been referred to the district committee at the time of this assessment.	<b>1</b>
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	Kasese District Local Government had a functional Grievance redress mechanism which entailed appointment of focal person and committee, publicization of the grievance redress referral pathway, a log book and minutes of the grievance redress committee, however no grievance under microscale irrigation had been referred to the district committee at the time of this assessment.	<b>1</b>
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	Kasese District Local Government had a functional Grievance redress mechanism which entailed appointment of focal person and committee, publicization of the grievance redress referral pathway, a log book and minutes of the grievance redress committee, however no grievance under microscale irrigation had been referred to the district committee at the time of this assessment.	<b>1</b>

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese District Local Government had a functional Grievance redress mechanism which entailed appointment of focal person and committee, publicization of the grievance redress referral pathway, a log book and minutes of the grievance redress committee, however no grievance under microscale irrigation had been referred to the district committee at the time of this assessment.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>DLG did not disseminate micro-scale irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access, proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers as evidenced by lack of farm visit reports.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening had been carried out and ESMPs developed, before the installation of irrigation equipment;</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation demonstration site for Sam Mutswanga in Kighete village was screened on 10/10/2022. However, the ESMP was not prepared and costed.</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation demonstration site for Sanyu Esther in Kivengenyi village was screened on 10/10/2022. However, the ESMP was not prepared and costed.</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation demonstration site for Patrick Bengehania in Kisongola village was screened on 10/10/2022. However, the ESMP was not prepared and costed.</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation demonstration site for Augustine Musubibaho in Rwehingo village was screened on 10/10/2022. However, the ESMP was not prepared and costed.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

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	There was no evidence that monitoring for irrigation impact was carried out for micro-scale irrigation projects.	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	There was no evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by the Environmental Officer before payments of contractor invoices/certificates at the interim and final stages of projects.	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	There was no evidence that E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by the CDO before payments of contractor invoices/certificates at the interim and final stages of micro-scale projects.	0

**Crosscutting  
Minimum Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Kasese DLG has a substantive CFO. Ms Muhindo Margaret as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 16th March 2021 referenced under Min No. DSC/ 100/ 2021. At the time of assessment, the District Planner was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023 and duly signed by CAO on 17th July 2023 .	<b>3</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Kasese DLG has a substantive District Planner - Mr. Masereka Alex as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 21st may 2018 referenced under Min No. 134/ 2018. At the time of assessment, the District Planner was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.	<b>3</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Kasese DLG does not have a substantive District. Engineer. Mr. Asiimwe Ronald the substantively appointed Senior Civil Engineering Officer as evidenced by letter dated 23rd April 2018 referenced under Min.No. 18/2012 of the District Service Commission is assigned duty as acting District Engineer by the CAO. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 1st July 2022.	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Kasese DLG has a substantive District Natural Resources Officer - Katswera Joseph as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 25th August 2008 referenced under Min No. 48/2008. At the time of assessment, the DNRO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.	<b>3</b>

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive District Production Officer – Baluku Julius as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 16th March 2021 referenced under Min no. DSC/99/2021. At the time of assessment, the District Production Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive District Community Development Officer – Mr. Birungi Ben Henry as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 19th September 2003 referenced under Min no. 40/2003. At the time of assessment, the DCDO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive District Commercial Officer – Mr. Kasereka Yambuka Simon as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 21st May 2018 referenced under Min No. 133/2018. At the time of assessment, the District Commercial Officer was found duly appraised for the period under review as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Senior Procurement Officer – Mr. Kisembo Edward Masitaki as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 15th May 2018 referenced under Min No. 98/2018 of the DSC. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 21st July 2023.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Procurement Officer – Mr. Muhindo Stephen as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 29th April 2019 referenced under Min No. 65/2019. At the time of assessment, the Procurement Officer was found to have been duly appraised for the year under review as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 24th July 2023</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Principal Human Resources Officer – Mr. Bihanikire Samson as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 10th July 2017 referenced under Min No. 161/2017 of the DSC. At the time of assessment, the PHRO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 24th July 2023 .</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Senior Environment Officer -Mr Kooli Augustine as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 30th May 2022 referenced under Min No. 105/2011 of the DSC. At the time of assessment, the SEO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 24th July 2023 .</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Senior Land management Officer -Mr. Baluku James as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 30th December 2013 referenced under Minute No. 259/2013. At the time of assessment, the SLMO Planner was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Senior Accountant -Mr Mbusa John as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 9th February 2010 referenced under Min No. 117/2009. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kases e DLG has a substantive Principal Internal Auditor- Mr. Bwambale K.Yona as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 31st March 2020. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Principal Human Resources Officer (Secretary DSC)- Mr. Miramagho Joshua as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 26th May 2017 referenced under Min No. 44/2017 of the DSC. At the time of assessment, the PHRO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 24th July 2023 .</p>	2
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG  Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>Kasese District Local Government has forty-one LLGs. At the time of assessment, all files were reviewed and the LLGs presented hereunder are illustrations of the findings on recruited staff in place.</p> <p><b><u>Town Councils</u></b></p> <p>1. Hima TC</p> <p>Mr. Muhiarwe Sezi, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Principal Township Officer/ Town Clerk dated 10th November 2017 referenced under Min. No. 267/2017 and by letter of appointment as Accounting Officer dated 30th June 2023. The said officer was found duly appraised on 8th August 2023.</p> <p>2. Maliba TC</p> <p>Ms. Bwambale Alice Thabulhakyoho, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Principal Township Officer/ Town Clerk dated 30th August 2017 referenced under Min. No. 222/2017 and by posting instructions dated 4th July 2023. The said officer was found duly appraised on 30th August 2023.</p> <p>3. Kisinga TC</p> <p>Mr. Baluku Bosco, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Principal Township Officer/ Town Clerk dated 31st December 2021 referenced under Min. No. 208/2021 and by posting instructions dated 9th November 2022. The said officer was found duly appraised on 20th August 2023.</p> <p>4. Katwe-Kabatoro TC</p> <p>Mr. Murongo Essau, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Principal Township Officer/ Town Clerk dated 2nd December 2021 referenced under Min. No. 172/2021 and by posting instruction dated 19th October 2022. The said officer was found duly appraised on 30th June 2023.</p> <p><b><u>Sub-counties</u></b></p> <p>1. Kyabahungira SC</p> <p>Mr. Ngamba Paul, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Assistant Secretary/ Sub-County Chief dated 10th June 2011 referenced under Min. No. 136/2011 and by</p>	5

posting instruction dated 9th November 2022. The said officer was found duly appraised on 17th August 2023.

#### 2. Karambi SC

Mr. Masereka Yusuf, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Assistant Secretary/ Sub-County Chief dated 19th December 2019 referenced under Min. No. 294/2019 and by posting instruction dated 15th November 2021. The said officer was found duly appraised on 17th July 2023.

#### 3. Nyakiyumbu SC

Mr. Kikusa Mustafa, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Assistant Secretary/ Sub-County Chief dated 19th December 2019 referenced under Min. No. 294/2019 and by posting instructions dated 7th August 2020. The said officer was found duly appraised on 30th June 2023.

#### 4. Maliba SC

Mr. Kabughuma Christopher, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Assistant Secretary/ Sub-County Chief dated 29th April 2019 referenced under Min. No. 63/2019 and by posting instruction dated 15th November 2021. The said officer was found duly appraised on 30th June 2023.

#### 5. Bwesumbu SC

Mr. Kikenge Baluku Joackim, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Assistant Secretary/ Sub-County Chief dated 24th June 2019 referenced under Min. No. 161/2019 and by posting instruction dated 9th November 2022. The said officer was found duly appraised on 17th July 2023.

#### 6. Ihandiro SC

Mr. Kuule Kisolhu Jerome, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Assistant Secretary/ Sub-County Chief dated 1st July 2008 referenced under Min. No. 7/2008 and by posting instructions dated 3rd November 2021. The said officer was found duly appraised on 6th July 2023.

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Kasese District Local Government has forty-one LLGs. At the time of assessment, all files were reviewed and the LLGs presented hereunder are illustrations of the findings on recruited staff in place.

5

#### **Town Councils**

##### 1. Hima TC

Mr. Thembo Mbauta Zerubaber, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior CDO dated 31st May 2018 referenced under Min. No.



141/2018 and posting instructions dated 1st December 2022. The said officer was found duly appraised on 8th August 2023.

#### 2. Maliba TC

Ms. Kabugho M.Night, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior CDO dated 31st May 2019 referenced under Min. No. 141/2018 and by posting instructions dated 16th December 2019. The said officer was found duly appraised on 30th June 2023.

#### 3. Kisinga TC

Ms. Kasambangene M Genipher, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior CDO dated 31st May 2018 referenced under Min. No. 112/2019 and by posting instruction dated 16th December 2019. The said officer was found duly appraised on 8th August 2023.

#### 4. Katwe-Kabatoro TC

Mr. Masereka Asasio Kayugha, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Community Development Officer dated 31st May 2019 referenced under Min. No. 112/2019 and by posting instructions dated 4th June 2019. The said officer was found duly appraised on 30th June 2023.

### **Sub-counties**

#### 1. Kyabarungira SC

Mr. Kimanywenda Patrick, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Community Development Officer dated 11th May 2019 referenced under Min. No. 84/2019 and by posting instruction dated 31st May 2019. The said officer was found duly appraised on 20th June 2023.

#### 2. Karambi SC

Ms. Kabugho Jennifer Daniel, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Community Development Officer dated 24th June 2019 referenced under Min. No. 158/2019 and by posting instruction dated 14th April 2023. The said officer was found duly appraised on 30th June 2023.

#### 3. Maliba SC

Ms. Musoki Elizabeth, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Community Development Officer dated 25th March 2010 referenced under Min. No. 21/2010 and by posting instruction dated 9th November 2022. The said officer was found duly appraised on 30th June 2023.

#### 4. Bwesumbu SC

Ms. Kabugho Bridget as evidenced by appointment dated 1st July 2008 Miv No. 48/2007 as Parish Chief, posting instruction to Bwesumbu as caretaker CDO dated 7th July 2017.

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Kasese District Local Government has forty-one LLGs. At the time of assessment, all files were reviewed and the LLGs presented hereunder are illustrations of the findings on recruited staff in place.

**Town Councils**

1. Hima TC

Mr. Muhindo Joseph, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Accounts Assistant dated 30th May 2019 referenced under Min. No. 92/2019, posting instruction to Hima Town Council dated 22nd February 2023 appraised 30th June 2023.

2. Maliba TC

Ms. Biira Harriet, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Accounts Assistant dated 30th May 2019 referenced under Min. No. 92/2019, posting instruction to Maliba Town Council dated 14th July 2023, appraised 30th June 2023.

3. Katwe-Kabatoro TC

Ms. Asiimwe Annet, as evidenced by letter of appointment as Senior Assistant Accountant dated 28th June 2022 referenced under Min. No. 11/2022, posting instruction to Katwe Town Council dated 8th August 2022, appraised 30th June 2023.

5

**Environment and Social Requirements**

3

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

Maximum score is 4

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

a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0

A review of LG Draft Final Accounts for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG released only 97% of funds allocated to the Department of Natural Resources for FY2022/23.

**Evidence**

Kasese District Local Government Reports and Financial Statements for the Year Ended 30 June 2023. Received by Accountant General's Office 30 October 2023.

Amount Warranted for FY2022/23 was UGX 1,475,903,901

Revised Budget Amount for FY2022/23 was UGX 1,514,961,605

**Calculation**

Amount Warranted/Revised Budget\*100=  
1,475,903,901/1,514,961,605\*100= 97.4%

0

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	A review of LG Draft Final Accounts for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG released only 82% of funds allocated to the Department of Community-Based Services for FY2022/23.	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.	<b>Evidence</b>	
		score 2 or else 0.	Amount Warranted for FY2022/23 was UGX 1,125,222,292	
			Revised Budget Amount for FY2022/23 was UGX 1,530,693,533+32,181,710= 1,562,875,243	
			<b>Calculation</b>	
			Amount Warranted/Revised Budget*100=1,125,222,292/1,562,875,243*100 = 71.9%	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,	There was no evidence that Kasese LG carried out Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening for the DDEG-funded project for the previous FY. The project was the construction of the administration block.	0
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or else 0		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	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),	There was no evidence that Kasese LG carried out environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) prior to the commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),	0
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

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

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The list of LG audit opinions for FY 2022/23 released by OAG confirms that LG's financial statements for FY 2022/23 was unqualified.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of recommendations in the Auditor General's Report for FY2021/22 after 28 February 2023.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>VIDE: CR: 103/1: Responses to issues raised in the Auditor General's Report for Kasese District Local Government for the Year Ended 30 June 2022 dated 20 March 2023. Received MoFPED Registry 22 March 2023.</p>	0

7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY  Maximum Score 4	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,  score 4 or else 0.	The LG did not provide evidence to ascertain whether the Annual Performance Contract for FY2023/24 was submitted to the PS/ST before the 31 August 2023. In addition, the review of the list of Performance Contract submissions from MoFPED revealed no submissions from the LG.	0
8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year  maximum score 4 or else 0	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,  score 4 or else 0.	The LG submitted the Annual Performance Report for FY2022/23 to MoFPED before the 31 August 2023.  <b>Evidence</b>  Submitted on 23 August 2023.	4
9	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  Maximum score is 4	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,  score 4 or else 0.	The LG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPR) for FY2022/23 to MoFPED before 31 August 2023  <b>Evidence</b>  Q1 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 10 January 2023.  Q2 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 10 February 2023.  Q3 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 12 May 2023.  Q4 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 23 August 2023.	4

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------

**Human Resource Management and Development**

1				<b>0</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

New\_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.

a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0

Kasese DLG does not have a substantive District Education Officer as the former office holder retired on 27th September 2023. Mr Thabugha Bwambale Ernest is the caretaker DEO as evidenced by letter of assignment of duties of District Education Officer dated 3rd October 2023. At the time of assessment, the Ag. DEO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023 .

*The Maximum Score of 70*

1				<b>40</b>
---	--	--	--	-----------

New\_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.

b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.

Kasese DLG has five inspectors of schools as found in post as shown here under.

**Principal Inspector of Schools** - Mr. Thabugha Bwambale Ernest as evidenced by the letter of appointment on promotion as Principal Inspector of Schools dated 31st July 2012 referenced under Min No. 61/2012. Kasese DLG MoPS(2017) approved and adopted staff structure provides for a Principal Inspector of Schools. At the time of assessment, the PIS was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.

**Inspectors of schools(5No.)**

1. Kabinga Moses, appointed 6th June 2023 vide Min.No. 80/2023, no appraisal information provided.

2. Muhindo Rosemary appointed 6th June 2023 vide Min.No. 79/2023, no appraisal information provided.

3. Kule Erisania, appointed 6th June 2023 vide Min.No. 61/2023, appraised 31st July 2023.

4. Masika Harriet, appointed 26th September 2013 vide Min.No. 199/2013, appraised 31st July 2023.

*The Maximum Score of 70*

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening was carried out for projects under Education;  Construction of a two-classroom block and latrine at Nyamutswa primary school was screened on 11/02/2023 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 13,000,000 dated 20/02/2023.  Construction of a two-classroom block at Kibuga primary school was screened on 10/02/2023 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 1,300,000 dated 20/02/2023.  Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero was screened on 20/04/2023 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 9,000,000 dated 21/04/2022	<b>15</b>
	The Maximum score is 30			

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	The projects implemented under education did not qualify to under go an ESIA upon being screened The sampled projects included;  Construction of a two-classroom block and latrine at Nyamutswa primary school was screened on 11/02/2023 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 13,000,000 dated 20/02/2023.  Construction of a two-classroom block at Kibuga primary school was screened on 10/02/2023 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 1,300,000 dated 20/02/2023.  Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kahendero was screened on 20/04/2023 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 9,000,000 dated 21/04/2022	<b>15</b>
	The Maximum score is 30			

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kasese DLG does not have a substantive District Health Officer.The DHO retired in July 2023. The LG has an acting DHO Mr. Bagonza Stephen the substantive ADHO-E. At the time of assessment, the Ag. DHO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 29th June 2023.</p>	<b>0</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Assistant District Health Officer-maternal, Child Health and Nursing- Ms.Muhindo Loy Sekalombi, appointed 7th May 2019 vide Min No. 81/2019. At the time of assessment, the ADHO/EH was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Assistant District Health Officer-(Environmental)- Mr. Bagonza Stephen, appointed 2nd December 2021 vide Min No. 163/2021.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the ADHO/EH was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 29th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Principal Health Inspector – Mr Mutoro Julius as evidenced by letter of appointment on accelerated promotion to the position dated 1st March 2021 referenced under Min No. DSC/56/2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>



1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Senior Health Educator- Ms. Mbambu Agnes as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 2nd December 2021 referenced under DSC Min No. 167/2021. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Bio Statistician - Mr. Thembo Coastatine as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 5th May 2017 referenced under DSC Min No. 30/2017. At the time of assessment, the BS was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Cold Chain Technician – Bwambale Jowan, as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 29th April 2019 referenced under DSC Min No. 72/2019.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the BS was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.
- j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

## **Environment and Social Requirements**

- 2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)
- If the LG carried out:
- a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.
- 15
- There was evidence that environmental social and climate change screening was carried out for health projects for the previous FY. The sampled projects included;
- Construction of a maternity ward at Nyabirongo HCIII was screened on 18/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 35,500,000 dated 18/08/2022
- Construction of a theatre at Bugoye HCIII was screened on 18/08/2022 with a costed EMP of UGX:12,000,000 dated 18/08/2022.
- Construction of a maternity ward at Buhuhira HCIII was screened on 18/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 35,000,000 dated 18/08/2022.
- Maximum score is 30
- 2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)
- b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.
- 15
- The projects under Health for the previous FY upon being screened did not qualify to undergo an ESIA. The sampled projects included;
- Construction of a maternity ward at Nyabirongo HCIII was screened on 18/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 35,500,000 dated 18/08/2022
- Construction of a theatre at Bugoye HCIII was screened on 18/08/2022 with a costed EMP of UGX:12,000,000 dated 18/08/2022.
- Construction of a maternity ward at Buhuhira HCIII was screened on 18/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 35,000,000 dated 18/08/2022.
- Maximum score is 30

**Micro-scale Irrigation  
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>Kasese DLG has a substantive Senior Agriculture Engineer (Water for Production) - Mr. Agaba Benson evidenced by letter of appointment dated 3rd November 2021 referenced under Min No. 132/2021. At the time of assessment, the AE was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p>	<b>70</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p><i>score 30 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>Kasese LG carried out screening for environment social and climate change, however, the costed ESMPs were not developed as applicable.</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation demonstration site for Sam Mutswanga in Kighete village was screened on 10/10/2022. However, the ESMP was not prepared and costed.</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation demonstration site for Sanyu Esther in Kivengenyi village was screened on 10/10/2022. However, the ESMP was not prepared and costed.</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation demonstration site for Patrick Bengehania in Kisongola village was screened on 10/10/2022. However, the ESMP was not prepared and costed.</p> <p>Micro-scale irrigation demonstration site for Augustine Musubibaho in Rwehingo village was screened on 10/10/2022. However, the ESMP was not prepared and costed.</p>	<b>0</b>

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Kasese DLG has a substantive Civil Engineer (Water) - Mr. Kalende George Kells as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 31st July 2012 referenced under Min No. 65/2012.  At the time of assessment, the Officer was found no to have been duly appraised as the officer was on interdiction during the period under review.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Kasese DLG has a substantive Assistant Water Officer (Mobilization) - Ms. Kobusingye Kate, Community Development Officer as evidenced by letter of attachment to the District Water Department dated 23rd June 2011. At the time of assessment, the Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kasese DLG has a substantive Borehole Maintenance Technician - Mr. Rubale Solace as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 31st May 2018 referenced under Min No. 159/2018. At the time of assessment, the BMO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 12th July 2023.	<b>10</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Kasese DLG has a substantive District Natural Resources Officer – Katswera Joseph as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion dated 25th August 2008 referenced under Min No. 48/2008. At the time of assessment, the DNRO was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 10th July 2023.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kasese DLG has a substantive Environment Officer - Ms. Bwenge Judith evidenced by letter of appointment dated 26th September 2013 referenced under Min No. 211/2013. At the time of assessment, the Environment Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.	<b>10</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Kasese DLG has a substantive Senior Forestry Officer - Mr. Bwambale William Wilberforce as evidenced by letter of appointment dated 10th December 2007 referenced under Min No. 23/2007. At the time of assessment, the Forestry Officer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated.	<b>10</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Kasese LG did not conduct Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening for water infrastructure projects for the previous FY. Examples of projected implemented underwater include;  Construction of Makongothe GFS in Ibanda- Kyanja.  Construction of Bitere GFS phase 3.  Construction and extension of Buthale water stream source in Mahango sub country.  Construction of Buhunga GFS Phase III	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	Kasese LG did not conduct Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening for water infrastructure projects to propose mitigation measures for the previous FY. Examples of projected implemented underwater include;  Construction of Makongothe GFS in Ibanda- Kyanja.  Construction of Bitere GFS phase 3.  Construction and extension of Buthale water stream source in Mahango sub country.  Construction of Buhunga GFS Phase III	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	The LG did not have abstraction permits despite implementation of piped water schemes in the period under review.	0