



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Bugiri Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 795)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	89%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	100%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	70%
Educational Performance Measures	79%
Health Performance Measures	93%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting  
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	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<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 LG implemented the project; Supply and installation of 13 solar street lights in Bugiri Municipal in Western division with a Contract Price of Ugx 64,504,700.</p> <p>A visit to the project 7th November, 2023 found the lights functional.</p>	<b>4</b>
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance  Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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>According to the LLG Performance Assessment Variance 2022 - 2023 from OPAMS, Bugiri Municipality scored 75% in 2022 and 74% in 2023 which presented a decline of 1%</p>	<b>0</b>
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance  Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 implemented the project; Supply and installation of 13 solar street lights in Bugiri Municipal in Western division.</p> <p>The project was completed 100% (1/1 X 100) as per the ABPR of the previous FY.</p>	<b>3</b>
3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Municipal Council budgeted and spent Ugx 64,504,700 to the supply and installation of 13 solar street lights in Bugiri Municipal in Western division. A review of the DDEG investment menu found the project eligible.</p>	<b>2</b>

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	The variation in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled DDEG projects were as follows;  Supply and installation of 13 solar street lights in Bugiri Municipal in Western division with a Contract Price of Ugx 64,504,700 against Budget of Ugx 65,880,750 implying that the variation was -2.08%	2
---	--	--	---	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,  score 2 or else score 0	The two divisions of Western and Eastern were visited and confirmed that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kaguna Juliet was working in Eastern division as Town Agent</li> <li>• Nsubuga Henry was the Senior Assistant Town Clerk of Eastern as indicated both in the staff lists obtained at the MC and at the division.</li> <li>• Kwagala Hellen was the Senior Assistant Town Clerk of western division and was present as of 7th November, 2023.</li> <li>• Kuluba Enock, Community Development Officer was working as and deployed in Western division.</li> </ul>	2
4	Accuracy of reported information  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: <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>	The DDEG project that was; the Supply and installation of 13 solar street lights in Bugiri Municipal in Western division was in place as reported in the ABPR FY 2022/2023 presented by the Municipal Planner .  The assessment conducted a verification tour and found the solar lights working on 7th November, 2023.	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 scores obtained from the two Divisions in the Municipality internal assessment and from the LLG IVA, two LLGs scored outside the performance range of +/- 10 which implied that the assessment was not credible. The comparative analyzed data was as presented below;</p> <table border="0" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: center;"><b><u>DLG IVA</u></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Western Div</td> <td style="text-align: center;">72</td> <td style="text-align: center;">84</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eeastern Div</td> <td style="text-align: center;">76</td> <td style="text-align: center;">51</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		<b><u>DLG IVA</u></b>			Western Div	72	84		Eeastern Div	76	51		0
	<b><u>DLG IVA</u></b>															
Western Div	72	84														
Eeastern Div	76	51														

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>The PIP were designed by the MC for the two LLGs of Eastern and Western division. The areas that registered low performance in the previous assessment results included ; low staffing levels in the LLGs in terms of filling critical positions, poor record keeping late submission of online PBS reports due to poor network performance management and inadequate space to accommodate all the staff.</p>	2
---	--	---	--	---

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>There was no evidence availed to show that the plans were implemented.</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>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence availed to the assessor at the time of assessment.</p> <p>The MC had not submitted the staffing requirements because of the current ban on recruitment by MoPS.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence of analysis reports were on file for both LLGs and those at the headquarters.</p> <p>Reference was taken from Duty Analysis Attendance Report for the month of January 2023, Dated 5th April 2023 which was prepared by the Senior HRO. According to the duty analysis report for the month of January 2023 revealed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Azam Mulondo (planner) attended for 10 days and was absent for 7 days thus scoring 59%;</li> <li>● Kuluba Enock, (CDO) attended for 15 days was absent for 7 days and also reported late to work for 4 days which thus scoring 68%;</li> <li>● Kisaakye Esther (Senior Assistant Secretary) attended for 21 days and was absent for 1 day thus scoring 95%.</li> </ul>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence showed that the Heads of departments were appraised by the Town Clerk. However, some of the HODs were appraised past the month of June 30th which was late in reference to MoPS CSI ;</p> <p>The Town Clerk was away from office for other official duties so he could not sign the performance reports by 30th June.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mugala Martha, Principal CDO (Community Service) was appraised on 30/06/2023</li> <li>• Mulondo Azam, Ag. Senior Planner was appraised on 20/7/2023.</li> <li>• Were Isiaah, Senior Education Officer was appraised on 11/07/2023.</li> <li>• Mugoya Samson Elliot, Ag. Municipal Engineer was appraised on 30/06/2023</li> <li>• Baisi Stephen, Principal Treasurer was appraised on 6/06/2023.</li> <li>• Wasige Siraji, senior Environment Officer was appraised on 30/06/2023.</li> <li>• Baligeya Jude, Principal Commercial Officer was not appraised because he was on interdiction at the time of assessment.</li> </ul>	0

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

Bugiri MC implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines.

Committee members were:

- Mr. Baligeya Jude, (chairperson)
- Mr. Wasige Siraji, (Member)
- Dr. Zzimbe Richard, (Member)
- Ms. Biryeri Proscovia, (Member)
- Ms. Namakula Maimuna, (Member)
- Mr. Tamuzzade Andrew, (Member)

Evidence was obtained from the rewards and sanctions committee meeting that sat on 23rd November, 2022 under MC/RAS/MIN NO. 04/2022/23. In the meeting, the committee discussed the previous minutes and recommended the lifting of interdiction of the Municipal Education Officer (Were Isaiah) and also recommended that the two officers ( Babirye Alice/ Education Officer; Nabawanuka Culusum/ Agricultural Officer be deleted from the government payroll with immediate effect.

In conclusion, the interdiction Municipal Education Officer (Were Isaiah) was lifted, the two vacancies were declared to DSC for replacement.

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

Bugiri MC established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress on 24/07/2019 and it was functional. Members on the committee included;

- Mr. Azam Mulondo, Ag. Deputy Town Clerk, (chairperson)
- Mr. Wambwire Herbert, Senior Human Resource Officer, (Secretary)
- Mr. Were Isaiah, Senior Education Officer, (Member)
- Dr. Zzimbe Richard, Medical Officer, (Member)
- Mr. Stephen Baisi, Principal Treasurer, (Member)
- Mr. Stephen Samanya, Education Assistant, (Member)
- Mr. Stephen Samanya, Education Assistant, (Member)
- Ms. Naigaga Zahara, Senior Education Assistant, (Member)
- Ms. Babirye Sofi, Enrolled Nurse, (Member)
- Ms. Nabirye Leira, Clinical Officer, (Member)
- Mr. Nkanja Joshua, Assistant Education Officer, (Member)
- Ms. Martha Mugala, Principal CDO, (Member)

Evidence regarding its functionality was obtained from the Minutes of the report dated 5th July, 2022 held in the boardroom at 9:00am under MIN.3/07/2022 where the focal person for the complaints stated that there were no registered complaints during the quarter.

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.

A list of staff that were recruited in FY 2022/23 dated 30/10/2023 revealed that only one (1) person out of (14) had accessed the salary payroll in a period of not more than two months.

Also noted was that 93% of Staff assessed the salary payroll after two months for instance;

1. Ayub Masingano, (Assistant Records Officer) IPPS No. 1794791, assumed duty on 9/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

2. Robert Kanalo, (Physical Planner) IPPS No. 1794793, assumed duty on 9/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

3. Fred Bunga, (Health Inspector) IPPS No. 1794795, assumed duty on 9/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

4. Johnson Bwamiki, (Health Educator) IPPS No. 1794797, assumed duty on 9/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

5. Moses Mugema, (Agricultural Officer) IPPS No. 1794798, assumed duty on 9/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

6. Denis Mukwaya, (Senior Assistant Accountant), IPPS No. 1794799, assumed duty on 9/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

7. Noar Kwanyai, (Librarian) IPPS No. 1794802, assumed duty on 9/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

8. Hellen Akoth, (Education Assistant) IPPS No. 1794958, assumed duty on 5/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

9. Hairati Nabandha, (Education Assistant) IPPS No. 1794945, assumed duty on 24/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

10. Awazi Mugonvu, (Education Assistant), IPPS No. 1035429, assumed duty on 10/5/2023 and accessed in September 2023.

The delayed access was a result of migration from IPPS to HCM.



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.	Bugiri MC had two staff members that retired in FY 2022/23. It was established that only one accessed payroll pension and the other one hadn't as indicated below;  1. Buyinza Musisi Michael, (Assistant Education Officer) IPPS No. 289028, retired on 9/5/2022 and accessed on 18/10/2022.  2. Mugoya Muzamilu Kayongo, Education (Assistant) IPPS No. 701710, retired on 24/12/2022 and accessed on 15/03/2023.	<b>0</b>
---	---	--	---	----------

**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	The Municipality made direct transfers to the two Divisions in two instalments during 2nd Qrt on 24/10/2022 shs.26,552,589 and in 3rd Qrt on 14/1/2023 Ushs.53,158,343.	<b>2</b>
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	The LG made timely warranting of DDEG transfers i.e. within 5 working days from the date of receipt of releases. The first release received on 18/10/2022 and warranting made on 24/10/2022 (within 4 working days). The second release received on 13/1/2023 and warranting made on 14/1/2023 (within 1 day).	<b>2</b>
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:  Score 2 or else score 0	The Council did timely invoicing/communicated all DDEG transfers for FY 2022/2023 to the LLGs as follows: The first release received on 18/10/2022 and invoiced on 21/10/2022 (within 3 working days). The second release received on 13/1/2023 and invoiced on 16/1/2023 (within 3 days).	<b>2</b>

11	Routine oversight and monitoring  Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:  Score 2 or else score 0	The Municipality carried out mentoring exercise of the Divisions on a quarterly basis by the planner who produced the reports as follows: 1st Qrt mentored them on development planning and a report was produced on 15/8/2022, 2nd Qrt on budgeting process and a report was generated on 1/11/2022, 3rd Qrt mentoring was on preparation for performance assessment and the report came out on 3/2/2023 and finally the 4th Qrt report was produced on 22/5/2023 on DDEG Guidelines, development planning and local revenue management	2
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 Municipal Council took the monitoring visit reports to TPC for discussion who made recommendations for corrective actions. For example, 1st Qrt report was discussed on 26/8/2022 under Min. 5 TPC 2022/08 and made recommendations such as i. Divisions to increase on their budgets for garbage collection, ii. Health Assistants to be involved in garbage management and supervision. The 2nd Qrt report was discussed on 25/11/2022 under Min. 6/TPC 2022/11:6 on solar street lighting, etc.	2
<b>Investment Management</b>				
12	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  <b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b>	The Municipality maintained a manual assets registers for Land and Buildings, Motor vehicles and Heavy Plants and Office Equipment. Each category had own details. For example, Land and Buildings had: Location, Land Title, Description, Purchase price or Value and Remarks.	2
12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively  Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:  Score 1 or else 0	The Council had a board of survey report for FY2021/2022 which was used to make asset management decisions. Examples included: 1. Lobbying for funds from MoFPED for construction of an office block. It was reported that efforts had commenced. 2. Completion of a staff house at Bugiri HC III. The works had been completed as per the completion certificate for shs.116,997,000 dated 20/11/2022. School desks should be procured. By assessment date 24 desks had been procured and given to Busanzi P/S, 16 desks for Walumerere P/S and 14 desks for Bugubo P/S.	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The Municipality had a functional physical Planning committee which met every quarter of FY2022/2023, produced minutes and submitted them to MoLHUD as follows: In 1st Qrt. Four meeting were held and minutes produced and submitted on 3/10/2022 and acknowledged on 23/11/2022. In Qrt 2 one meeting was held and minutes produced and submitted on 14/12/2022. In 3rd Qrt two meeting were held and minutes were submitted 27/6/2023 and in 4th Qrt three meetings were held and minutes were submitted on 27/6/2023.</p>	2
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 Municipality conducted a desk appraisal for three projects in the budget on 28th July, 2022. The exercise was done by the Planner, Engineer, Environment Officer, PCDO, and Medical Officer who endorsed the forms. The three projects were i. Solar street lighting ii. Construction of a staff house at Bugiri HC III iii. Construction of a 2-classroom block at Bugubo-Butambula.</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 Municipality through Planner, Environ. Officer, Engineer, PCDO, conducted the field appraisal on 28th July, 2023 of three projects of FY 2022/2023 namely 1. Construction of a staff house at Bugiri HC III 2. Solar Street lighting 3. Construction of a 2-classroom block at Bugubo-Butambula.</p> <p>For all the three projects technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability and whether the projects addressed community needs were ticked "yes" and overall the projects were recommended for implementation.</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 Council developed project profiles with costing Examples are: i. Construction of a 3-classroom block at Waluwerere P/S at shs.80,000,000. ii. Procurement and installation solar street lights at shs.40,000,000 iii. Laboratory construction at Bugiri HC III at shs.74,000,000.</p> <p>The profiles were discussed by the TPC in their meeting of 27/1/2023 under Min. 5 TPC 2023/01 as required by Planning and DDEG Guidelines</p>	<b>1</b>
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>No documentary evidence provided on the screening of project of the current FY2023/24</p>	<b>0</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the DDEG infrastructure projects were incorporated in the current FY. The unpagged procurement plan was approved on 31st July 2023 by Town Clerk Kasajja Jamiru Kaiiru. The project incorporated included;</p> <p>1. Procurement of installation of solar panel street lights at Ugx 26,000,000 .</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DDEG projects in the financial year were still under prequalification</p>	<b>0</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a project implementation team for all the Municipal Council sector projects appointed on 1st July 2022 by CAO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Engineer as Contract manager</li> <li>• Senior Environment officer</li> <li>• Municipal Planner</li> <li>• Procurement officer</li> <li>• Procurement officer</li> <li>• Municipal Education officer</li> <li>• Municipal Health officer</li> </ul> <p>The team did not meet the requirements of a complete team because it lacked a CDO and labour officer..</p>	<b>0</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence that DDEG infrastructure projects indicated adhered to standards.</p> <p>The lights were fully lighting as observed in the evening indicating the systems were in accordance to the required specifications as per the Engineer's certificate of 13th March 2023 prior to the payment. .</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of supervision by the relevant technical officers prior to verification of works;</p> <p>A progress report on the 20th December 2022 indicated 8 lights confirmed functional and fully lighting at night. The report also indicated conformity of parts of the systems in accordance to the specification</p> <p>A progress report on 28th November 2022, works were at the initial stages which included; setting out, excavation of pits and casting the concrete mass.</p>	<b>2</b>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	Supply and installation of 13 solar street lights in Bugiri Municipal Council in western division  The contractor M/s Jack Manufacturers and Distributors Ltd raised a payment claim of Ugx 24,809,500 on 4th March 2023  An interim certificate signed on 13th March 2023 by Municipal Engineer, Senior internal auditor, Senior Assistant Town clerk and the treasurer of UGX 24,809,500 and the  The payment was affected on 6th June, 2023 of UGX 13,288,136 and on the 7th March 2023 of UGX 10,259,864.  However, the payment process was not proper in terms of certification and the vouchers.	<b>0</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	From the sampled projects, there was evidence that LG had complete procurement files with all records as per PPDA law. Example of projects included;  Supply and installation of 13 solar street lights in Bugiri Municipal Council; Procurement ref no. BMC702/wrks/22-23/00001  The works contract signed on 14th July 2022 with M/s Jack Manufacturers and Distributors Ltd,  The evaluation report approved by the contracts committee on 23rd September 2022,  Minutes of contracts committee no. MIN (ii)/23/September/2023.	<b>1</b>

**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>There was evidence of designating Ms. Mugala Martha- Principal CDO as the grievance Focal person. Through a letter dated 12th/07/2021 signed by the Ag. Town Clerk, the MC designated her as the grievance handling officer. The Ag. Town Clerk further appointed the GRC member on 12th/07/2021 and the members were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Kwagala Hellen - Ag. Deputy town clerk - chairperson GRC</li> <li>2.Mugala Martha- Principal CDO/ secretary GRC</li> <li>3.Kagere Ibrahim -Ag. labour officer</li> <li>4. Were Isaiah - MEO</li> <li>5. Dr. Zzimbe Richard</li> <li>6.Mukwaya David Kyakulga - Lands management officer</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>
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 MC had a specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included a centralised complaints log which was opened on 20th/12/2022 for the FY 2022/23 under review.</p> <p>The LG had GRM titled “Bugiri MC grievance redress handling procedure” and had the contact of grievance focal person</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>The LG had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms at the district notice board at the main block and at the compound notice board and had grievance redress mechanisms titled “Bugiri MC grievance redress handling procedure” and had the contact of the grievance focal person at the time of assessment. And contained the grievance referral path.</p>	<b>1</b>

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that environment, social and climate change had been integrated into the DP/III, Annual work plans and budgets. For example;  Work plan for FY 2022/23 under program 6 Natural resource environment climate change  Land use compliance  Natural resource management  DP/III page 65  Enforce environmental laws and regulation promote the use of energy-saving technologies  Awareness creation and sustainable use of the environment  developing wetlands management action plan	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	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  score 1 or else 0	DDEG guidelines were disseminated during the TPC meeting held on 28th/10/2022 under minute 04/TPC/2022/10 dissemination of DDEG guidelines by the planner the minutes were prepared by planner and approved by Town Clerk and in attendance were the Senior Asst. Town clerks from different divisions,  Kwagala Hellen- Senior Asst. Town clerk western division  Wabwire Herbert - Ag. Senior Asst. Town clerk Eastern division	1
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	The LG had projects financed by DDEG other than health, education, water and irrigation. The project was;  The installation of street solar light along Grant street in western division but there was no evidence provided on incorporation of the ESMP into the designs. BoQs, bidding and contractual documents because of miscommunication from the previous town clerk as explained by the Environment officer.	0



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 with additional cost for addressing impacts from climate change at the MLG	<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	The LG implemented only one project under DDEG which was Installation of street solar light along grant street in western division which did not require land documents.	<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	Monitoring report for the installation of street solar lights along grant street with recommendations hoarding off the site, placing signage prepared by the Senior environment officer and Principal CDO on 15th/11/2022 and 31st/01/2023.	<b>1</b>
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 a signed E&S compliance certificate and payment records for the project under DDEG as indicated below; payment certificate issued for the installation of street solar lights along grant street Eastern division, the senior Environment Officer and Principal CDO on 4th/03/2023 endorsed the works and payment was made on 15/03/2023.  Contractor: M/S Jack manufacturers & distributor's Ltd under procurement Ref. No. BMC702/WRKS/22-23/00001	<b>1</b>

## Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Council made bank reconciliation and were up to date at the time of this assessment. As illustrated in these examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Fund A/c reconciled at shs.7,740 on 30/6/2023 and at shs.39,550 on 30/9/2023.</li> <li>• UWEP Recovery A/c reconciled at shs.157,950 on 30/6/2023 and at shs.60,299 on 30/9/2023.</li> <li>• YLP Recovery reconciled at shs.10,748 on 30/6/2023 and at shs.775,537 on 30/9/2023.</li> </ul>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>For FY 2022/2023, the Municipal Council produced all the four quarterly internal audit reports as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st Qrt report produced on 17/10/2022,</li> <li>• 2nd Qrt report on 16/1/2023,</li> <li>• 3rd Qrt report on 17/4/2023 and</li> <li>• 4th Qrt report produced on 17/7/2023</li> </ul>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG provided information to both the Council and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings, usually under section headed "Review of the previous Audit." The Q1, Q3, Q4 audit reports were reportedly taken by the Mayor and Internal Auditor General respectively, hence did not have stamped copies indicating receipt, neither did they avail submission letters.</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>It was reported that during the whole of FY 2022/2023, the District PAC did not handle any internal audit reports of the Municipality.</p>	0

## Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The budgeted collections of local revenue was shs.271,118,000 as noted in the approved budget for FY 2022/2023. The actual collections during the period was shs.105,479,500 as noted on page 8 of the draft financial statements of the same FY. This was 39.9% performance far below the expected range of +/-10%.</p>	0
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The actual collections of OSR for FY 2021/2022 was Ushs.114,266,325 as noted on page 6 of the audited financial statements of the period. On the other hand, actual collections for FY 2022/2023 was Ushs.105,479,825. This was a decrease of Ushs.8,786,825.</p>	0
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The shareable local revenue during FY 2022/2023 was Ushs.206,065,323 (shs.105,479,500 + shs.100,585,823 paid to LLGs). The mandatory LLGs share during the period is 100,585,823/206,065,323 giving a percentage of 48.8% less than 50% set in the law.</p>	0

### Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts during FY 2022/2023 were published on the notice board in front of the main building of Council. Some of the awarded contract are: 1. Construction and fixing of gates at the Bus Park awarded to M/s Yofisa Investments Ltd at Ushs.2,950,000. 2. Supply and installation of 13 solar street lights awarded to Jack Manufacturers at Ushs.64,504,700</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 Municipality performance results for year 2022 were published on a notice board of the Administration Building. It showed marks scored in different areas. For example, Crosscutting Measures 64%, Education Measures 82%, Health Measures 45%. The Council was scored 19th overall.</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>During FY 2022/2023, the Municipal Council conducted discussions with the communities on different topics. Minutes of these barazas were recorded and availed to the team for review. On 15/12/2022 in the Bus Park they handle a topic on Parish Development Model. It was noted that the program had not yet taken off in Council. They agreed way forward. On 15/1/2023 at the Executive Hotel the community and UNRA Jinja discussed drainage issues on Maraba Highway. On 18/4/2023 at the Bus Park they discussed the establishment of a Central Market in Council.</p>	<b>1</b>
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>Although by this assessment date, adverts during FY 2022/2023 for i. tax rates, ii. Collection procedures and iii. Procedures for appears had been removed from public notice board, the old documents containing the information were availed to the team for review. They were endorsed by the Principal Treasurer on 29/6/2022.</p>	<b>1</b>
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 Municipality informed the AT that during FY 2022/2023 there were no cases of alleged fraud and corruption that needed the attention of IGG. For this reason there was no report prepared for this office.</p>	<b>1</b>

**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>School Year 2020</p> <p>The Total No. of Candidates registered was 512</p> <p>Total absentees was 5</p> <p>Total Grades (I, II &amp; III) = (34+277+110) = 421</p> <p>Pass rate = <math>421 \times 100</math></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><math>507 = 83\%</math></p> <p>School Year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of Candidates registered was 983</p> <p>Total absentees were 19</p> <p>Total Grades (I, II &amp; III) = (151 + 523 + 154) = 828</p> <p>Pass rate = <math>828 \times 100</math></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><math>964 = 862\%</math></p> <p>The PLE pass rate increased by 3% (from 83% to 86%)</p>	<b>2</b>

1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>School Year 2020</p> <p>Total registered candidates = 191 Absentees = 02</p> <p>Total Grades (I, II &amp; III) = (6+40+47) =93</p> <p>Pass rate = <math>93 \times 100</math> 189 =49.2%</p> <p>School Year 2022</p> <p>Total registered Candidates = 140</p> <p>Total absentees were 4</p> <p>Total Grades (I, II &amp; III) = (12+37+38) = 87</p> <p>Pass rate = <math>87 \times 100</math> 136 = 64%</p> <p>The UCE pass rate increased by 14.8% (from 49.2% to 64%)</p>	3
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>		2	
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>There was an improvement of 15% from 65% obtained in 2022 to 80% obtained in 2023 according to the Comparing LLG scores for 2022 &amp; 2023 of the LLG Performance Assessment Variance 2022 - 2023 obtained from OPAMS</p>	2
<p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5%, score 1</li> <li>• No Improvement, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>		2	
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The LG spent the SFG obtained last FY on eligible activities which included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 2-classroom block at Bugubo-Butambula P/S at Ugx 78,968,500</li> <li>• construction and installation of Rainwater PVC 10,000 litre tank at Bugubo-Butambula P/S at 15,900,000</li> </ul>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education Sector Construction projects implemented during the FY 2022/2023 For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The construction of a 2-classroom block at Buguba-Batambula Primary school was by M/s Reca Nero Logistics Ltd. The Contractor requisitioned Ugx 25,629,000 on 18th May, 2023. The payment certificate No 1 was drawn by the Engineer on 29th May, 2023 and was verified and Certified by the Environment Officer and CDO 7th June, 2023 and payment of Ugx. 15,555,613 on 28th June, 2023 via EFT Voucher 6436939.</li> <li>2. The construction and installation of a 10,000 litres rainwater harvesting PVC tank at Buguba-Butambula P/S by M/s Muzela General Enterprises Uganda Ltd. The Contractor made a claim of Ugx 15,559,520 on 5th June, 2023. The interim certificate 1 was drawn on 6th June, 2023 by the Engineer and was verified and certified by the Environment Officer and CDO on 7th June, 2023 before payment of Ugx 13th June, 2023 via EFT voucher No. 6442150.</li> </ol>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence from the education project investments indicates the following variations;</p> <p>The construction of a 2-classroom block at Bugubo-Butambula, primary school: the Contract sum was Ugx78,968,500 against the Engineer's estimate of UGX 80,420,000.</p> <p>The Variation was UGX -1,451,500 and % Variation=-1.80%</p> <p>The construction of a 10,000 litre PVC water tank at Bugubo-Butambula primary school; the Contract price was UGX 15,900,000 against the Engineer's estimates of UGX 15,900,000 hence a variation of UGX -0. Therefore the % Variation =0%</p>	2

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	The LG did not have a SEED secondary school infrastructure project implemented during the past FY.	2
	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>		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	The LG Teacher’s staff ceiling was 92 and the UPE teachers in post were 89 in 05 registered Primary schools.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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>	$\frac{89}{92} \times 100 = 97\%$	
			This implied that the LG was 97% compliant with the MoES staffing guidelines of one teacher per class.	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	The LG Consolidated Assets registers for Bugiri MLG for FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023 that captured assets for the 5 UPE and 01 USE schools plus one tertiary institution was in place signed by the MEO on 6th February, 2023.	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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>	A review of the Assets of the two Years indicated; In FY 2021/2022	
			<b>Primary Assets were</b>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Classrooms were 1131</li> <li>2. Latrine stances were 1820</li> <li>3. Desks were 1519, and</li> <li>4. Staff houses were 65</li> </ol>	
			<b>Secondary Assets were;</b>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Classrooms were 56</li> <li>2. Latrine stances were 55</li> <li>3. Desks were 1531</li> <li>4. Laboratories were 8, and</li> <li>5. Staff houses were 03</li> </ol>	
			In FY 2022/2023	
			<b>Primary Assets were</b>	
			1. Classrooms were 1165	



2. Latrine stances were 1726
3. Desks were 20030, and
4. Staff houses were 65

**Secondary Assets were;**

1. Classrooms were 62
2. Latrine stances were 67
3. Desks were 1671
4. Laboratories were 10, and
6. Staff houses were 06

**Tertiary institution**

1. Classrooms were 09
2. Latrine stances were 07
3. Desks were 250, and
4. Staff houses were 02

This implies that 100% met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format.

The assessment further verified this from the 3 sampled Primary Schools of; Busanzi, Hindocha and Waluwerere where assets registers tallied with those at the DEO's office.

Therefore, the percentage of Schools that met DES guidelines was;

Total schools that complied X 100

Total (UPE, USE & Tertiary)

07 X 100

07

= 100%

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.

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

The LG accurately reported on teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving according to the Staff list/deployment list 2023 duly signed by the DEO on 23rd February, 2023 and date-stamped 6th June, 2023 had 89 teachers who were serving in the 05 UPE Schools..

From the three (3) visited Schools of; Hindocha (Urban), Waluwerere (Semi urban) and Busanzi (rural) it was verified from the teacher's duty rosta, the displayed teachers' list and the teacher's daily attendance books the actual presence of the teachers as per the deployment list at the DEO's office.

At Hindocha P/S, the staff list that was posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office indicated that the Government teachers were 22 which was in tandem with the DEO's deployment list.

While at Waluwerere P/S, the staff list posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU teachers were 20 which number tallied with that on the DEO's deployment list.

At Busanzi P/S, the staff list posted on the wall of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU teachers were 16 which number was matching with that on the DEO's deployment list

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG Consolidated Assets register for FY 2022/2023 endorsed by the MEO on 6th February, 2013 accurately reported on the primary school assets. The assessment sampled three schools to verify the records in the consolidated asset register and the findings are presented below;

● In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Hindocha P/S had; classrooms 18, latrine stances 10, desks 376 and the School had no staff houses. The Performance Assessment field verification noted the same asset stocks as was reported by the Consolidated Assets register at the DEO's office.

● In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Waluwerere P/S had; 16 classrooms, 30 latrine stances, 320 desks and the had no staff houses and library. A comparison with the field findings observed the same stocks of assets

● In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Busanzi P/S had; 10 classrooms, 15 latrine stances, 272 desks and there were no staff houses and library. When the assessment team visited the school, similar assets logs were presented by the Headteacher.

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

There was evidence that the five Headteachers of the five primary schools under the jurisdiction of Bugiri MLG complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines.

The Headteachers prepared the annual budget performance reports which contained key sections like; highlights of school performance, a reconciled Cash flow statement, an annual budget and expenditure report and the assets registers.

The copies reviewed were duly signed by the Headteachers and SMC Chairpersons of the respective schools and were submitted to MEO.

From the sampled Schools; Hindocha, Waluwerere and Busanzi copies of Annual Budget Performance were presented to the assessor.

The reports were submitted to the MEO on the following dates

1. Busanzi P/S submitted on 2nd July 2023

2. Al Jama P/S submitted on 6th February, 2023

3. Waluwerere P/S submitted on 25th February, 2023

4. Bugubo-Butambula P/S submitted on 16th October, 2023, and

5. Hindocha P/S submitted on 01st July, 2023

Since all the Headteachers submitted beyond the set timelines of December 31st 2022, the LG was not compliant to the set timelines.

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>The LG presented evidence as proof of having helped the Schools to prepare and implement the SIPs.</p> <p>The report dated 22nd August, 2013 on Academic Seminar and Feedback, it was observed that Schools lacked SIPs that would guide development. The Municipal Inspector of Schools offered to support Heateachers develop and implement SIPs and indeed this was done as evidenced from the sampled schools.</p> <p>When the team visited Waluwerere P/S, the Headteacher in addition to stating that she was trained and was in possession of a self-developed copy of the SIP, the Headteacher Ms. Muwaganya Harriet had implemented the SIP in regard to the activity of paving the compound as was recommended by the Inspector Proscovia on 7th July, 2023. The school administration had removed the tree hedges and replaced them with constructed and paved surfaces.</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had collected and compiled OTIMS return forms for all the 05 Primary schools with a total enrolment of 5382 pupils and 1 secondary school with an enrolment of 1900 learners from the previous FY.</p> <p>The submission to MoES of the EMIS data was on 23rd January, 2023.</p> <p>The %age of schools was;</p> $6 \times 100$ $6$ $= 100\%$	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>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>The LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2022/2023 output 320157 subsection 211101 General staff salary for 92 Primary teachers was Ugx 727,027,000</p>	4
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>		
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>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p>	<p>From the three visited Schools of Hindocha (urban), Waluwerere (semi-urban) and Busanzi (rural), the names and number of teachers as displayed in the Headteachers' office matched with what was on the teacher's deployment list at the Muicipal Education Officer's office.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>For example, as per the Deployment list; Hindocha had 22 teachers, Waluwerere had 20 and Busanzi had 16 teachers including the Headteachers.</p>	
			<p>A school verification visit that reviewed the teacher's daily attendance book and the posted staff lists and duty allocation schedules observed that the numbers and names were similar with those on the deployment list at the DEO's desk</p>	
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p>	<p>The LG staff list for 2023 that contained 89 teachers was found posted on the LG Education notice board.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Headteachers at the visited schools of Hindocha, Waluwerere and Busanzi had also posted their respective staff lists for calendar year 2023 on the walls of the Headteacher's offices</p>	

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>All Primary School Head Teachers in Bugiri MC were appraised. The MC has 5 Primary Head Teachers and appraisal forms reviewed on staff files confirmed that appraisal was conducted as below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mugweri Michael (Busanzi P/s) was appraised by Wambwire Herbert (Ag. Assistant Town Clerk), on 1/02/2023.. This was late appraisal.</li> <li>• Gafunbye Phaebe (Bugubo Butambula p/s) was appraised by Namukuve Daphine (Senior Assistant Town Clerk) on 10/12/2022.,l</li> <li>• Gabite Assani (Al-Jama p/s) was appraised by Amaculang Juliet on (Sub county Chief) 8/02/2023.This was late appraisal</li> <li>• Muwaganya Harriet (Waluwerere p/s) was appraised by Namukuve Daphine (Senior Assistant Town Clerk)on 5/02/2023. This was late appraisal</li> <li>• Basan Muhamad Khan (Hindochoa p/s) was appraised by Kwagala Hellen (Senior Assistant Town Clerk) on 01/01/2023. This was late appraisal</li> </ul> <p>Only one HT (Gafunbye Phaebe (Bugubo Butambula P/S) was appraised within the set timelines and therefore the MLG was not compliant to the guidelines.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Bugiri MLG had only one Secondary Head teacher. There was no evidence availed regarding his appraisal for FY 2022/2023.</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>All the 3 staff in the Bugiri MLG Education Department were appraised however it was past 30th June which was not in line with guidelines of MoPS CSI. Details are as follows;</p> <p>1) Were Isiah (Senior Education officer) appraised by Kasajja Kaiiru (Town Clerk ) on 11/07/2023. This was late appraisal,</p> <p>2 ) Biryeri Proscovia (Inspector of Schools) was appraised on 1/07/2022 by Were Isiah (Municipal Education Officer) on 7/7/2023. This was late appraisal,</p> <p>3) Isabirye Ibrahim (Education Officer) was appraised by Senior Education Officer on 7/07/2023. This was late appraisal,</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	--	----------

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>A training plan for 2023 duly signed on 16th March, 2023 by the Municipal Inspector of Schools was presented for assessment.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually. If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessment noted from the DEO, that the LG was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrolment data. Therefore, there was no need of communicating corrections/revisions of school lists and enrolment data to the MoES</p>	<b>2</b>
---	---	--	--	----------



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. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Education Department made allocations of UGX 14,000,000 to monitoring and inspection secondary captured as output 000023 of the LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2022/2023. This was in line with sector guidelines (page 18 and 21 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of UGX 4,000,000 per LG</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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>The Municipality made timely (within 5 working days) warranting/verification of UPE Capitation for FY 2022/2023 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st Qtr Cash limits date was on 28th July, 2022 and warranting was on 2nd August, 2022</li> <li>• 2nd Qtr Cash limits date was on 14th October, 2022 and warranting was on 18th October, 2022</li> <li>• The 3rd Qtr Cash limits date was on 10th January, 2023 and warranting was on 13th January, 2023</li> <li>• The 4th Qtr Cash limits date was on 28th May, 2023 and warranting was on 2nd May, 2023.</li> </ul>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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>The Municipal Council invoiced and communicated the capitation releases to Schools on the following dates during FY 2022/2023;</p> <p>Warranting and communication about UPE grants by the LG was as follows:</p> <p>2nd Quarter warranting was done on 18th/10/2022 and communication by the MEO was on 24th/10/2022 i.e. 6 days.</p> <p>3rd Quarter warranting was on 13th/01/2023 and communication by the MEO was on 14th/01/2023 i.e. 1 day.</p> <p>4th Quarter warranting was on 02nd/05/2023 while communication by MEO was on 05th/05/2023 i.e. 3 days.</p> <p>Q2 was beyond the 3 days requirement hence score is 0.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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>For the FY 2022/2023, the Education prepared two inspection Plans dated; 8th September, 2022 and 13th March, 2023 that were signed by the MEO and MIS. The plan prioritized to inspect the Government Schools (5 Primary and 01 Secondary).</p> <p>The department held termly pre-inspection meetings to draw deployment schedules and plan for logistics for instance on 18th July, 2023 through minute Min. 2/T2/2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The reviewed inspection reports for the previous Financial Year revealed that 100% Government Schools were inspected on a termly basis.</p> <p>The term I, 2023 and term II, reports FY 2022/2023 dated 27th March, 2022 indicated that all the five primary and one Secondary Schools were inspected in addition to private schools for instance term II, 2023 inspection report dated 18th August, 2023 indicated that 20 schools had been inspected which included noth GoU and private schools.</p> <p>6 X 100</p> <p>6</p> <p>= 100%</p>	<b>2</b>

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The assessment team observed that inspection reports were discussed at both the school and the LG levels as per the examples below;

- On 26th January, 2023 under minute Min. 004/Jan/2023, dissemination of Inspection findings term III, 2022. The meeting observed that there was poor time management and called for remedial action
- On 9th May, 2023 vide Min. 006/May/2023, Inspection findings and rescheduled school programs. The meeting observed issues like gaps in effective utilization of TELA devices, EMIS data entered by Headteachers was inadequate and resolved for capacity building of Headteachers.

At the visited Schools, there was proof of discussion of inspection findings for instance; at Hindocha P/S the inspection feedback report dated 27th November, 2022 stated that inspector Biryeri Proscovia after inspecting the school she discussed the findings with Mr. Basan Muhamed Khan the HT and recommended that there was in to beautify the compound and indeed the assessment found when fruit trees had been planted. The feedback report was jointly signed by the Headteacher and the Inspector on 27th November, 2022.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The inspection feedback reports duly signed by the Inspectors of Schools and the School Headteachers were found at the three sampled and visited Schools as evidence of discussion and agreement on the inspection findings between the School administration and the inspectors for example on 27th November, 2022 inspector Biryeri Proscovia shared inspection findings Mr. Basan Muhamed Khan the Headteacher of Hindocha P/S. The findings were discussed and a feedback report was signed by the Inspector and the Head teacher.</p> <p>The MIS prepared and submitted all the inspection reports together with the Activity work plans and budgets to DES on various dates as per the examples below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term I, 2023 report was submitted on 25th July, 2023 and was received by Marion Adong.</li> <li>• Term II, 2023 was submitted on 10th July, 2023</li> </ul>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Education service delivery issues were being discussed by the General Planning Committee as per the example below;</p> <p>On 6th November, 2022 vide Min.04/GPC4//BMC/2022, there was discussion of monitoring reports for the Education and observations like bushy school compounds, damaged school buildings and latrines. It was resolved that the department intensifies inspections</p> <p>Through minute No. 04/GPC05/BMC/2022/2023 of the meeting held on 11th May, 2023, there was discussion of quarter 3 performance reports for the education.</p>	2

11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners  <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,  <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	There was evidence of mobilizing learners into Schools through the community engagements held by the LG and various stakeholders for example;  On 26th January, 2023 through Min.005/Jan/2023 of the Headteacher's beginning of term meeting attended by the MIS, there was discussion of strategies for retaining learners in school and it was concluded that Headteachers intensify on the sensitization of parents through radio talk shows, PTA and SMC meetings were tasked to enhance counselling and guidance and providing learners with life skills.	<b>2</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

**Investment Management**

12	Planning and budgeting for investments  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	The Consolidated School Asset register at the MEO's office indicated accurate reporting on the assets of 5 primary, 1 Secondary schools. The assets register had also captured assets for the 1 tertiary institution and assets that had been acquired in the previous Financial Year as indicated from the three sampled.  The assessment sampled three schools (Busanzi, Hindocha and Waluwerere) where assets registers tallied with those at the MEO's office) to verify the records in the consolidated asset register and the findings are presented below;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Hindocha P/S had; 18 classrooms, 19 latrine stances, 376 desks and no staff house staff houses. The Performance Assessment field verification noted the same asset stocks as was reported by the Consolidated Assets register at the MEO's office.</li> <li>• In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Waluwerere P/S had; 16 classrooms, 30 latrine stances, 320 desks and no staff houses. A comparison with the field findings observed the same stocks of assets.</li> <li>• In the Consolidated Assets register, it was reported that Busanzi P/S had; 10 classrooms, 15 latrine stances, 191 desks and no staff houses. When the assessment team visited the school, similar assets logs were presented by the Headteacher.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

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, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of Desk appraisal for the Education sector implemented projects implemented during FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The desk appraisal form for the civil works for example Bugobo-Butambula was screened on 28th July, 2022. It was derived from the DDP III and was captured on page 90 under the Programme Human capital development, indicator Number of classrooms (1.5k) constructed to improve the pupil to classroom ratio.</p>	<b>1</b>
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, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of field appraisal for the Education sector implemented projects FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The field appraisal was undertaken by a team that comprised of the; the Planner, the PCDO, Senior Environment Officer and MEO on 28th July, 2022 and it was concluded that the sector projects were technically feasible, environmentally and socially acceptable and were to use customized designs.</p>	<b>1</b>
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 no Seed Secondary School incorporated into the procurement plan for the current FY (2023/2024)</p>	<b>1</b>
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 of approval of the school infrastructure projects by the Contracts committee;</p> <p>The construction of a 2-classroom block at Bugobo-Butambula primary school was approved under MIN. 4(i)/23/September 2022 on 28th September 2022.</p> <p>A sector procurement plan for the previous financial year submitted on 26th April 2022 by the Municipal Education Officer</p>	<b>1</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of establishment of the project implementation team appointed by the Town Clerk on 1st July 2022 for education projects as listed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Engineer</li> <li>• Senior Environment officer</li> <li>• Municipal Planner</li> <li>• Procurement officer</li> <li>• Municipal Education officer</li> <li>• Municipal Health officer</li> <li>• Senior Internal auditor</li> </ul> <p>There was no appointment for a clerk of works and a labour officer as a complete requirement for a full implementation team.</p>	<b>0</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no Seed Secondary School implemented during the previous FY..</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The indicator particularly required a Seed Secondary School infrastructure project which the Municipal Council had not undertaken during the year of assessment.</p>	<b>1</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of undertaking the technical supervision during critical stages of construction for example a site meeting was held on 10th February 2023 for civil works at Bugubo-Butambula primary school under MIN004/Feb/23/Bugubo and MIN005/Feb/23/Bugubo were discussions between the contractor and the project manager on technical issues like increasing on the speed of construction was the topic..</p> <p>A site meeting in attendance of the Engineer, environment officer, Community development officer held on 13th June 2023 when the structures were being commissioned to the users.</p> <p>A progress report prepared on 6th June 2023 for the installation of the rain water PVC tank including works done as; setting out water tank platform, excavation and placing the mass concrete</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of proper execution of projects and payments to contractors of the education infrastructure projects for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The construction of a 2-classroom block at Buguba-Batambula Primary school was by M/s Reca Nero Logistics Ltd. The Contractor requisitioned Ugx 25,629,000 on 18th May, 2023. The payment certificate No 1 was drawn by the Engineer on 29th May, 2023 and was verified and Certified by the Environment Officer and CDO 7th June, 2023 and payment of Ugx. 15,555,613 on 28th June, 2023 via EFT Voucher 6436939.</li> <li>2. The construction and installation of a 10,000 litres rainwater harvesting PVC tank at Buguba-Butambula P/S by M/s Muzela General Enterprises Uganda Ltd. The Contractor made a claim of Ugx 15,559,520 on 5th June, 2023. The interim certificate 1 was drawn on 6th June, 2023 by the Engineer and was verified and certified by the Environment Officer and CDO on 7th June, 2023 before payment of Ugx 15,559,520 was made on 13th June, 2023 via EFT voucher No. 6442150.</li> <li>3. The construction of a 2-classroom block at Bugubo-Butambula primary school with a requisition for payment made on 29th November 2022 by M/s Reca Nero Logistics Ltd of Ugx</li> </ol>	1



30,000,000. The Engineer's interim certificate was prepared on 6th December 2022. There was certification of works by the Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education Officer, Environment Officer on for works worth Ugx 24,700,000

4. A second payment requisition of Ugx 45,629,000 on 20th March 2023 . The Engineer certified the work through an interim certificate on 30th March 2023 signed by Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education Officer, Community Development officer and Environment officer. The certificate was worth Ugx 33,549,000.

5, A third payment requisition of Ugx 25,629,000 on 18th May 2023 . The Engineer certified the work through an interim certificate on 7th June 2023 signed by Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education Officer, Community Development officer and Environment officer. The certificate was worth Ugx 16,548,525

6. The construction and installation of rain water harvesting facility at Bugubo-Butambula primary school with a requisition for payment made on 5th June 2023 by M/s Muzero General Enterprises (U) Ltd of Ugx 15,559,520. The Engineer's interim certificate was prepared on 7th June 2023. There was certification of works by the Municipal Engineer, Municipal Education Officer, Environment Officer on for works worth Ugx 14,781,544. The payment was made on 13th June, 2023

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, score: 1, else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the sector procurement plan was submitted to PDU on 24th April 2022 and it captured among others projects like;</p> <p>Construction of a 2-classroom block at Bugubo-Butambula primary school</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no Seed Secondary school implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023.</p>	1

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>The MC had a log for recording grievance which was in place and during the assessment the log was reviewed, it was noted that for the FY2022/23 under review, there were no grievances recorded under the education sector project implementation by the time of assessment as the log of grievance was opened on 20/12/2022.</p> <p>There was a grievance redress framework titled "Bugiri MC grievance and redress handling procedure</p>	<b>3</b>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, green schools and energy and water conservation</p>	<b>0</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of incorporating costed ESMPs in the BoQs and contractual documents for the construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Bugubo - Butambula primary school as the senior environment officer stated they were misguided by the previous town clerk that the ESMPs are taken care of in the the screening and monitoring budget.</p>	<b>0</b>
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment there was proof of land ownership documents availed for the education project as shown below;</p> <p>The Land Purchase agreement between Mr. Joshua Kalaja of Bugubo village Naluwerere parish, Bugiri Town council and Bugiri town council where Joshua Kalaja agreed to sale land measuring 1.8 acres at UGX.5,000,000 as per the agreement dated 23rd/11/2001</p>	<b>1</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 were monthly monitoring reports of support supervision of an education project as below;  Monitoring reports for the construction of 1 block of a 2-classroom at Bugubo - Butambula primary school in the eastern division and recommendations made such as hoarding off the site, planting of trees and grass in the school compound removal of construction wastes from the site and landscaping prepared by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 18th/10/2022,12th/12/2022, 16th/01/2023 and 21st/04/2023.	<b>2</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>	There was evidence of E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing contractors payments for the project in the education sector.  The interim payment certificate was issued for the construction of 2-classrooms block at Bugubo-Butambula primary school.  Contractor: M.s Reca Nero Logistics Ltd under contract Ref.No. BMC702/WRKS/22-23/00003 endorsed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 5th/12/2022 and payment was made on 15th/12/2022 and final payment was endorsed on 7th/06/2023	<b>1</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>Upon calculating the annual Delivery attendance for health facilities using the Monthly reports (HMIS107). The summaries for the sampled health facility was as follows:</p> <p>(Percentage utilisation =</p> <p>Registered attendance for previous FY minus registered attendance for current FY, divided by registered attendance for previous FY and multiply by 100)</p> <p>2021/2022 583</p> <p>2022/2023 726</p> <p>The difference is <math>143/583*100= 24.5\%</math>.</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>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>From the results of LLGs performance for FY 2022/2023, the MLG average score was as follows;</p> <p>Eastern division 76%</p> <p>Western Division 72%</p> <p>Giving an average score of <math>148/2 , 74\%</math></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>There was a letter dated 7th September 2022 to all AOs proving for Policy change regarding RBF funds</p>	<b>2</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>The LG set out to implement one infrastructure project during the previous FY which was the construction of a twin staff house at Bugiri Municipal HCIII: Contract sum Ugx 165,081,358.</p> <p>The project according the health sector grant guidelines plus planning and budgeting was eligible</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>There was evidence of certification of civil works by the MMOH, Environment officer and CDO before payments for the health sector projects within specified timeframes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cconstruction of a twin staff house at Bugiri Municipal HC III.</li> </ul> <p>The Contractor M/s Danzu Investments Ltd requested for a Ugx 60,000,000 payment on 29th November 2022.</p> <p>The Engineer's interim certificate wort Ugx 53,147,085 dated 5th December 2022 was prepared and endorsed by Municipal Engineer, Municipal Health Officer, Environment Officer and CDO on 5th December, 2022.</p> <p>A second payment requisition of Ugx 115,123,098 was drawn on 13th January 2023. The Engineer's interim payment certificate worth Ugx 103,680,205 was prepared and signed by the Municipal Engineer, Environment officer, Municipal Health officer and CDO.</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 variation in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled health projects were as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Construction of a twin staff house at Bugiri Municipal HCIII: Contract sum Ugx 165,081,358 versus, Engineers estimates of Ugx 168,000,000 resulting into a variation of Ugx -2,918,642</li> </ul> <p>The % Variation=-1.74%</p>	2

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY  • If 100 % Score 2  • Between 80 and 99% score 1  • less than 80 %: Score 0	There was no health centre upgraded during FY 2022/2023	2
4	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	Bugiri MC had only one HCIII (Bugiri HC III) thus the MC had 16 filled positions against the required number (19).  The %age of filled positions was;  $16 \times 100$  19  = 84%	1
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.  • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0	There was no upgrading of Health facilities.	2

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The staff recruitment and deployment was verified at the three facility below;  1. Bugiri Municipal HC III, had 18 staff in number compared to the 19 recommended by the ministry of Health.  Thus the information about health workers was accurate.	2
5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There was no Health Facility Upgraded or constructed	2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the budgets were prepared by 31st March. As per the sampled facility below;</p> <p>1). Bugiri MunicipalHC III, prepared a budget and a work Plan dated 31st march 2023 and prepared by Magoola Saad the Senior Clinical Officer In-Charge</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the sampled facility, the BPR was prepared and submitted on 1st July 2023.</p> <p>1). Bugiri Municipal HCIII Budget and Work Plan, was prepared and submitted on 1st July 2023 by the Facility In-Charge Magoola Saad Senior the Clinical Officer</p>	2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the Annual facility performance report, the following sampled facility developed and reported on implementation of improvement plans</p> <p>1) Bugiri Municipal HCIII developed and reported on the implementation of facility Improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <p>and these Issues Included,</p> <p>Construction of a permanent structure or a lab house</p> <p>The need for National medical Stores to supply the Missed Cycle 5 and 6 of the drugs</p> <p>Strengthen or streamline HIV AIDs prevention services</p> <p>Include family planning out reaches and all this was compiled by Saad Magoola the Facility In-Charge and dated 4th July 2023</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the health facilities submitted monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely</p> <p>Bugiri Municipal HCIII submitted reports for</p> <p>Q1 on 7/10/2023</p> <p>Q2 on 5/01/2023</p> <p>Q3 on 7/04/2023</p> <p>Q4 on 6/07/2023</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			



6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>A letter from the ministry of health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all Town clerks highlighting the termination of RBF Funding was availed</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>A letter from the ministry of health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all Town clerks highlighting the termination of RBF Funding was availed</p>	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>In Qtr 1, 13th October 2022,  In Qtr 2, 17th January 2023  In Qtr 3, 12th April 2023  In Qtr 4, 18th July 2023</p> <p>From the information above it is evident that local governments timely by the end of the first month of the following quarter compiled and submitted all quarterly Budget performance reports</p>	1

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the Municipal LG developed PIP for weakest performing Health facility i.e and some of the gaps identified included under staffing, limited infrastructure. Some of the proposals included;</p> <p>Inadequate accommodation for staff at the only health facility they have.</p> <p>Stock out of essential medicines and supplies.</p> <p>Coordinate training of health workers .</p> <p>Inadequate staffing at the municipal Health office and at the health Facility.</p>	<b>1</b>
---	--	--	---	----------

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 recruitment of Health Educator and the health Inspector addressing the understaffing aspect</p> <p>A twin staff house was constructed at the health facility</p> <p>Furniture was procured</p>	<b>1</b>
---	--	--	---	----------

**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>There was proof that Bugiri MLG budgeted for the department of health workers in FY 2022/2023 as evidenced by the Bugiri MLG Annual budget Vote 702 FY 2022/2023. Shillings 352,329,0000 was budgeted for 21 health workers</p>	<b>2</b>
---	---	---	--	----------

7	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).	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	From Bugiri MLG staff audit, approved staff structure is 25 staff, the number recruited was 21, giving a percentage of 84%	2
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure			
7	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).	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 deployed in their respective HCs. Those visited included; Bugiri MLG HC III duty roaster dated 1st July 2023,18 staff were deployed out of 19  As per the duty roasters there was evidence that the staff were working at their places of deployment	3
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure			
7	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).	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 to prove the publicization of the health worker's deployment list right from the department of health  AT visited Bugiri Municipal HCIII as it was the only Health centre in the Municipal	2
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	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	Bugiri MC had only one Health In-Charge (Mr. Magoola Saadi) and there was evidence that the MHO conducted the annual performance appraisal for Health Facility In-charge during the FY 2022/23.  1. Magoola Saadi, a Senior Clinical Officer at Bugiri HC III was appraised by Dr ZZimbe Richard Isaac (Municipal Health Officer) on 26/06/2023.	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

It was evident that Health facility In-charges conducted appraisal for health facility workers as indicated below;

1. Babirye Sofiya, (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised by Nabirye Leira, (Clinical Officer) on 16/06/20232.

2. Galusha Johnson, (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised by Nabirye Leira, (Clinical Officer) on 15/06/2023.

3. Nabwire Mercy, (Enrolled Midwife) was appraised by Namakula Margret, (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 21/06/2023.

4. Kambedha Immaculate, (Health Information Assistant) was appraised by Magoola Saadi, (Senior Medical Officer) on 25/06/2023.

5. Opala Asuman, (Medical Laboratory Assistant) was appraised by Kyewalyanga Jafali, (Laboratory Technician) on 20/06/2023.

6. Nabirye Leira, (Clinical Officer) was appraised by Magoola Saadi, (Senior Medical Officer) on 25/06/2023.

7. Ondale Vincent, (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised by Nabirye Leira, (Clinical Officer) on 15/06/2023.

8. Mirembe Prossy, (Enrolled Midwife) was appraised by Namakula Margret, (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 19/06/2023

9. Babirye Sarah, (Porter) was appraised by Kyewalyanga Jafali, (Laboratory Technician) on 23/06/2023.

10. Wayenga Swami Sabirat, (Askari) was appraised by Kyewalyanga Jafali, (Laboratory Technician) on 23/06/2023.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0

Reference was made to the report dated 16/10/2022 where a number of health workers were trained on HMIS from 10th to 15th October, 2022. Among the skills that participants attained included, equipping healthy workers with skills in entering data on the system, how to draw graphs related to performance at facility level and how to make pivot tables using data on the system

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MLG conducted continuous professional training of Health workers.</p> <p>Training report on training of health workers on Infection prevention and control dated 17/09/2022</p> <p>A report on training of health workers non-healthcare and waste management date 28th September 2022</p> <p>A training report on quality Improvement methods dated 2nd march 2023 for LLHS</p> <p>A report on training of health workers on Young child care date 16th June 2023</p>	<b>1</b>
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>All these training were available in the Bugiri MC database of Public Health Department FY 2022/2023, these included; training of health workers on infection control, training of health workers on young child care, training of health workers on quality improvement methods among others</p>	<b>1</b>

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

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>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was a letter written by the Town Clerk of Bugiri MLG to the PS ministry of Health dated 29th September 2023 mentioning Health facilities benefitting from PHC Non wage recurrent grants</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	---	--	----------

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.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

According to the Annual work plan of Bugiri MLG Vote 702 for FY 2022/2023, the total Budget for primary health care was Shillings 13,468,576

The monitoring of health services was allocated Shillings 5,000,000

Thus, the percentage allocation was  $5,000,000/13,468,576 * 100 = 37\%$  which was above the 15 percent minimum

2

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.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was timely warranting of the Health sector direct transfer as indicated below;

- Quarter 1 cash limit date was 02/08/2022 and warranted on the same date
- Quarter II cash limit date was 18/10/2022 and was warranted on the same day
- Quarter III cash limit date was 13/01/2023 and date of warrantee was 13/01/2023
- Quarter IV cash limit date was 2/05/2023 and date of warrantee was 2/05/2023

2

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>The LG invoiced and communicated the PHC NWR as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 date of receipt of funds release was 2/8/2022 and date of invoicing was 29/08/2022, after 20 working days</li> <li>• Quarter II date of receipt of funds release was 18/10/2022 and date of invoicing was 28/10/2022, after 8 working days</li> <li>• Quarter III date of receipt of funds release was 13/01/2023 and date of invoicing was 19/01/2023, after 4 working days</li> <li>• Quarter IV date of receipt of funds release was 2/05/2023 and date of invoicing was 08/05/2023, after 4 working days</li> </ul>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>invoicing and communication for Q1 and Q2 was done beyond 5 working days, therefore LG was not compliant</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>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all the health facilities as below,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarter I , date of receipt of expenditure limits was 2/08/2022 and date of publicizing was 5/09/2022, after 25 working days</li> <li>Quarter 2 ,date of receipt of expenditure limits was 18/10/2022 and date of publicizing was 3/ 11/ 2022, after 18 working days</li> <li>Quarter 3 date of receipt of expenditure limits was 13/01/2023 and date of publicizing was 30/01/2023, after 9 working days</li> <li>Quarter 4 date of receipt of expenditure limits was 2/05/2023 and date of publicizing was 17/05/2023, after 11 working days</li> </ul> <p>publicizing of all quarterly releases was done beyond 5 working days time frame, therefore LG was not compliant on this indicator</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was proof that the Municipal Council implemented MHMT recommendations, evidenced by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Placing an order through the AIMO to NMS was done awaiting delivery</li> <li>● The EPI Refrigerator was serviced and the cold chain chart updated</li> <li>● Sex Education in nearby schools, Institutions and market places</li> </ul>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were minutes of the performance review meetings where Health facility In charges attended.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report dated 21/11/2023, all health facility in-charges participated, CDO, Veterinary officer, H/A, MHO</p> <p>Quarter 2 report dated 9/02/2023, all health facility in-charges participated, CDO, Veterinary officer, H/A, MHO</p> <p>Quarter 3 report dated 23/06/2023, all health facility in-charges participated, CDO, Veterinary officer, H/AMHO</p> <p>Quarter 4 report dated 18/08/2023, all health facility in-charges participated, CDO, Veterinary officer, H/AMHO</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There were reports on the joint supervision visits conducted in the Health facilities and here examples included;</p> <p>Q1 support supervision report dated 26/09/2022</p> <p>Q2 support supervision report dated 15/12/2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 support supervision report dated 25/03/2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 support supervision report dated 29/06/2023</p>	1



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If not applicable, provide the score</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable in MLGs, because the structures do not allow</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was proof that the Municipal Council implemented MHMT recommendations from the support supervision reports;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Placing an order through the AIMO to NMS was done awaiting delivery</li> <li>● The EPI Refrigerator was serviced and the cold chain chart updated</li> <li>● Sex Education in nearby schools, Institutions and market places</li> </ul>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Quarterly support supervision reports were availed by the Municipal Medicine Management supervisor called Kazungu Samuel i.e.,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Q1 report dated 06//8/2022</li> <li>2. Quarter II report was dated 06/01/2023,</li> <li>3. Quarter III was dated 14/04/2023</li> <li>4. Quarter IV dated 30/06/2023,</li> </ol> <p>and these reports are referred to as essential medicines supervision performance and recognition strategy (EMSPAs)</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to the budget Vote 702, Bugiri Municipal FY 2022/2023, MMHO's office was allocated Ugx 14,468,576 million.</p> <p>Then out of the total allocation, 9,648,576 was allocated to health promotion activities</p> <p><math>9,648,576/14,468,576 \times 100 = 65.8\%</math>.</p> <p>which was above the 30% the minimum required</p>	2

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MHT held health promotion activities as evidenced by the reports below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support supervision report for Quarter One dated 21/11/2022</li> <li>● A supervision report for Quarter two dated 9/02/2023</li> <li>● Another supervision report for quarter three dated 23/06/2023</li> <li>● In quarter four, a supervision report was compiled on 18/08/2023</li> </ul> <p>All these reports were compiled by Bwamiki Johnson the MHE</p>	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

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 of the follow up action taken by the MHT on the Health promotion and prevention Issues according to the PHC work plan for 2023/2024</p> <p>Sex Education in nearby schools, Institutions and market places</p> <p>Community sensitisation and dialogue</p> <p>Placing an order through the AIMO to NMS was done awaiting delivery</p> <p>Community dialogue meetings were held</p>	<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>The Asset register for the Health department Bugiri Municipal provided the following;</p> <p>Office equipment, Medical equipment, machinery, buildings, Fittings, Immovable assets and many others last updated on 01st July 2023</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>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII); (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality conducted a desk appraisal for three projects in the budget. The exercise was done by the Planner, Engineer, Environment. Officer, PCDO, and Medical Officer who endorsed the forms for Health department Civil works which included; construction of a twin house at Bugiri HC III. The appraisal was conducted on 28th July, 2022.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 Municipality through Planner, Environment Officer, Engineer, PCDO, conducted the field appraisal 28th July, 2022 Civil works which included; construction of a twin house at Bugiri HC III. The project was found to be technically feasible, environment and socially acceptable and whether the projects addressed community needs and were ticked “yes” and overall the projects were recommended for implementation.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Screening form for the construction of the a twin staff house at Bugiri HC III in Eastern division, was carried out as per report dated 05th/09/2022. The impacts identified were; loose over burden waste generation on site, soil erosion and noise and mitigation measures suggested such as backfilling and site levelling, proper waste management on site made in the costed ESMP of UGX. 4,600,000 was prepared by the Senior Environment Officer and the PCDO on 05th/09/2022.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of timely submission of the sector procurement plan for 2023/24. It was submitted on 24th April 2023 and it incorporated projects like;</p> <p>a. Construction of a single staff house at Bugiri Municipal HCIII at UGX 74,143,518</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 of timely submission to PDU by 1st quarter of the current financial year of Form PP1. The form was submitted on 26th July 2023 and contained;</p> <p>Construction of a laboratory at Bugiri Municipal HCIII of UGX 84,079,000</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>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Construction of a Staff house at Bugiri Municipal HCIII approved under MIN4(iii).23rd /September/2022 on 23rd September 2022</p> <p>The project was below the threshold for clearance.</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>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Evidence of a project Implementation team for health infrastructure projects as indicated below was appointed on 1st July 2022 by the Town Clerk;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Engineer</li> <li>• Senior Environment officer</li> <li>• Municipal Education officer</li> <li>• Municipal planner</li> <li>• Procurement officer</li> <li>• Municipal Health officer</li> </ul> <p>The team was incomplete as there was no appointment for a clerk of works and labour officer.</p>	<b>0</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>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 no upgrade of HC II to HC III or construction of a new HC III in the previous FY hence adherence to standard technical designss was not applicable.</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 upgrade of HC II to HC III or construction of a new HC III in the previous FY hence maintaining of daily records by the clerk of works was not applicable.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The indicator particularly refers to upgrades and the LG did not undertake HC II to HC III upgrading projects last FY.</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>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>Evidence of a site instruction form no.00004 filled by the Municipal engineer to the contractor on 28th November 2022 urging the contractor to maintain uniformity of the colour of iron sheets to con sign with the already existing structures.</p> <p>A site visit book where the Community development officer, Environment officer and the Municipal Engineer all supervised works on 29th November 2022.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of verification of works before payments for health projects within specified timeframes;</p> <p>o Construction of a twin staff house at Bugiri Municipal HC III. Contractor M/s Danzu Investments Ltd requested for a Ugx 60,000,000 payment on 29th November 2022. The Engineer's interim certificate dated 5th December 2022 was prepared and endorsed by Municipal Engineer, Municipal Health Officer, Environment Officer and CDO worth Ugx 53,147,085.</p> <p>o A second payment requisition of Ugx 115,123,098 on 13th January 2023. The Engineer's interim payment certificate worth Ugx 103,680,205 was signed by the Municipal Engineer, Environment officer, Municipal Health officer and CDO.</p> <p>The accounting officer did not provide payment vouchers at the time of assessment.</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>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>The LG presented evidence of complete health sector project procurement files as required by PPDA law in the examples below;</p> <p>The file for the Construction of a twin staff house at Bugiri Municipal HC III procurement ref no. BMC702/wrks/2022-2023/00004 contained the approval record by the contracts committee on 1st December 2022 under MIN04(iii)/23rd/September/2022, An evaluation report dated 23rd September 2022 and a copy of signed contract between M/s Danzu Investments Ltd dated 20th October 2022</p>	<b>1</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 a centralized grievances log opened on 20th/12/2022 where grievances were recorded for further investigation and responded to in the health sector and at the time of assessment there was no grievance recorded under the sector related to project implementation</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>The MC had guidelines on health care / medical waste management titled "Approaches to health care waste management. health workers guide second edition 2013" and Natinal saanitation and hygiene guidene 2017 and disseminated o the health unit, there was evidence guidelines and medical waste segregation charts in sampled health Centres such as; Bugiri HC III the only health centre a the Municipality.</p>	2
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 health facilities had functional health care waste bins and placenta pits, safety pits where ash was disposed after burning from the shallow pits</p> <p>M/s Green Label Services Ltd was contracted by MoH with funding from USAID to manage health care waste at Health Centre IV and III that generate higher volumes of waste and there was evidence of waste collection forms dated 20th/04/2023, 18th/05/2023, and 15th /03/2022.</p> <p>Other health units take the waste generated to Health Centre IV and III for collection.</p>	2
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 a record of training health workers of Bugiri HC III on health care waste management from the training report dated 28th/09/2022 approved by the MHO Dr. Zzimbe Richard.</p> <p>In attendance were there health workers as listed below;</p> <p>Nabirye Leira - medical clinical officer</p> <p>Ondale Vincent - enrolled nurse</p> <p>Johnson Galusha - enrolled nurse</p> <p>Kyewalyanga Jafali - medical laboratory technician</p> <p>Kambedha Immaculate - health Asst</p>	1

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	There was a costed ESMP for health project for the FY 2022/2023, during the review of the BoQ there was not incorporated costed ESMP into BoQs	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	There was evidence on land acquisition for sites where Health project for the FY 2022/23 which included;  Land title for where there was construction of a twin staff house at Bugiri HC III in eastern division, Freehold volume JJA 494 FOLIO 6 measuring 0.3080 hectares on plot 4 along Amis Mwondha road at Klyinibi west issued on 10/12/2019.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	Monitoring reports for the construction of a twin staff house at Bugiri HCIII in eastern division, with recommendations made in the report such as planting trees and re-grassing he compound and proper hygiene and sanitation prepared by the PCDO and Senior Environment officer on 10/11/2022, 12th/12/2022 and 26th/01/2023	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	The interim Payment certificate for the construction of a twin staff house at Bugiri HCIII in Eastern division under procurement Ref. No. BMC702/WRKS/22-23/00004  Contractor: M/s Danzu investments Ltd. The Principal CDO and the Senior Environment Officer endorsed works on 5th /12/2022 for the final payment on 23rd/01/2023 and payment was made on 23rd/01/2023.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			



**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
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>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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 Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 1</li> <li>o If below 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment</p>	0

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If within +/-20% score 2</li> <li>o If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If there is an increase: score 2</li> <li>o If no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</li> <li>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</li> <li>o If there is no increase : score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0

**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>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>• If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If 60-79: Score 1</li> <li>• If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>				
<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>				

9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
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>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
<b>Investment Management</b>				
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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 Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>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 Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0



12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <p>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2</p> <p>o If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0

### 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: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water &amp; Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.</p>	0
----	---	---	--	---

14	Safeguards for service delivery  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:  Score 3, If not score 0	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 3, If not score 0	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 2, If not score 0	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0

15

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers  
undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with  
ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:

Score 2, If not score 0

The Urban LG  
Water sector  
was managed  
by National  
Water &  
Sewerage  
Corporation  
and was  
excluded  
from the  
Annual  
Assessment.

**0**

**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>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assessment</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assessment</p>	0
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 Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assessment</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assessment</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY  <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>	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Council that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

**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 Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	---	----------

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

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>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	<b>0</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

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>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0



8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:  i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;  Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers  Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
<p>Maximum score 10</p>				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</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>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 Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</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>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 Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
<p>Maximum score 10</p>				

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> </ul> <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0

### **Investment Management**

12	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 Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	0
----	--	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</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>The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0



14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.  score 2 or else 0	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesment	0
----	--	--	---	---

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

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

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 in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The post of Principal Treasurer was substantively filled by (Mr. Baisi Stephen) who was appointed on 10/03/2017 under MIN No. BDSC 645/2017.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The position of Senior Planner was not substantively filled and there was no evidence of a seconded staff from the Central Government for that position.  However, Mr. Mulondo Azam who was substantively appointed as Planner on 26th June, 2017 under MIN No. BDSC 13/2018 was the Ag. Senior Planner.  He was assigned duties of Ag. Senior Planner by the Town Clerk on 13th January, 2020.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Principal Engineer was not substantively filled and there was no evidence of a seconded staff from the Central Government for that position.  However, Mr. Mugoya Samson Elliot, a substantive supervisor of works appointed on 10th March, 2017 under Min No. BDSC641/2017 was assigned to act as Principal Engineer on 22/02/2022.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Wasige Siraji was a substantive Senior Environment Officer appointed on 13/05/2019 as was directed by MIN No. BDSC 3/2019.</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Senior Veterinary Officer was not substantively filled and there was no evidence of a seconded staff from the Central Government for that position.  Mr. Bogere Maunsen a substantive Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer appointed on 13/5/2019 under BDSC Min SERIAL No. 3/2019 was assigned duties of Senior Animal Husbandry Officer by Town Clerk as on 22/08/2022.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The post of Principal Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Ms. Mugala Martha who was appointed on 03/03/2020 under MIN No. BDSC 02/2020 (46).	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of Principal Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Baligeya Jude who was appointed on 9/03/2021 under MIN No. BDSC 01/2021 (244).	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The position of Principal Procurement Officer was substantively filled by MS. Mirembe Christine who was appointed on 28/03/2017 under MIN No. BDSC 702/2017.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The post of Assistant Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Muzei Isima appointed on 11/05/2022 under MIN No. BDSC 02/2022/49.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Human Resource Officer Mr. Wabwire Herbert was substantively appointed on 27/03/2019 under MIN No. BDSC 2/2019.	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Wasige Siraji was a substantive Senior Environment Officer appointed on 13th May, 2019 as was directed by MIN No. BDSC 3/2019.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The position of senior Physical Planner was substantively filled by Ms. Nakibuka Irene Lydia who was appointed on 14/06/2022 under MIN No. BDSC 03/2022/184.  According to Bugiri MC approved customized staff structure, the position of senior Physical Planner was provided for implementation.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The position of Senior Accountant was not substantively filled and there was no evidence of a seconded staff from the Central Government for that position.  Ms. Nanyanzi Moreen, a substantive Finance Officer appointed on 13/05/2019 under BDSC MIN No. 3/2019 was in addition assigned the roles of Senior Accountant as per the Town Clerk's letter dated 16th August, 2023.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The post of Senior Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Mr. Lutalo Godfrey Davis appointed on 27/03/2019 as was directed by BDSC MIN No. 2/2019.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	Bugiri MC was served by the same Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) as Bugiri DLG.  Mr. Isiko Emma, the Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was substantively appointed on 05/12/2016 under Min.No. BDSC 615/2016.	2

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>Evidence availed at the time of assessment showed that Bugiri MC had two (2) divisions that was Eastern and Western with substantively filled positions of Senior Assistant Town Clerks as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The Senior Assistant Town Clerk, Ms. Kwagala Hellen deployed in Western division was appointed on 23/08/2022 under BDSC MIN No. 05/2022/161.</li> <li>2. Mr. Nsubuga Henry, the Senior Assistant Town Clerk deployed in the Eastern division was appointed on 10/11/2022 under BDSC MIN No. 05/2022/182.</li> </ol>	5
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Evidence availed at the time of assessment showed that Bugiri MC had two (2) divisions that was Eastern and Western with substantively filled positions of Community Development Officers as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nakato Faridah was appointed by the Town Clerk on 10/03/2017 (Ref; BMC/156/1) under MIN No. BDSC 649/2017.</li> <li>2. Kulaba Enoch was appointed by the Town Clerk on 11/11/2020 (Ref; BMC/156/1) under MIN No. BDSC 07/2020(161).</li> </ol>	5
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Evidence availed at the time of assessment showed that Bugiri MC had two (2) divisions that was Eastern and Western with substantively filled positions of Senior Accounts Assistant as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kisakye Esther, a Senior Accounts Assistant deployed in Eastern Division was appointed on 13/05/2019 under BDSC MIN SERIAL No. 3/2019.</li> <li>2. Were David deployed in Western division was appointed as Assistant Treasurer on 13/05/2019 under BDSC MIN SERIAL No 3/2019.</li> </ol>	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.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	There was evidence that the LG released 100% of the funds allocated to the Natural Resources Department in the previous FY2022/23, According to the Final Accounts for FY2022/2023, the revised budget for Bugiri MC towards Natural Resources department was UGX 122,000,000. All the UGX 122,000,000 was released to the department and it utilised UGX 115,270,164, which translated into 99.9% as reported in the Draft Final Accounts.	2
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 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:	The revised budget for Community Based Services for the FY under review was UGX 16,314,006, and UGX 12,314,005 was warranted and released to the department. The actual performance was of the released funds was UGX 12,313,900, which translated into 99.9%.(100%)	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.  score 2 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.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,  score 4 or else 0	There was evidence that LG carried out Environmental, social and climate change screening prior to commencement of all projects' civil works for all the projects implemented using the DDEG.  Screening form for the Installation of street solar light along grant street in eastern division , the impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed made in the screening form prepared by the Principal CDO and Senior Environment officer on 30th/09/ 2022.	4
	Maximum score is 12			
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),	The DDEG financed project did not require ESIAs, this is in reference to the National Environment Act 20219 under schedule 4 part 2 which consist of projects with simple environment and social measures and the minimal level of impacts and require ESMPs and strictly following the requirements and guidance in the ESMPs	4
	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>A costed ESMP of UGX 1,020,000 for Installation of street solar light along grant street in eastern division the impacts identified such as accidents, blocking of access road, noise and waste generation on site and mitigation measures proper waste disposal to designated sites, traffic flow control, hoarding off the site prepared and by the Principal and Senior Environment officer on 30th/09/ 2022</p>	<b>4</b>
---	---	---	--	----------

**Financial management and reporting**

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The LG obtained an Unqualified audit opinion from the OAG for its operations during the FY 2022/2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
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 Municipality provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Auditor General's findings for FY 2021/2022 on 23/2/2023, a date before end of February as required by PFMA s. 112g. For this matter the LG was compliant</p>	<b>10</b>
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted via PBS, the Annual Performance Contract for FY 2023/2024 to the MoFPED on 27th June, 2023, a date before August 31st as required</p>	<b>4</b>



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 Municipal Council submitted to MoFPED the Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 on 16th/8/2023 before August 31st as required	<b>4</b>
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 Municipality submitted the four quarterly budget performance reports for FY 2022/2023 as follows: 1st, 2nd and 3rd Qrt reports submitted on 12/5/2023, while 4th Qrt report was submitted on 16/8/2023. Since all the four reports were in by August 31, the LG was compliant.	<b>4</b>

**Education  
Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
-----	-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------

**Human Resource Management and Development**

1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The position of Senior Education Officer was substantively filled by Mr. Were Isaiah appointed by Town Clerk on 10/03/2017 under MIN No. BDSC 644/2017.	<b>30</b>
---	---	---	---	-----------

*The Maximum Score of 70*

1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The Municipal Inspector of schools Ms. Biryeri Proscovia was substantively appointed by Town Clerk on 10/03/2017 under MIN No. BDSC 643/2017.	<b>40</b>
---	---	---	---	-----------

*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.	The Municipal Council Filled Environmental, Social and climate change Screening Forms for all Education projects for the previous FY2022/23 as per the examples below; Screening form for the construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Bugubo-Butambula Primary school in Eastern Division the impacts identified such as vegetation clearance, habitat disruption, loose over burden soils leading to erosion and mitigation measures identified such as proper waste management at the site, backfilling, planting of grass and trees and removal of debris on site, prepared by the Principal CDO and Senior Environment officer on 21st/08/2022 and attached a costed ESMP of UGX 3,100,000 which had been approved by Senior Environment officer and CDO on 21st/08/2022.	<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.

All the Education projects in the LG did not require ESIAs, this was in reference to the National Environment Act 2019 schedule 4, part 2 section (4) sub-section (d) which were small projects that required screening and have minimal impacts.

The anticipated impacts and Mitigation measures for the education projects were identified in the screening process and proposed in the ESMPs.

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	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.		

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The position of Medical Officer for Health Services was substantively filled by Dr. Zzimbe Richard who was appointed on 16/09/2021 as was directed by MIN No. 05/2021/306 .
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	The position of Principal Health Inspector was substantively filled by Ms. Namuge Irene who was appointed by Town Clerk on 14/06/2022 under BDSC MIN SERIAL No.03/2022/83.

**30**

**20**

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	The position of Health Educator was substantively filled by Mr. Bwamiki Johnson who was appointed on 4/5/2023 as was directed by BDSC MIN SERIAL MIN No. 01/2023 (9).	<b>20</b>
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

**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.	There was evidence that showed LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for health project implemented during the previous FY2022/23 as shown below;  Screening form for the construction of the twin staff house at Bugiri HC III in Eastern division, was carried out as per report dated 05th/09/2022. The impacts identified were; loose over burden waste generation on site, soil erosion and noise and mitigation measures suggested such as backfilling and site levelling, proper waste management on site made in the costed ESMP of UGX. 4,600,000 was prepared by the Senior Environment Officer and the PCDO on 05th/09/2022.	<b>15</b>
	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.	There was no requirement for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for the health projects, this was in reference to the National environment Act 2019 schedule 4, part 2 section (4) sub-section(e) which categorizes projects that require ESMPs and have minimal impacts.  The environmental and social impacts and mitigation measures were identified and mitigations suggested in the ESMP after screening.	<b>15</b>
	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	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited;  a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer  <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	<b>0</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.  <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG:  Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening  <i>score 30 or else 0.</i>	The Municipal Council was excluded from the Local Governments that implement MSI investments and was therefore not eligible for assesement	<b>0</b>

**Water & Environment Minimum  
Conditions**

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.	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0



1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0

### 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.	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	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.	The Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	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 Urban LG Water sector was managed by National Water & Sewerage Corporation and was excluded from the Annual Assessment.	0