



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Busia Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 776)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	82%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	65%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	52%
Educational Performance Measures	76%
Health Performance Measures	74%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>5 projects were implemented using USMID;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Wanyama Bonny Road, Rehabilitation of Busia SS road, Rehabilitation of Market square road, rehabilitation of Obernester road and refurbishment of taxi park.</p> <p>All projects were functional and utilised as per the purpose.</p>	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment 2021/2022 of 77% to 89% for FY 2022/2023 resulting into an increase of 12%.</p>	3
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>5 projects were implemented using USMID;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Wanyama Bonny Road, Rehabilitation of Busia SS road ,Rehabilitation of Market square road Rehabilitation of Obernester road.</p> <p>Refurbishment of taxi park, as per the Q4 progressive report, the projects were at 89% completion at the close of the FY in accordance with the annual work plan FY 2022/2023 page 2</p>	2

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:  Score 2 or else score 0.	The Busia MLG budgeted and spent all the USMID grant on eligible activities as indicated  1. Road infrastructure projects budget at UGX 4,141,461,137 and spent same amount  2. Supervision consultancy budgeted at UGX 904,599,317 and spent same amount  3. Institutional strengthening was budgeted at UGX 183,540,170 and spent same amount	2
---	--	--	---	---

3	Investment Performance  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,  score 2 or else score 0	The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the USMID project was as follows:  Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineers Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))  BUMC 776/USMID-Wrks/20-21/00002. Construction of infrastructure Sub Projects in Busia Municipal Council. This project was budgeted at UGX 22,000,000,000/= actual contract price was UGX 19,012,397,103/= with a variation of UGX 2,987,602,897/= represented by 13.58%  In conclusion, the variation was within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual.	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	There was no sufficient evidence to show that the positions filled in LLGs was accurate. For instance from the Eastern Division the HRM staff list as per 2023 had Mr. Wandera Francis as a Community Development Officer and the LLG staff list had Ms. Winnie Rose Jumah as the Ag. CDO.	0
---	--	--	--	---

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:  • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.  <b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b>	5 projects were implemented using USMID; Rehabilitation of Wanyama Bonny Road, Rehabilitation of Busia SS road, Rehabilitation of Market square road, Rehabilitation of Obernester road and Refurbishment of taxi park  All projects were in place as reported in Q4 budget performance reports	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 2 divisions in Busia Municipality had assessment results as follows;</p> <p>1. Eastern Division scored 98% based on the assessment conducted by the Municipality and 84% based on IVA. The deviation between the two was 14%.</p> <p>2. And Western Division scored 80% based on the assessment conducted by the Municipality and 68% based on IVA. The deviation was 12%.</p> <p>All the Divisions had their deviations outside the allowed +/-10% hence not credible.</p>	0
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>There was no evidence to show that the Municipality had developed a performance improvement plan for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the Financial Year 2023/2024.</p>	0
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Municipality had implemented the PIP for the lowest performing LLGs in the Financial Year 2022/2023.</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>The Municipality had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming Financial Year on 13th/October, 2023 which was past the deadline of 30th September.</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Municipality had conducted a tracking analysis of staff attendance on a monthly basis during the Financial Year 2022/2023. For instance a tracking and analysis report that covers the month of August, absentees were 22 which was below 50% of the required number covering August.</p>	2

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC had conducted an appraisal with the HoDs in the Financial Year 2022/2023. However most of the appraisals were conducted past the deadline of 30th June, for instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Chimulwa Wycliffe the Principal Accountant was appraised by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the T.C on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>2. Mr. Egesa Aggrey the Senior Planner was appraised by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the T.C on 14th July, 2022.</li> <li>3. Dr. Sserunkuma Joachim a Veterinary Officer was appraised by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the T.C on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>4. Mr. Ogallo Julius Nyerere was appraised by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the T.C on 4th July, 2023.</li> <li>5. Mr. Ekwaru John Michael Ag. Principal Commercial Officer was appraised by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the T.C on 18th July, 2023.</li> <li>6. Mr. Ojom Moses a Principal Medical Officer was appraised by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the T.C on 14th July, 2023.</li> <li>7. Mr. Mangeni Aggrey Ag. Principal Education Officer was appraised by Mr. Wafuba Johnson the Deputy T.C on 1st January, 2023.</li> <li>8. Ms. Namajja Teopista was not appraised because she was sick.</li> </ol>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The rewards and sanction committee was functional during the Financial Year under review had considered various cases for instance;</p> <p>The meeting held on 1st June, 2022 in the former library under Minute No. 3/1/6/R&amp;S/2022 Mr. Wasike Luke, a teacher at Madibira Primary School had been sanctioned to be cautioned against abscondment of duty.</p> <p>The Officers apologised for defying the standing orders and asked for forgiveness.</p> <p>The committee under Minute 4/1/6/R&amp;S/2022 recommended Mr. Wasike Luke to present any written documentation as per his request for that leave.</p> <p>The Officer was asked to furnish it with a copy of the received request letter from the supervisor on Monday 6/6/2022.</p>	1

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipality had not appointed a consultative committee to handle staff grievances.</p>	0
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>The Municipality had 20 staff recruited in the Financial Year 2022/2023 but not all accessed their salary payroll within two months after appointment, for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nabwire Sheila a Laboratory Assistant was appointed on 17th/10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>2. Ojambo Simon a Human Resource Officer was appointed on 26th /10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>3. Achola Jackline an Education Assistant was appointed on 26th/10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>4. Achola Jackline an Education Assistant was appointed on 26th/10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December 2022.</li> <li>5. Auga Syeunda Education Assistant was appointed on 26th/10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>6. Ngolobe Charles Education Assistant was appointed on 26th/10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>7. Mugeni Rosette Education Assistant was appointed on 26th/10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>8. Siiso Annet Education Assistant was appointed on 26th/10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>9. Amoding Mwajuma Assistant Town Clerk was appointed on 3rd/11/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>10. Nyadoi Martha Office Attendant was appointed on 3rd/11/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>11. Wafula Julius Office Attendant was appointed on 3rd/11/2022 and accessed salary payroll in December, 2022.</li> <li>12. Mugeni Norah Assistant Inventory Management Officer was appointed on 3rd/11/2022 and accessed salary payroll</li> </ol>	0

in December, 2022.

13. Onyango Stephen, a Community Development Officer was appointed on 7th/12/2022 and accessed salary payroll in February, 2023.

14. Barasa Christopher an Education Officer Counselling and Guidance was appointed on 7th/12/2022 and accessed salary payroll in February, 2023.

15. Mangheni Godfrey, an Inspector of Schools was appointed on 7th/12/2022 and accessed salary payroll in February, 2023.

16. Namuyumba Josephine Education Assistant was appointed on 7th/12/2022 and accessed salary payroll in February, 2023.

Those who did not access within two months were,

1. Kiganda James a Senior Civil Engineer was appointed on 26th/10/2022 and accessed salary payroll in January, 2023.

2. Weli Fred a Senior Assistant Accountant was appointed on 20th/7/2022 and accessed in salary payroll October, 2022.

3. Katooka Zerika Health Assistant was appointed on 20th/7/2022 and accessed salary payroll in October, 2022.

4. Sasaki Vannisa an Agricultural Officer was appointed on 20th/7/2022 and accessed salary payroll in October, 2022.

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.

The Municipality had 7 staff who retired during the Financial Year 2022/2023 and only one staff didn't access her pension payroll in time because the system had closed .

1. Mayo Masiga Pascal, a Principal Assistant Town Clerk retired on 10th November 2022 and accessed pension payroll on 18th January, 2023.

Those who accessed in time were;

2. Ms. Nabwire Dinah Office typist retired on 1st August, 2022 and accessed pension payroll in September, 2022.

3. Wesonga Saul an Education Assistant retired on 9th December, 2022 and accessed in January, 2023.

4. Kafeeza Mary Gorette Education Assistant 1st December, 2022 and accessed pension payroll in January, 2023.

5. Edaku Joseph Laboratory Assistant retired on 31st August, 2022 and accessed pension payroll in September.

6. Sany Esther Education Assistant retired on 1st November, 2022 and accessed in December.

7. Malongooti Mukasa George Education Assistant retired on 6th October 2022 and accessed in November 2022.

### 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 MC budgeted and transferred DDEG funds to the LLGs in accordance with the requirements of the budget as follows;

In quarter 2, UGX 45,850,632 was budgeted and UGX 45,845,632 was released.

In quarter 3, UGX 91,701,264 was budgeted and UGX 91,701,264 was released.

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	DDEG funds were warranted to the LLGs as follows;  For quarter 2, cash limit date was 19th October 2022, amount was UGX 45,850,632, and warranting was done on 19th October 2022. This was within 1 working day.  For quarter 3, cash limit date was 13th January 2023, amount was UGX 91,701,264 and warranting was done on 13th January 2023. This was within 1 working day.  Warranting was done within 5 working days from the dates of cash limits.	2
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 MC invoiced DDEG transfers to the Divisions in the the Financial Year 2022/2023 as follows;  1. Quarter 2 DDEG funds were invoiced on 11th November, 2022.  2. Quarter 3 DDEG funds were invoiced on 19th January, 2023.  The dates of communication of these releases were however not provided to assessment.	0
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 MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of the assessment	0
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 MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of the assessment	0

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p>	<p>The Municipality had an assets register which covered details on buildings, vehicles and other fixed assets of the District as per the accounting manual. Examples of assets contained included; 7 new buildings, 3 laptops, office equipment, machinery equipment among others.</p>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		
		<p><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b></p>		
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p>	<p>The board of survey report for FY 2021/2022 dated 5th August 2022 was availed However there was no evidence that Busia MLG used the above report to make assets management decisions</p>	0
		<p>Score 1 or else 0</p>		
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 Physical Planning Committee held the minimum recommended 4 meetings and the minutes of these meetings were all submitted to the MoLHUD as follows;</p> <p>Minutes of the PPC meeting held on 30th August 2022 were submitted to MoLHUD on 2nd September 2022.</p> <p>Minutes of the PPC meeting held on 20th October 2022 were submitted on 24th October 2022.</p> <p>Minutes of meeting held on 27th March 2023 were submitted on 30th March 2023.</p> <p>And minutes of the PPC meeting held on 25th May 2023 were submitted on 29th May 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 MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of the assessment</p>	0
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 MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of the assessment</p>	0
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 MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of the assessment</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no USMID project in the current FY 2023/2024 approved procurement plans.</p>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan  Score 1 or else score 0	The MLG had incorporated USMID project; Stated as Completion of Road works on page 1 Sno. 7 of the approved Procurement Plan endorsed by the TC on 03rd Aug 2023.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	The USMID Project incorporated is a continuous project and procurement process was completed in the FY 2020/21.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	The Municipality had not appointed the Project Implementation team according to the guidelines in the manual, but had appointed according to the USMID Guidelines.  appointment letter from the TC dated 28th Jan 2021 appointing;  ● Ogallo Nyerere Julius as the CDO  ● Namajja Teopista as the Environment Officer  Letter Dated 01st July 2021 appointing;  ● Wabwire Paul as the Project manager.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence to show that the infrastructure project implemented using USMID followed the standard technical design and workmanship was good; From the visit of the roads;  The Construction of Market Square road had the walkways at 2m wide as the design, workmanship was good and also the drainages were in place as per the design.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There were no supervision reports availed.	<b>0</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC had evidence of Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes:</p> <p>The Construction of Busia SS Road (0.176km), Wanyama Boni road (0.279km), Market Square Road (0.658km), Obemester (0.517km), Ekaka Road (0.658km) and Taxi Park. Dott Services was the Contractor; payment request made by the Contractor on 16th Mar 2023 and works were verified, approved and certified by the ME, Environmental officer and CDO on 16th Mar 2023 and subsequent payment was initiated and timely paid on 30th Mar 2023 under Voucher No. 4677993.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the MC had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA.</p> <p>BUMC 776/USMID-Wrks/20-21/00002. The Construction of Busia SS Road (0.176km), Wanyama Boni road (0.279km), Market Square Road (0.658km), Obemester (0.517km), Ekaka Road (0.658km) and Taxi Park was awarded to Dott Services (U) Ltd. Approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 23rd Dec 2020 Under minute number MIN: CMM 164/20/03 and Contract signing was done on 28th Jan 2021.</p>	<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 feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of an appointment letter for the Grievance Focal Person Mr. Bwire Edwin Macho (Planner) dated 18/12/2023 from Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the Town Clerk.</p> <p>There was evidence of appointment letters for the Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) members. There GRC members were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross, Town Clerk (Chairperson).</li> <li>- Mr. Bwire Edwin Macho, Planner (Secretary)</li> <li>- Ms. Taaka Kevina, CDO.</li> <li>- Ms. Namajja Teopista, Senior Environment Officer.</li> <li>- Mr. Oluka Peter, Physical Planner.</li> <li>- Mr. Wabwire Paul, Civil Engineer-Roads.</li> </ul> <p>There was evidence of GRC meetings minutes from meeting held on 2/10/2022, 3/01/2023, 31/03/2023, 3/07/2023 and 2/10/2023.</p>	<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>There was evidence of a centralised grievance log book and the Grievance Redress Mechanism for the MLG was availed.</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 availed Grievance Redress Mechanism was seen publicised on the Municipal Local Government notice Board.</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 interventions had been integrated into the MC development plans, annual work plan and budget for FY 2023/2024. for instance the said issues were reflected on page 17-23,169-172 Of the LGDP, and work plan page 37, in the budget page 38 and there was a budget provision of UGX 106,142,000.	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	There was no evidence at the time of assessment that MC disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):  c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:  score 3 or else score 0	There was evidence of a revised ESMP for The Proposed Upgrade of priority Roads in Busia Municipal Council (Wanyama Bonny Road, Ekaka Road, Obernester Road, Busia SS road and Market Square Road) dated 08/08/2022 and with total cost of UGX. 309,500,000/=.  The costed ESMP was incorporated in its contract documents/ BoQ for the USMID roads project.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.  Score 3 or else score 0	There was no costing of additional impact from Climate change in the USMID road project (6 roads) Bill of Quantities.	0

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 road reserves were already identified for the USMID roads.  There was only on PAP (project affected person) by the construction of Ekaka Road Late Mr. Wanyama Obura (Estate).  There was evidence of an MoU between Busia MLG and M/s Rev.Fr. Henry Wanyama William (Admin of the Estate for Late Wanyama Obura) of Habomi Village, Masaba Parish, Masaba Sub county in Busia District dated 22/12/2022 for compensation of a sum of UGX. 30,000,000/= to the Project Affected Person.	1
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	There was no evidence of monthly supervision and monitoring reports availed by the CDO and Environment Officer to verify that they conducted monthly support supervision and monitoring.  The reports that were provided were dated 24/11/2022 and 24/02/2023 done on quarterly basis.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There were no Environmental and Social compliance certificates for availed by the CDO and the Environment Officer.	0
<b>Financial management</b>				
16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations  Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:  Score 2 or else score 0	Busia MLG had the following accounts.  1. Busia Municipal Council Revenue Collection account no. 00352108 in Finance Trust bank  2. Busia Municipal UWEP account no. 9030015601107 Stanbic bank.  These had been reconciled up to 30th June 2023 meaning that bank reconciliations were not up to date at the time of assessment (as on 21st December 2023).	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>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC produced all the quarterly internal audit reports during the FY 2022/2023. These were dated; 24th January 2023 for quarter 1, 5th May 2023 for quarter 2, 19th June 2023 for quarter 3 and 31st July 2023 for quarter 4.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of assessment</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>The quarterly internal audit reports were submitted to the Accounting Officer 24th January 2023 and LG PAC on 24th January 2023 for quarter 1, Accounting Office on 8th May 2023 and LGPAC on 8th May 2023 for quarter 2, Accounting on 20th June 2023 and LGPAC on 21st June 2023 for quarter 3, Accounting on 31st July 2023, and LGPAC on 31st July 2023 for quarter 4.</p> <p>However there was no documentary evidence to show that LG PAC reviewed the quarterly internal audit reports FY 2022/2023.</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 budget for Local revenue was;</p> <p>FY 2022/2023 UGX 1,599,880,000 Page 37 of draft final accounts</p> <p>Local revenue collected for FY 2022/2023 was 827,290,456</p> <p>Therefore, Budget realisation was 827,290,456/1,599,880 giving 52% resulting into a deficit of 48% which was outside the required 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>Local revenue decreased from UGX 1,079,989,766 FY 2021/2022 to UGX 827,290,456 FY 2022/2023 resulting into a decrease of UGX 252,699,310.</p> <p>Percentage decrease</p> <p><math>252,699,456/1,079,989,766 \times 100 = 23\%</math> decrease</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 MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of the assessment.</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 Unit awarded contracts and amounts for FY 2021/2022 were available, endorsed by the Town Clerk and Procurement Officer, published on the procurement Notice Board at the Municipal Headquarters. Sampled contracts included;</p> <p>BUMC 776/Wrks/22-23/000003. Construction of a 4-stance water borne toilet at Busia MC HCIV was awarded to Raph Constructors and Consultants Ltd at a contract price of 38,628,143/= and BEB date was on 22nd Dec 2022.</p> <p>BUMC 776/Wrks/22-23/000003. Construction of Maternity ward Extension for ground flow at Busia municipal Council HCIV was awarded to Jotham Construction Ltd at a contract price of 242,321,671/= and BEB date was on 22nd Dec 2022.</p> <p>MoH-UgiFT/Wrks/22-23/000001. Construction of New HCIII in Busia Municipal Council Eastern Division HCIII was awarded to RAK Bold Edge Joint Venture at a Contract price of 889,255,031/= and BEB date was on 14th Oct 2022.</p>	2
----	--	---	---	---

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The National Performance Results for Busia MLG for 2022 were posted on the Municipal Public Notice Board and website; <a href="http://www.Busia_MC.go.ug">www.Busia_MC.go.ug</a>, on 5th August 2023 by the Municipal Planner The overall performance was 64%.</p>	<b>2</b>
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that MC conducted discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation;</p>	<b>0</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>The MC displayed available information on tax rates, collection procedures and procedures for appeal on public notice boards on 5th July 2023.</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 MC did not have IGG issues to address during the FY 2022/2023.</p>	<b>1</b>

**Educational  
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>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>In 2020, 1,582 pupils sat for PLE of whom 1,377 passed in divisions 1 to 3. The pass rate was 87%.</p> <p>In 2022, 1,362 pupils sat for PLE and of these, 1,362 passed in divisions 1 to 3. The pass rate was 87.1%.</p> <p>There was no significant improvement in Performance.</p>	<b>0</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>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>In 2020, 304 students sat for UCE of whom 115 passed in divisions 1 to 3. The pass rate was 38%.</p> <p>In 2022, 315 students sat for UCE of whom 141 passed in divisions 1 to 3. The pass rate was 45%.</p> <p>There was an increase of 7% between the two school years.</p>	<b>3</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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>	<p>The average score in education LLG performance was 70% in 2022 and 50% in 2023. There was a decrease of 20%.</p>	<b>0</b>

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

The Education Department received  
UGX 154,161,061 as SFG grant for FY  
2022/2023. The Projects were;

1. Classroom Renovation at Buchicha  
Primary school at UGX 29,460,000
2. Busia Border Primary School Un  
finished works at UGX 28,800,000.
3. Maintenance of Pit Latrines at  
Mawero East and Madibira Primary  
Schools at UGX 23,000,000.
4. Emptying Pit Latrine at Arubaine  
Primary School at UGX 3,000,000.
5. Construction of Pit Latrine at UGX  
9,366,064.
6. Supply of Desks at at UGX  
28,000,000.
7. Renovation of Arubaine Primary  
school at UGX 15,434,000
8. Payment of Retention of UGX  
4,200,000.
9. And monitoring of works at UGX  
12,901,000.

Therefore, the Development Grant  
was spent on eligible activities.

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

Maximum 8 points on  
this performance  
measure

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

The CDO, MEO and environment  
officer certified works before  
payments were made as indicated in  
the sampled payment vouchers  
below;

1. Voucher n0. 4771092 dated 18th  
April 2023 amounting 9,221,400 to  
Nassi Construction Ltd for renovation  
of 10 stance pit latrine at Madibira  
P/s. The Municipal Education Officer,  
Municipal Engineer, Environment  
Officer and CDO all certified works on  
4th April 2023 and payment was  
effected on 18th April 2023

2. Voucher n0. 4692285 dated 30th  
March 2023 amounting 26,826,338  
to Sinoc General trading and  
contractors for renovation of 2  
classroom blocks at Buchacha P/s.  
The Municipal Education Officer,  
Municipal Engineer, Environment  
Officer and CDO all certified works on  
22nd March 2023 and payment was  
effected on 30th March 2023

3. Voucher n0. 5889608 dated 15th  
June 2023 amounting 8,043,810 to  
Nassi construction Ltd for  
construction of 5 stance pit latrin.  
The Municipal Education Officer,  
Municipal Engineer, Environment  
Officer and CDO all certified works on  
12th June 2023 and payment was  
effected on 15th June 2023

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>The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled projects were as follows:</p> <p>Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineers Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))</p>	2
			<p>BUMC 776/wrks/22-23/00005 Renovation of 10 Stance lined Pit latrine at Madibira Primary School was budgeted at UGX 11,000,000/=, actual contract price was UGX 10,900,000/= with a variation of UGX 100,000/= represented by 0.9%.</p>	
			<p>BUMC 776/Wrks/22-23/00008 Renovation of 10 Stance lined Pit latrine at Mwero East Primary School was budgeted at UGX 12,000,000/=, actual contract price was UGX 11,819,588/= with a variation of UGX 180,412/= represented by 1.5%.</p>	
			<p>BUMC 776/Wrks/22-23/00004 Construction of 5-Stance latrine at Busia Border Primary School was budgeted at UGX 24,000,000/=, actual contract price was UGX 22,929,559/= with a variation of UGX 1,070,441/= represented by 4.46%.</p>	
			<p>In conclusion,  The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual.</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>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools)were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no Seed Secondary School Constructed in the FY 2022/23.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The MC had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines.</p> <p>The ceiling of primary school teachers was 146 and actual was 138 that is,</p> <p><math>138/146 * 100 = 94.5\%</math></p>	2

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Busia MLG had 7 primary schools and 1 secondary school giving a total of 8 government schools; The consolidated assets register for the education department had the following; 125 classrooms, 174 latrine stances, 2,288 desks, 12 staff houses for the 7 primary schools and 19 classrooms, 32 latrine stances, 768 desks, 2 laboratories, and 4 staff houses for the secondary school.</p> <p>According to calculations that were done by the Inspector of Schools during school inspection and monitoring, all the 8 government schools met the basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines, which amounted to 100%.</p>	<b>3</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The MC accurately reported on all the teachers and where they are teaching. For example for the sampled schools, the following was on the staff lists at the education department.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Madibira Primary School had 37 teachers; 14 male and 23 female.</li> <li>2. Buchicha Primary School had 25 teachers; 14 male and 11 female.</li> <li>3. And Mawero Primary School had 19 teachers; 9 male and 10 female.</li> </ol> <p>The information contained on the stafflist at the education department was consistent with the staff that were deployed in the above 3 schools, evidenced by stafflists that were displaced in the head teachers' offices of the respective schools and the staff attendance registers.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	---	---	--	----------

5

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 MC prepared a consolidated assets register which is reporting on all infrastructure in all primary schools. For the three sampled schools, the consolidated assets register had the following;

1. Madibira Primary School; 32 classrooms, 562 desks, 40 latrine stances and 2 staff houses.
2. Buchachi Primary School; 21 classrooms, 335 desks, 20 latrine stances and 2 staff houses.
3. And Mawero Primary School; 16 classrooms, 280 desks, 25 latrine stances, 4 tables, 2 chairs and 1 staff house.

The assets on the consolidated assets register for the sampled schools was found to be consistent with the assets found in the said schools.

2

6

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 all schools in the Municipality prepared their Annual Work Plans and Budgets. In the sampled schools;

1. Madibira Primary School had its Budget signed by the Head teacher and Chairperson SMC on 6th 10 2023.
2. Buchicha Primary School had its Budget signed by the Head teacher and Chair SMC on 3rd March 2023
3. And Mawero Primary School had its Budget signed by the Head teacher and Chairperson SMC on 5th April 2023.

However, the date for submission of these Annual Work Plans and Budgets were not registered at the Education Department to assess whether these had been submitted in time.

0

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 Department supported all Primary Schools to prepare and implement School Improvement Plans. This was done through a workshop of all Head teachers which was held on 7th December 2022. There was also a follow up activity done on 20th February 2023. In all the schools that were sampled, that is Madibira Primary School. Buchicha Primary school and Mawera Primary school all their School Improvement Plans were in Place during the time of assessment.</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>No evidence was provided to show that the LG had collected and compiled OTIMS data for the schools.</p>	0

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The MC budgeted UGX 1,241,445,000 for wages for the 159 teachers and 7 head teachers.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

From the staffing list obtained from the Education Department, it was observed that all schools had a headteacher and a minimum of 7 teachers as per the staffing guidelines which required that each school had a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers for schools going up to P7 and a teacher per class. For the sampled schools, deployment was as follows.

1. Madibira Primary School had a head teacher and 36 classroom teachers.

2. Buchicha Primary School had a head teacher and 24 classroom teachers.

3. And Mawero Primary School had a head teacher and 18 classroom teachers.

3

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

The deployment data for teachers was publicised on the Municipality Notice Board this was for the month of June 2023. In the sampled schools the deployment data was displayed in the Head teachers' offices.

1

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The MC had 7 primary schools and all head teachers were appraised by PEO in the Financial Year 2022/2023 as follows;

1. Mr. Nguemale Bwire Sam head teacher Marachi Primary School was appraised by Ouma Robert SATC Eastern Division on 22 December, 2022.
2. Mr. Guloba Bazil head teacher Busia Integrated Primary School was appraised by Natocho Hellena Ag. SATC Western Division on 20th December, 2022.
3. Mr. Majimbo Polly Siraji head teacher Mawero East Primary School was appraised by Mr. Ouma Robert Ag. SATC on 28th December, 2022.
4. Ms. Munaila Rose head teacher Busia Border Primary School was appraised by Ouma Robert Ag. SATC on 1st January, 2023.
5. Mr. Wafula Hassan head teacher Arubaine Islamic Primary School was appraised by Ouma Robert Ag. SATC on 22nd December, 2022.
6. Mr. Agaba William Joosten head teacher Buchicha Primary School was appraised on 20th December, 2022 by Natocho Hellen Ag. SATC Western Division.
7. Mr. Mugeni Martin Mathias head teacher Madibira Primary School was appraised by Mr. Masiga Pascal Moya Principal T.C Western Division on 4th January, 2023.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The Municipality had only one secondary school and Mr. Mayenda Aggrey head teacher Busia Secondary School was appraised on 3rd December, 2022 by Wafuba Johnson Deputy CAO.

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>The Education department had 4 staff and were appraised against their performance plans as indicated below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Barasa Christopher an Education Officer was appraised by Mangeni Aggrey the PEO on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>2. Nabwire Winfred an Office Attendant was appraised by Mango Brain on 4th July, 2023.</li> <li>3. Barasa Godfrey Albert an Inspector of Schools was appraised by Mangeni Aggrey the PEO on 4th July, 2023.</li> <li>4. Mr. Bangheni Godfrey an Inspector of Schools was appraised by Mangeni Aggrey the PEO on 30th June, 2023.</li> </ol>	2
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The department prepared a training plan for FY 2022/2023. This was signed by the Municipal Education Officer. The issues therein were. Training of Head teachers on Financial Management, Preparation of SIPs, Training members of SMC and BOG on their roles and responsibilities among others.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

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

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>According to the Municipal Education Officer, the MC submitted lists of schools, their enrollment and budget allocations to the Ministry of Education and Sports via electronic means. However, details when this was done were not provided for assessment.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The MC received UGX 14,500,000 as the inspection and monitoring grant and it was allocated as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. UGX 5,400,000 was allocated towards the Municipal Education Officer's monitoring</li> <li>2. And UGX 9,000,000 was allocated to the inspectorate.</li> </ol> <p>This was in line with sector guidelines (page 12 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of UGX 4 million per LG, plus UGX 336,000 (6 inspections at UGX 56,000) per school for the 3 terms</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The MC submitted warrants for School's capitation as follows;</p> <p>For quarter 1, cash limit date was 9th August 2022, amount was UGX 30,005,875, and warrant date was 9th August 2023. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>For quarter 2, cash limit date was 19th October 2022, amount was UGX 30,005,875 and warrant date was 19th October 2022. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>For quarter 3, cash limit date was 13th January 2023, amount was UGX 60,011,750 and warrant date was 13th January 2023. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>And for quarter 4, cash limit date was 26th April 2023, amount was UGX 60,011,750 and warrant date was 26th April 2023. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>All warranting dates were within 5 working days from the cash limit dates.</p>	2

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p>	<p>The MC invoiced and the MEO communicated to schools as follows;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>1. Quarter 1 invoice date was 16th September 2022 and communication was made on 16th September 2022, within 1 working day.</p> <p>2. Quarter 2 invoice date was 26th October 2022 and communication was made on 20th October 2022, 4 working days earlier.</p> <p>3. Quarter 3 invoicing date was 16th February 2023 and communication was made on 16th February 2023, within 1 working day</p> <p>4. And quarter 4 invoicing date was 17th May 2023 and communication was made on 17th May .2023, within 1 working day.</p>	
			<p>The MC was not compliant in communicating the quarter 2 releases.</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>Inspection planning meetings were held on 3rd October 2022 for Term III 2022, 4th April 2023 for term I 2023 and 3rd July 2023 for Term III 2023.</p> <p>The MC also had inspection plans which were dated 1st October 2022 for Term III 2022, 1st April 2023 for term I 2023 and 1st July 2023 for term II 2023.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence, according to the inspection and monitoring reports for the three terms, that all the 7 UPE schools had been inspected and monitored in each of the three terms, representing 100%.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that inspection reports were discussed and were used to recommend corrective action to all schools inspected. The meetings were held as follows; 2nd December 2022 for Term III 2022, 1 March 2023 for Term I 2023 and 5th July 2023 for Term II 2023.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Municipal Education Officer made an effort to submit Inspection reports to DES as follows;</p> <p>14th.Feb. 2023 for Term 3 11th.April.2023 for Term 1 and 10th.July .2023 for Term 2.</p>	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 Committee responsible for education sat and discussed service delivery issues as indicated below;</p> <p>Q1 meeting held on 12th December 2022 under minute 04/GenPC/12/12/2023 and discussed the following key issues, members requested MEO to update on the issue of school management committee for Arubaine P/S, understaffing for some primary schools</p> <p>Q2 meeting held on 23rd January 2023 under minute 11/Gen PC/23/02/2023 and discussed the following key issues Overcrowding in some schools</p> <p>Q3 meeting held on 18th April 2023 under minute 17/Gen pc/18/04/2023 and discussed the following key issues ; Poor quality works done by contractors, lack of skilled teachers to handle special needs education</p> <p>Q4 meeting held on 4th May 2023 under minute 5/Genpc/5/04/2023 and discussed the following key issues; non surveyed school land arising fear of encroachment</p>	2
11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>In an effort to mobilize, attract and retain children to school, the Municipal Education Officer, in his speech during the AGM for Buchicha P/S on 14th September 2022 encourage parents to bring their children to school with all the necessary requirements.</p>	2

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The MC had an updated assets register which is reporting on all infrastructure in all Primary Schools. In the sampled Schools;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Madibira Primary School had an assets register with the following; 32 classrooms, 562 desks, 40 latrine stances and 2 staff houses.</li> <li>2. Buchachi Primary School had an assets register with the following; 21 classrooms, 335 desks, 20 latrine stances and 2 staff houses.</li> <li>3. And Mawero Primary School had an assets register with the following; 16 classrooms, 280 desks, 25 latrine stances, 4 tables, 2 chairs and 1 staff house.</li> </ol>	<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>The MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of assessment</p>	<b>0</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>The MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of assessment</p>	<b>0</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>The MC had no Seed secondary School incorporated in the approved Procurement Plans because they had funds.</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>No Education infrastructure project required clearance from the Solicitor General because all were below 200m</p>	<b>1</b>

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	The MC had a project implementation team established as per TC letter of appointment of team members dated 09th Jan 2023.  Team Members Includes;  ● Mageni Aggrey (MEO)  ● Namaja Topista (Environment officer)  ● Kiganda James (ME)  ● Ogallo Nyerere Julius (CDO/Ag. Labour officer)  ● Sekamanya Martin (CoW)	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES  <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There was no Seed Secondary School Constructed in the FY 2022/23.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no Seed Secondary School Constructed in the FY 2022/23.	<b>1</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc ..., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence of Reports on the planned sector infrastructure projects in the FY 2022/2023 by the joint technical teams involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs.  Supervision Reports on the Renovation of 10 Stance lined Pit latrine at Madibira Primary School dated 31st Mar 2023. Site meetings at dated 03rd Mar 2023 and 24th Jan 2023  Supervision Reports on the Renovation of 10 Stance lined Pit latrine at Mawero East Primary School dated 13th Feb 2023. Site meetings dated 3rd Mar 2023.  Supervision Reports on the Construction of 5-Stance latrine at Busia Border Primary School dated 12th Mar 2023. Site meeting dated 10th Mar 2023.	<b>1</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The MC made payments to contractors within timeframe as per the sampled vouchers below;</p> <p>Voucher n0. 4771092 dated 18th April 2023 amounting 9,221,400 to Nassi Construction Ltd for renovation of 10 stance pit latrine at Madibira P/s, contractor raised request for payment on 31st March 2023, certificate was endorsed by the ME, Environment officer, CDO and MEO on 4th April 2023 and payment was effected on 18th April 2023 after 10 working days</p> <p>Voucher n0. 4692285 dated 30th March 2023 amounting 26,826,338 to Sinoc General trading and contractors for renovation of 2 classroom blocks at Buchacha P/s, contractor raised request for payment on 15th March 2023, certificate was endorsed by the ME, Environment officer, CDO and MEO on 22nd March 2023 and payment was effected on 30th March 2023 after 11 working days</p> <p>Voucher n0. 5889608 dated 15th June 2023 amounting 8,043,810 to Nassi construction Ltd for construction of 5 stance pit latrine, contractor raised request for payment on 6th June 2023, certificate was endorsed by the ME, Environment officer, CDO and MEO on 12th June 2023 and payment was effected on 15th June 2023 after 8 working days</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The MC Education department submitted its procurement plan on 20th April 2022 in accordance with the PPDA requirement.</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 <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>There was no Seed Secondary School Constructed in the FY 2022/23.</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>In the grievance log, no grievances/complaints were recorded from the Education Department as none had arisen from the implementation of Education projects for the previous FY 2022/2023.</p>	3
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>The Education Guidelines on Environmental Mainstreaming in Schools were disseminated by the Municipal Education Officer. The guidelines were prepared by the Environment Officer dated 6th.April 2022 and were available in all the sample schools. According to the acknowledge list all schools received these guidelines on 10th.April 2023.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The costed ESMPs for the Education projects were incorporated in their respective project documents/ BoQs.</p> <p>The ESMP for the renovation of 5 stance pit latrine for Boys and 5 stance pit latrine for Girls at Madibira Primary School dated 14/10/2022 as Element 7 of the BoQ.</p> <p>The ESMP for the construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Busia Border Primary School dated 14/10/2022 as Element 6 of the BoQ.</p> <p>The ESMP for the renovation of 10 stance lined pit latrine at Mawero East Primary School dated 14/10/2022 as Element 7 of the BoQ.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence availed during assessment.</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There was no evidence of monthly supervision and monitoring reports for the education projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023.  There was one combined report for the education projects dated 14/06/2023 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.	<b>0</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments  <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was evidence of Environment and Social Compliance Certificates for the Education projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO completed and signed before final contractor payment invoices/certificates.  There were Environmental and Social Compliance Certificates for;  The renovation of 5 stance pit latrine for Boys and 5 stance pit latrine for Girls at Madibira Primary School dated 20/09/2023.  The construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Busia Border Primary School dated 19/10/2023.  The renovation of 10 stance lined pit latrine at Mawero East Primary School dated 30/08/2023.	<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>The MC did not register a 20% higher population accessing health care services.</p> <p>The sampled health facility had the following deliveries</p> <p>FY 2021-2022</p> <p>Busia HCIV - 2700</p> <p>TOTAL 2700</p> <p>FY 2022-2023</p> <p>Busia HCIV - 2880</p> <p>TOTAL 2880</p> <p>%age change = <math>(2880 - 2700)/2700 * 100\%</math></p> <p>= 6.6%</p>	<b>0</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 100%</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 change in MOH framework to mainstream RBF into PHC so this indicator is not applicable for this year's assessment</p>	<b>0</b>

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The MC budgeted and spent the health development grant as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Construction of New HCIII in Eastern Division budgeted at UGX 889,255,031 and spent UGX 889,255,03</li> <li>2. Construction of wall fence at Busia HCIVI budgeted at UGX 39,225,679 and spent UGX 39,225,679</li> <li>3. Construction of maternity ward at Busia HCIV budgeted at UGX 279,902,615 and spent UGX 279,902,615</li> <li>4. Construction of 4 stance pit latrine at Busia HCIV budgeted at UGX 38,628,143 and spent UGX 38,628,143</li> </ol> <p>Therefore MC spent all the money that was budgeted on eligible activities</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MHO,CDO and environment officer certified works before payments were made as per the sampled payment vouchers below;</p> <p>Voucher n0. 5893916 dated 15th June 2023 amount UGX 27,398,930 to Raph construction and consultants Ltd for construction of 4 lined pit latrine at Busia HCIV. The payment certificate was endorsed by MHO, Municipal Engineer ,CDO and environment officer on 25th May 2023 and payment was effected on 15th June 2023</p> <p>Voucher n0. 5880692 dated 15th June 2023 amount UGX 80,787,895 to Jotham Construction Ltd for construction of extension of maternity ward at Busia HCIV. The payment certificate was endorsed by MHO, Municipal Engineer ,CDO and environment officer on 1st June 2023 and payment was effected on 15th June 2023</p>	2

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The variation in the contract price and Engineer's estimate was;</p> <p>Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineers Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))</p> <p>BUMC 776/Wrks/22-23/000003. Construction of a 4-stance water borne toilet at Busia MC HCIV was Budgeted at 35,000,000/= actual contract price was UGX 38,628,143/= with a variation of - 3,628,143/= represented by -10.36%</p> <p>BUMC 776/Wrks/22-23/000003. Construction of Maternity ward Extension for ground flow at Busia municipal Council HCIV was Budgeted at 242,321,671/= actual contract price was UGX 279,902,615/= with a variation of - 37,580,944/= represented by -15.5%</p> <p>MoH-UgiFT/Wrks/22-23/000001. Construction of New HCIII in Busia Municipal Council Eastern Division HCIII was Budgeted at 900,000,000/= actual contract price was UGX 889,255,031/= with a variation of 10744969/= represented by 1.19%</p> <p>In conclusion,</p> <p>The variation was within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the reports from the clerk of works, the Construction of New HCIII in Busia Municipal Council Eastern Division HCIII was 37% at the closure of the year.</p>	0
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Municipality had only one HCIV and had recruited staff as per staffing structure. The HRM staff list had a ceiling of 47 and filled was 36.</p> <p><math>36/47 * 100 = 76.5\%</math></p>	1

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the MC health infrastructure project met the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs;</p> <p>The Linen store was 3mx1.75m, the Sterile Store was 1.8mx2.9m, Female ward 6.6mx5m which corresponded to the MoH designs.</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per health staff lists obtained from PMOs office, the information was accurate for the sampled health facility as detailed below.</p> <p>Busia HCIV had 36 staff on the DHO's deployment; this was similar to the facility list.</p>	2
---	--	--	--	---

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Sofia Health centre was constructed in FY 22/23 and Phase 1 was budgeted for in PBS budget page 24 FY22/23 item 312121. Budget performance report page 18 showed construction ongoing for phase one but the facility is not yet functional. This information was accurate.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &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>The only health facility in the Municipality, Busia HC IV, submitted its annual work plans of FY 2023/24 to the DHO on 29th March 2023.</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>Busia HCIV submitted on 14/7/2023 signed by Ojiambo Micah Masinde Chairman HUMC</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities 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>Busia HCIV developed an improvement plan for FY23/24 dated 11/1/2023. There was evidence of implementation detailed in progress on action plan in Q3 meeting where an issue of low immunisation had been followed up with mapping of communities with unvaccinated children.</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,  
 • score 2 or else score 0

Health facilities submitted monthly HMIS 105 reports as detailed below.

July 2022

Busia HCIV - 5/8/2022

August 2022

Busia HCIV - 6/9/2022

September 2022

Busia HCIV - 5/10/2022

October 2022

Busia HCIV - 6/11/2022

November 2022

Busia HCIV - 5/12/2022

December 2022

Busia HCIV - 6/1/2023

January 2023

Busia HCIV - 6/2/2023

February 2023

Busia HCIV - 7/3/2023

March 2023

Busia HCIV - 6/4/2023

April 2023

Busia HCIV - 5/5/2023

May 2023

Busia HCIV - 7/6/2023

June 2023

Busia HCIV - 6/7/2023

Quarterly 106

July-Sept 2022

Busia HCIV - 5/10/2022

Oct-Dec 2022

Busia HCIV - 6/1/2023

Jan-March 2023

Busia HCIV - 6/4/2023

April-June 2023

Busia HCIV - 6/7/2023

All submissions were made within the timeline

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>There was a change in MOH framework to mainstream RBF into PHC so this indicator is not applicable for this year's assessment</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>There was a change in MOH framework to mainstream RBF into PHC so this indicator is not applicable for this year's assessment</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Department of Health submitted its quarterly budget performance reports as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The report for quarter 1 was submitted on 21st December 2022</li> <li>2. The quarter 2 report was submitted on 13th February 2023</li> <li>3. The quarter 3 report on 18th May 2023</li> <li>4. And quarter 4 report on 3rd August 2023.</li> </ol> <p>All the reports were submitted within the required timeline</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>The MC developed had only 1 health facility and there was evidence in the quarterly performance review meeting detailing actions to improve performance in the poorly performed indicators.</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q2 - Performance review meeting held on 19/1/23 detailed action plan in min4/1/23 had the issue of missed opportunity to vaccinate children and the action was to map out communities with unvaccinated children.</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q3 - Performance review meeting held on 19/4/23 had performance gaps identified and action plan made - there was an action of providing internet for timely reporting to be done</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q4 - Performance review meeting held on 4/7/23 had recommendations made - Distribution of stock to ease on stock out.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The MC implemented the action plan for performance improvement as detailed in detailed in FY 2022/23 Q3 - Performance review meeting held on 19/4/23 discussed follow up actions on performance gap of missed opportunity for vaccination children and here the action was to map out communities with unvaccinated children and as per the report this had been done.</p>	1
---	--	--	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Municipal budgeted 1,056,360,000/= in FY 2023/24 for 40 staff as detailed in the annual budget on page 19 of the PBS annual budget for FY 2023/24.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>According to the deployment staff lists, the staffing level was at 75% 40 staff positions were filled out of the required 53.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>Health workers were working where they were deployed as detailed below Busia HCIV had 36 staff on the MMOH's deployment list and 28 staff could be found on the facility attendance register. 2 staff were on study leave and 2 staff were on sick leave, 1 staff was on maternity leave, 3 staff were on annual leave.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Local Government Publicised health workers on the facility notice boards. From the sampled health facility Busia HCIV had 36 staff on the DHO's deployment; this was publicised on the facility notice board.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Busia HCIV had only In-charge Mr. Lule Yusuf a Senior Medical Officer was appraised by Dr. Otom James a Principal Medical Officer on 5th July, 2023. He was however appraised past the deadline of 30th June 2023.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that health facility workers had been appraised against the agreed performance plans in the FY 2022/2023 as indicated below.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abuku Carolyne Enrolled Nurse was appraised Nakalyango Lydia a Midwife on 5th July, 2023.</li> <li>2. Katooko Zarika a Health Assistant was appraised by Wafula James Mulumba a Health Inspector on 14th July, 2023.</li> <li>3. Taaka Lucy a Porter was appraised by Wafula James Mulumba Health Inspector on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>4. Anyango Harriet Enrolled Nurse was appraised by Nakalyango Lydia Assistant Nursing Officer on 5th July, 2023.</li> <li>5. Hadadu Violet Nelly Enrolled Midwife was appraised by Nakalyango Lydia ANO on 5th July, 2023.</li> <li>6. Aliba Sharon Enrolled Midwife was appraised by Nakalyango Lydia ANO on 5th July, 2023.</li> <li>7. Nekesa Gertrude a Medical Clinical Officer was appraised by Ayoma Fortunate Shanga a MO on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>8. Elechu Alex a Laboratory Technician was appraised by Dr. Lule Yusuf SMO on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>9. Mango Deogratios Egesa a Comprehensive Nurse was appraised by Oduya Betty NO on 14th July, 2023.</li> <li>10. Manyuru Wilber a Porter was appraised by Wafula James Malimba Health Inspector on 11th July, 2023.</li> </ol>	
			<p>However most appraisals were conducted past the deadline of 30th June.</p>	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Corrective actions were observed like training in computer skills, poor reporting skills and these had been acted upon in the Minute R&amp;S/COM/04/23</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>The MC conducted training as per the district training plan dated 20/7/2022 approved by the MMOH.</p> <p>A training report on a training on malaria in pregnancy dated 11/5/23 was available and was conducted in accordance with the training plan.</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>There was a training database in place and it had a health worker Nnabbowa Salima who attended who attended a training on New HIV 2022 guidelines on 19/6/2023 by MJAP</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>The Town Clerk communicated to the Ministry of Health through a letter dated 12/9/2023 detailing 2 health facilities receiving Non-wage grant. The letter was received by MOH on 29/9/2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	---	--	----------

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>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>As per the schedule from MHO' s office the MC allocated UGX 14,239,415 towards monitoring of service delivery and management out of the total PHC non-wage recurrent budget of UGX 75,708,000. This amounted to 18.8%.</p>	<b>2</b>
---	--	---	---	----------

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC warranted PHC grants to the health facilities as follows;</p> <p>For quarter 1, cash limit date was 9th August 2022, amount was UGX 9,463,516 and warranting was done on 9th August 2022. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>For quarter 2, cash limit date was 19th October 2022, amount was UGX 28,390,549, and warranting was done on 19th October 2022. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>For quarter 3, cash limit date was 13th January 2023, amount was UGX 18,927,033, and warranting was done on 13th January 2023. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>And for quarter 4, cash limit date was 26th April 2023, amount was UGX 18,927,033 and warranting was done on 26th April 2023. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>Warranting was done within 5 working days from the cash limit dates.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that invoicing and communication were done within 5 working days for all the quarters as indicated;</p> <p>Q1, date of funds release was 8th July 2022 and date of invoicing and communication was 12th July 2022, after 3 working days</p> <p>Q2; date of funds release was 11th October 2022, date of invoicing and communication was 11th October 2022, same day</p> <p>Q3; date of funds release was 3rd January 2023, date of invoicing and communication was 6th January 2023, same day</p> <p>Q4; date of funds release was 7th April 2023, date of invoicing and communication was 7th April 2023, same day therefore MC was compliant</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</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>There was evidence to show that publicising was done within 5 working days for all the quarters as indicated;</p> <p>Q1, date of receipt of expenditure limits was 8th July 2022 and date of publicising was 12th July 2022, after 3 working days</p> <p>Q2; date of receipt of expenditure limits was 11th October 2022, date of publicising was 11th October 2022, after 1 working day</p> <p>Q3; date of receipt of expenditure limits was 3rd January 2023, date of publicising was 6th January 2023, 1 working day</p> <p>Q4; date of receipt of expenditure limits was 7th April 2023, date of publicising was 7th April 2023, same day therefore MC was compliant</p>	1
<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>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>The MC implemented the action plan for performance review meetings as detailed in FY 2022/23 Q3 - Performance review meeting held on 19/4/23 discussed follow up actions on performance gap of missed opportunity for vaccination children and here the action was to map out communities with unvaccinated children and as per the report this had been done.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>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>No evidence was provided</p>	0
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>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>Busia HCIV was supervised as detailed below as per the support supervision reports.</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q1 on 15/9/22</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q2 on 8/12/23</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q3 on 16/3/23</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q4 on 30/6/23</p>	1
<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>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>The MC has only one HCIV and there are no lower health facilities for the HSD to supervise</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>The MC made sure that recommendations given in support supervision were implemented as detailed by feedback reports below.</p> <p>Q2 FY 22/23 Support supervision report by DHT dated 15/9/22 to Busia HCIV had a section on status of implementation of previous quarter action points. There was an issue of maternal and perinatal death notifications not done on time and the action point was to functionalize the MPDSR committee and the follow up status showed that this had been done.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The MC carried our medicines management supervision to facilities as detailed below.</p> <p>MMS reports to the MMOH dated 2/4/23 detailed Busia HCIV supervised on medicines management - EMHS.</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>The MC allocated UGX 4,557,157 towards health promotion and prevention activities out of the total PHC non-wage recurrent budget of UGX 14,239,415. This amounted to 26.6%. which was below the requirement of 30%</p>	0

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	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	The MHT led health promotion and prevention activities and detailed below. Q1 activity report PHI okurut Moses dated 22/11/2022 activities conducted were supervision of solid waste management, surveillance of epidemic diseases. 29 schools were visited, 35 eating places were supervised.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	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	There was no evidence provided	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

### Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	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	The MC had an updated Asset register at the MMOH's office. Facilities sampled had the equipment needed as per the basic standards  Busia HCIV- Asset register dated 3/10/23 had a BP machine, Autoclave, fetoscope, microscope.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p>	<p>The MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(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>		
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC did not provide documentary evidence at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Environmental and Social Screening reports and costed ESMPs for the current FY 2023/2024 Health projects signed by the Environment Officer and DCDO.</p> <p>There were screening reports for;</p> <p>The Construction of perimeter fence (Wall) at Busia Municipal HCIV dated 14/09/2023 and costed ESMP at UGX. 2,950,000/=.</p> <p>The construction of Busia Municipal HCIII (Phased construction- OPD) dated 14/09/2023 and costed ESMP at UGX. 10,570,000/=.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MLG Health department timely submitted all its infrastructure requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved MC annual work plan,</p> <p>As per a copy of the health sector procurement plan for current FY prepared by the DHO, date of submission to PDU 26th April 2023 which was before 30th April as required by PPDA laws.</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>The health department submitted their PP1 Forms to PDU by 1st Quarter of the Current year on 28th Aug 2023</p> <p>Projects Included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction of New HCIII in Eastern Division Sofia Phase 2.</li> <li>● Phase 2 Construction of wall fence at Busia HCIV</li> </ul>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Contracts Committee sat on 14th Oct 2022 and approved the health infrastructure project named Construction of New HCIII in Busia Municipal Council Eastern Division HCIII under Minute Min:629/DCC/2022 and the project was cleared by the Solicitor General on 14th Dec 2022.</p> <p>The Contracts Committee also sat on 22nd Dec 2022 and approved the health infrastructure project named Construction of Maternity ward Extension for ground flow at Busia municipal Council HCIV under Minute Min:CC10/22/03 and the project was cleared by the Solicitor General on 18th Jan 2023.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0	The MLG had a project implementation team established as per TC letter of appointment of team members dated 27th Jan 2023.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score	<p>Team Members Includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Dr. Lule Yusuf (MHO)</li> <li>● Namaja Topista (Environment officer)</li> <li>● Kiganda James (ME)</li> <li>● Ogallo Nyerere Julius (CDO/Ag. Labour officer)</li> </ul> <p>Appointment of Nakasita Juliet as the CoW was done on 01st Jan 2023.</p>	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the MLG health infrastructure project met the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs;	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score	The Linen store was 3mx1.75m, the Sterile Store was 1.8mx2.9m, Female ward 6.6mx5m which corresponded to the MoH designs.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0	Not all projects had reports from the clerk of works and also those that had they were inconsistent . Reports dated 31st August 2023, 13th June 2023, 31st April 2023 on the construction of New HCIII in Busia municipal council Eastern division, Report dated 05th April 2023 on the construction of maternity ward at Busia Municipal Council HCIV ward, Report dated 14th may 2023 on the construction of water borne toilet at Busia Municipal Council HCIV. all these projects duration was not less than 2 months.	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	There were no site meetings conducted.	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	There were no Supervision reports seen.	0
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The MLG verified works as indicated below;

Voucher no. 5893916 dated 15th June 2023 amount UGX 27,398,930 to Raph construction and consultants Ltd for construction of 4 lined pit latrine at Busia HCIV, contractor raised request for payment on 9th May 2023, payment certificate endorsed by MHO,ME,CDO and environment officer on 25th May 2023, after 12 working days.

Voucher n0. 5880692 dated 15th June 2023 amount UGX 80,787,895 to Jotham Construction Ltd for construction of extension of maternity ward at Busia HCIV e, contractor raised request for payment on 23rd May 2023, payment certificate endorsed by MHO,ME,CDO and environment officer on 1st June 2023, after 7 working days

Voucher n0. 58987170 dated 15th June 2023 amount UGX 15,592,354 to Buhunya International Consultants Ltd for construction of perimeter wall at Busia HCIV, contractor raised request for payment on 2nd May 2023, payment certificate endorsed by MHO,ME,CDO and environment officer on 10th May 2023, after 6 working days

The first payment was certified past the timeline of 10 working days.

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MLG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The project was;</p> <p>BUMC 776/Wrks/22-23/000003. Construction of a 4-stance water borne toilet at Busia MC HCIV was awarded to Raph Constructors and Consultants Ltd as the Contractor. Approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 22nd Dec 2022 under minute number MIN: CC10/22/03 and Contract signing was done on 09th Jan 2023.</p> <p>BUMC 776/Wrks/22-23/000003. Construction of Maternity ward Extension for ground flow at Busia municipal Council HCIV was awarded to Jotham Construction Ltd as the Contractor. Approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 22nd Dec 2022 under minute number MIN: CC10/22/03 and Contract signing was done on 19th Jan 2023.</p> <p>MoH-UgiFT/Wrks/22-23/000001. Construction of New HCIII in Busia Municipal Council Eastern Division HCIII was awarded to RAK Bold edge Joint Venture Ltd as the Contractor. Approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 14th Oct 2022 under minute number MIN: 629/DCC/2022 and Contract signing was done on 27th Jan 2023.</p>
----	--	---	---

## 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>In the grievance log, no grievances/complaints were recorded from the Health Department as none had arisen from the implementation of the Health projects in the FY 2022/2023.</p>
----	---	---	---

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Guidelines on Medical/ Health care waste management at Busia Municipal HCIV and evidence of follow up on their implementation was seen the Support Supervision book for Busia Municipal HCIV by the Principle Health Officer on 30/06/2023 and the Municipal Health Team on 29/09/2023.</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>Medical Waste was being budgeted under Prevention and Rehabilitation services.</p> <p>There was evidence of Green Label services Ltd as the contracted registered waste handler for Medical/ Health Care waste generated at Busia MC HCIV as verified from the waste transfer forms dated 27/11/2023 to 12/12/2023.</p> <p>There was evidence of an incinerator at Busia Municipal Council HCIV.</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 were two Health care waste management training reports availed dated 20/12/2023 - Quarter 2 and 30/06/2023 - Quarter 4.</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The costed ESMPs for the Health Projects implemented in the FY 2022/2023 were incorporated in their respective contract documents/ BoQs.</p> <p>The costed ESMP for the Construction of a 4 stance Waterborne toilet at Busia Municipal Council HCIV was incorporated on Page 10 of the BoQ.</p> <p>The ESMP for the construction of the maternity ward (Extension for ground floor) at Busia Municipal Council HCIV was incorporated on Page 13 of the BoQ.</p> <p>Environmental and Social issues were incorporated throughout the BoQ for the Construction of Busia Municipal Council HCIII (Safia HCIII) at Safia Village.</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of proof of land ownership where health projects were implemented.</p> <p>For;</p> <p>Busia Municipal HCIII (Safia HCIII)- Land title for 1.2380 hectares of land in Busia Municipality, Busia District on Plot 4-10, Block (Road) Okumu Road at Safia 'B' dated 6/06/2016 was availed.</p> <p>Busia Municipal HCIV- Land title for 1.1090 hectares of land in Samia Bugwe County, Dusia District on Plot 10 -2- Stadium Road dated 26/03/2012 was availed.</p>	2
----	--	--	---	---

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The CDO and Environment Officer conducted support supervision for health projects and produced reports as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There was a monitoring report for the Construction of a 4 stance Waterborne toilet at Busia HCIV dated 25/05/2023.</li> <li>2. There was a monitoring report for the construction of the maternity ward (Extension for ground floor) at Busia HCIV dated 20/06/2023.</li> <li>3. There was a monitoring report for the Construction of Busia HCIII (Safia HCIII) at Safia Village dated 10/08/2023.</li> </ol> <p>Note that for all the three health projects, the CDO and Environment officer did monitoring and support supervision only once during the entire project duration, and not on a monthly basis as was required. No evidence was provided to show that issues identified during the monitoring activities were eventually followed up on.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence of Environment and Social Compliance Certificates for two of the three health projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO completed and signed before final contractor payment invoices/ certificates.

There were Environmental and Social Compliance Certificates for;

The Construction of a 4 stance Waterborne toilet at Busia HCIV dated 28/11/2023.

The construction of a maternity ward (Extension for ground floor) at Busia HCIV dated 28/11/2023.

The above Environmental and Social Compliance certificates were with regards to final retention payments.

However;

There was no Environmental and Social Compliance Certificate for the Construction of Busia HCIII (Safia HCIII) at Safia Village dated 10/08/2023. The Environment Officer claimed that the reasons why the compliance certificate was not developed was because the project was a phased project and was still on going.

The Environment Officer and CDO were preparing Environmental and Social compliance Certificates for final contractor payment invoices/ certificates only ignoring contractor interim payments yet it was a requirement to complete and sign Environmental and Social compliance certificates at all stages of contractor payments.

However, the PCDO and SEO signed on the interim contractor payment Certificates for Health projects at interim payment stages.

**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>	Not applicable for a MLG	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>	Not applicable for a MLG	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>	Not applicable for a MLG	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>	Not applicable for a MLG	0

2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates  o If within +/-20% score 2 o If not score 0	Not applicable for a MLG	0
2	N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment  Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.  o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0	Not applicable for a MLG	0
3	New_Achievement of Standards:  The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning  o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0.	Not applicable for a MLG	0
3	New_Achievement of Standards:  The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).  o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0.	Not applicable for a MLG	0
<b>Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement</b>				
4	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3	Not applicable for a MLG	0

5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance  <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable for a MLG	0
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance  <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable for a MLG	0
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance  <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	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  <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>	Not applicable for a MLG	0

### **Human Resource Management and Development**

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2	Not applicable for a MLG	0
---	--	---	--------------------------	---

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff  <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2	Not applicable for a MLG	0
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3	Not applicable for a MLG	0
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable for a MLG	0

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

8	Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</li> <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>	Not applicable for a MLG	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><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>Not applicable for a MLG</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>Not applicable for a MLG</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>Not applicable for a MLG</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>Not applicable for a MLG</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>Not applicable for a MLG</p>	0

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.	Not applicable for a MLG	0
----	--	---	--------------------------	---

### Investment Management

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable for a MLG	0
----	---	---	--------------------------	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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:  Score 4 or else score 0.	Not applicable for a MLG	0
----	---	--	--------------------------	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2	Not applicable for a MLG	0
----	---	---	--------------------------	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable for a MLG	0
----	---	---	--------------------------	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable for a MLG	0
----	---	---	--------------------------	---

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> .	a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable for a MLG	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> .	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:	Not applicable for a MLG	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> .	c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:	Not applicable for a MLG	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> .	d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2	Not applicable for a MLG	0

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2	Not applicable for a MLG	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts  o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0	Not applicable for a MLG	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements  <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable for a MLG	0

### Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable for a MLG	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	Not applicable for a MLG	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	Not applicable for a MLG	<b>0</b>
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	Not applicable for a MLG	<b>0</b>
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	Not applicable for a MLG	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments  <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:  Score 2, If not score 0	Not applicable for a MLG	<b>0</b>

**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>	Not applicable	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>	Not applicable	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>	Not applicable	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>	Not applicable	0

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

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

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
---	---	---	----------------	---

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

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
---	--	--	----------------	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
---	--	--	----------------	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

**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	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 6			

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	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	Not applicable	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	Not applicable	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	Not applicable	0

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

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

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

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>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>	Not applicable	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable	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> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	Not applicable	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>	Not applicable	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>	Not applicable	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	----------------	----------

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	----------------	----------

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	----------------	----------

**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	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	----------------	----------

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
----	--	---	----------------	----------

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>0</p>

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	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:  i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines  Maximum score 18	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	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	Not applicable	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	Not applicable	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	Not applicable	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	Not applicable	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	Not applicable	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	Not applicable	0

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	<b>0</b>

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	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	Mr. Chimulwa Wycliffe was substantively appointed as a Principal Accountant on 10th October, 2006 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 125/2006, signed by Mr. Herold M. Wefuli Ag. Townclerk.	<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	Mr. Egezza Aggrey was substantively appointed as a Senior Planner on 10th May, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 26/2023, signed by the Townclerk Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross.	<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.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	This position was not filled at the time of assessment, an no evidence was provided to show that a staff had been seconded from Central Government.	<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	The MC had substantively appointed Ms. Namajja Teopista as a Senior Environment Officer on 4th October, 2019 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 12/2019, endorsed by the Town clerk Mr. Okurut Vincent.	<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	Dr. Sserunkuma Joachim a Veterinary Officer was assigned duties of a Municipal Production Officer on 1st July, 2023 through letter reference CR/161/1 endorsed by the Town clerk Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross.	<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.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Ogallo Julius Nyerere was substantively appointed as the Principal Community Development Officer on 22nd March, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 10/2017, endorsed by Mr. Godfrey K. Kateeba the Town clerk.	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	Mr. Ekwaru John Michael a substantive Commercial Officer was assigned duties of a Principal Commercial Officer on 3rd July, 2023 through letter reference CR/153/3, endorsed by Mr. Wafuba Johnson for Town clerk	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.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	There was no substantively appointed Senior Procurement Officer. Ms. Nabwire Maliza Obale, the substantive Procurement Officer was assigned duties of a Senior Procurement Officer on 13th July, 2023 through letter reference CR/161/1, endorsed by Baganzi Ronald Ross the Town Clerk.	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.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Ms. Nabwire Maliza Obale was substantively appointed as a Procurement Officer on 13th April, 2022 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 23(v)/2022 as signed by Baganzi Ronald Ross the Town Clerk.	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	Mr. Wandera Charles was substantively appointed as a Senior Human Resource Officer on 26th June, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 59/2023, endorsed by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the Town Clerk.	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. Bwire Evans was substantively appointed as an Environmental Officer on 20th July, 2022 as directed by the DSC Minute No.44/2022, signed by Baganzi Ronald Ross the Town Clerk.	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	Mr. Oluka Peter was substantively appointed as a Physical Planner on 28th April, 2014 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 165/2014, signed by Kenneth Ofwono for Town Clerk.	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	Mr. Mangeni Godfrey was substantively appointed as a Senior Accountant on 21st June, 2010 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 125/2009, signed by Kenneth Ofwono Ag. Town clerk.	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.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	Mr. Mangeni Godfrey was substantively appointed as a Senior Accountant on 21st June, 2010 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 125/2009, signed by Kenneth Ofwono Ag. Town clerk.	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.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The Municipal was being served by the same PHRO from the DLG Ms. Simu Catherine Omari.	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>The Municipality had 2 Divisions whose Senior Assistant Town Clerks were not substantive as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Ouma Robert, a substantive Assistant Town Clerk was assigned duties of a Senior Assistant Town Clerk Eastern Division on 1st July, 2023 through letter reference CR/161/1, signed by Baganzi Ronald Ross the Town Clerk.</li> <li>2. Ms. Natocho Helena, a substantive Assistant Town Clerk was assigned duties of a Senior Assistant Town Clerk on 1st July, 2023 through letter reference CR/161/1, signed by the Town Clerk Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross.</li> </ol>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The MC had 2 Divisions and appointed substantively all the CDO's</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ms Taaka Kevina was substantively appointed as a Community Development Officer on 25th May, 2018 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 14/2018, signed by the Town Clerk Godfrey .K. Kateeba</li> <li>2. Mr. Onyango Stephen was substantively appointed as a Community Development Officer on 7th December, 2022 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 29/2022, signed by the Town Clerk Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross.</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>The MC had 2 Divisions and appointed substantively the Accounts Assistant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Wandera Francis was substantively appointed as a Treasurer on 20th April, 2018 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 04/2023, signed by Baganzi Ronald Ross the Town Clerk.</li> <li>2. Mr. Okuku Alfred William was substantively appointed as an Accountant Assistant on 28th April, 2014 as directed by the DSC Minute 165/2014, signed by Kenneth Ofwono for the Town Clerk.</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:	The budget for the Natural Resources Department was UGX 104,141,524, warranted was UGX 79,755,272 and actual release was UGX 79,755,272. Therefore 100% of the warranted amount was released.	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 budget for the Community Based Services Department was UGX 156,385,465, warranted was UGX 66,807,073 and actual release was UGX 66,276,802. Therefore 100% of the warranted amount was released.	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 of the screening report for the USIMID road project availed by the City Environment Officer (SEO) and PCDO.  Project: The proposed Upgrade of priority Roads in Busia Municipal Council (Wanyama Bonny Road, Ekaka Road, Obernester Road, Busia SS road and Market Square Road).  The Screening report The proposed Upgrade of priority Roads in Busia Municipal Council (Wanyama Bonny Road, Ekaka Road, Obernester Road, Busia SS road and Market Square Road) signed by the Senior Environment Officer and PCDO on 12/010/2020.	4
	Maximum score is 12			

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

Maximum score is 12

b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),

score 4 or 0

There was evidence of the full Environmental and Social Impact Statement (ESIS) developed after conducting an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment.

There was evidence of Terms of Reference (ToRs) as seen in the ESIS. Terms of Reference Report are always developed before the ESIA report which acts as the Environment and Social Project Brief and Submitted to NEMA for review and Approval by the Authority.

The ToRs were submitted to NEMA and approved on 29/07/2020 by Ms. Harriet Namara on behalf of the Executive Director.

Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) report for The proposed upgrade of priority Roads in Busia Municipal Council (Wanyama Bonny Road, Ekaka Road, Obernester Road, Busia SS road and Market Square Road) Contract no. MLHUD/SRVCS/USMID-AF/18-19/00461/3 was developed and submitted to NEMA for review and Approval. There was evidence of the NEMA Environment and Social Certificate of Approval (No. 15411) signed by the Executive Director Dr. Tom Okurut dated 2/08/2021 with Conditions of Approval attached.

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

Maximum score is 12

c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;

score 4 or 0

There was evidence of a revised ESMP for The proposed upgrade of priority Roads in Busia Municipal Council (Wanyama Bonny Road, Ekaka Road, Obernester Road, Busia SS road and Market Square Road) dated 08/08/2022 and with total cost of UGX. 309,500,000/=.

## 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>Busia Municipal Council had an un-qualified audit opinion for 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 MC provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of the Internal Auditor General's findings for 2021/2022 on 21st November 2022 as per acknowledgement stamp.</p> <p>The MC had provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of the Auditor General's finding for 2021/2022 on 27th February 2023 as per acknowledgement stamp</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 Annual Performance Contract was submitted on 14th August 2023 via online submission (PBS)</p>	<b>4</b>
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Annual Performance Report for the FY 2022/2023 was submitted on 3rd August 2023 via PBS online submission system</p>	<b>4</b>

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 MC submitted its quarterly budget performance reports as follows;

- Quarter 1 report was submitted on 21st December 2022
- Quarter 2 report was submitted on 13th February 2023
- Quarter 3 report was submitted on 18th May 2023
- And quarter 4 report was submitted on 3rd August 2023.

All the submissions were made within the timeline of 31st August 2023.

**Education 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 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 MC did not have a substantively appointed Principal Education Officer but Mr. Mangeni Aggrey an Education Officer was assigned duties of a Principal Education Officer on 3rd July, 2023 through letter reference CR/161/1, signed by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the CAO.	0
	<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The MC had 2 inspectors of schools and were appointed substantively, for example;  1. Barasa Godfrey Albert, a head teacher was substantively appointed as an Inspector of Schools on 23rd May, 2018 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 9/2018, signed by Godfrey.K. Kateeba the T.C.  2. Mangheni Godfrey was substantively appointed as an Inspector of Schools on 7th December, 2022as directed by the DSC Minute No. 29/2022, signed by Mr. Baganzi Ronald Ross the T.C	40
	<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>			
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was evidence of Environmental and Social Screening reports for the Education projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.</li> <li>• There were screening reports for;</li> <li>• • The renovation of 5 stance pit latrine for Boys and 5 stance pit latrine for Girls at Madibira Primary School dated 14/10/2022.</li> <li>• • The construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Busia Border Primary School dated 14/10/2022.</li> <li>• • The renovation of 10 stance lined pit latrine at Mawero East Primary School dated 14/10/2022.</li> </ul>	15
	<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>			

2

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

If the LG carried out:  
b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.

The Education projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 never required preparation of Full ESIA reports since they lie under Part 2 of schedule 4 of the National Environment Act no. 5 of 2019 there by requiring preparation of ESMPs to mitigate any anticipated impacts during screening.

The Maximum score is 30

There were ESMPs for;

- The renovation of 5 stance pit latrine for Boys and 5 stance pit latrine for Girls at Madibira Primary School dated 14/10/2022 and costed at UGX. 790,000/=.
- The construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Busia Border Primary School dated 14/10/2022 costed at UGX. 2,580,000/=.
- The renovation of 10 stance lined pit latrine at Mawero East Primary School dated 14/10/2022 costed at UGX. 685,000/=.

**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.	<b>30</b>  The MC had substantively appointed Mr. Ojom James as a Principal Medical Officer on 6th April, 2016 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 18/2016, endorsed by Godfrey .K. Kateeba the Town Clerk.
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.	<b>20</b>  Mr. Okurut Moses Gamit was substantively appointed as a Principal Health Inspector on 10th December, 2020 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 28/2020, signed by Okurut Vincent the Town Clerk.

1

New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

The Municipality did not have a substantively appointed Health Educator but Mr. Tom Ejiet, a Senior Nursing Officer was assigned duties of a Health Educator on 5th January, 2023 through letter reference CR/153/3, signed by Banganzi Ronald Ross the Town Clerk.

However the Municipality had written to the MoPS twice seeking for authority to fill this position but the ministry had not yet acted upon it.

The first letter was written on 29th September, 2022, through letter reference CR/156, signed by Baganzi Ronald Ross.

The second letter written to MoPS seeking for permission to recruit was on 14th/December/2023.

0

### **Environment and Social Requirements**

2

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

There was evidence of Environmental and Social screening reports for the Health projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 signed by the Environment Officer and CDO.

There were screening reports for;

- The Construction of a 4 stance Water borne toilet at Busia Municipal Council HCIV dated 11/10/2022.
- The construction of maternity ward (Extension for ground floor) at Busia Municipal Council HCIV dated 11/10/2022.
- The Construction of Busia Municipal Council HCIII (Safia HCIII) at Safia Village dated 17/10/2022.

15

Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out:

Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)

Maximum score is 30

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

The construction of Busia Municipal HCIII required preparation of an Environmental and Social Project Brief and submission to NEMA for review and approval since it lies under projects listed in Part 1 of schedule 4 of the National Environment Act no. 5 of 2019 (construction and expansion of HCIIIs and HCIVs). However, there was no evidence of the required Environmental and Social Project Brief instead only an ESMP was prepared.

The ESMP for the Construction of Busia Municipal Council HCIII (Safia HCIII) at Safia Village dated 17/10/2022 costed at UGX. 9,610,000/=.

However;

The other Health projects never required preparation of full ESIAs/ PBs after screening since they lie under Part 2 of Schedule 4 of the National Environment Act thereby requiring preparation of ESMPs after screening.

There were ESMPs for;

The Construction of a 4 stance Waterborne toilet at Busia Municipal Council HCIV dated 11/10/2022 and costed at UGX. 3,940,000/=.

The construction of maternity ward (Extension for ground floor) at Busia Municipal Council HCIV dated 11/10/2022 and costed at UGX. 8,540,000/=.

**Micro-scale Irrigation 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 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>	Not applicable	<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 score 30 or else 0.	Not applicable	<b>0</b>

**Water & Environment 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 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.	Not applicable for MLG	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable for MLG	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable for MLG	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Not applicable for MLG	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable for MLG	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable for MLG	<b>0</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
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.	Not applicable for MLG	<b>0</b>
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.	Not applicable for MLG	<b>0</b>

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. Not applicable for MLG