



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Butaleja District

(Vote Code: 557)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	57%
Education Minimum Conditions	40%
Health Minimum Conditions	30%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	50%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	49%
Educational Performance Measures	51%
Health Performance Measures	51%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	56%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	67%

**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>There was one infrastructure project implemented using DDEG, construction of the District Administration block. It being a multiyear phased project, its stage of construction had not reached a level to be utilized by the end users.</p>	<b>4</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>• 1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>• If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The LG did not have performance score for LLG assessment for 2022, however the score for 2023 was 87%, therefore there was no basis for comparison</p>	<b>0</b>

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>In the FY 2022/2023, Butaleja DLG planned the following outputs using DDEG;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of the District Administration Block under phase II</li> <li>2. Surveying and titling of land in the following institutions; Busolwe P/S, Buhabela P/S, Muyagu Foundation P/S, St. Mary's P/S, Kapisa P/S, Nampologoma HC II, Muhura P/S, Hisega P/S, Bugosa P/S, Bufuja P/S, Butaleja SS, Mazimasa P/S and Bingo HC II</li> <li>3. And procurement on an animal chaff cutter for the production department.</li> </ol> <p>Of the 3 planned investments, only the administration block was completed as per the work plan. The surveying and titling of the land in the various institutions was still an ongoing process and the animal chaff cutter was not procured, according to information obtained from the Production Department.</p> <p>All in all, only 1 out of the 3 planned investments was completed as per the work plan, representing a 33% completion.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>In the FY 2022/2023, Butaleja DLG planned the following investments using DDEG.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of the District Administration Block under phase II</li> <li>2. Surveying and titling of land in the following institutions; Busolwe P/S, Buhabela P/S, Muyagu Foundation P/S, St. Mary's P/S, Kapisa P/S, Nampologoma HC II, Muhura P/S, Hisega P/S, Bugosa P/S, Bufuja P/S, Butaleja SS, Mazimasa P/S and Bingo HC II</li> <li>3. And procurement on an animal chaff cutter for the production department.</li> </ol> <p>The LG, however, did not provide details of how much the DDEG budget was and how much had been allocated and / or spent on the above projects to determine whether the DDEG grant had been utilized as by the guidelines.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance	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,	The DDEG Project (Construction of Butalejja House) was done on Force on account, it was not contracted out to any contractor. It was executed by the district and supervised by the District Engineer.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	score 2 or else score 0		

(The LG had only one DDEG funded project according to the files and information availed to me by the Procurement and Engineer)

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	Accuracy of reported information	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,	There was sufficient evidence to show that the information on the position filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	score 2 or else score 0		

3 LLGs had been sampled that was; Butalejja S/C, Naweyo S/C and Nabiganda T/C.

Nabiganda Town Council:

The HRM staff list and the LLG staff list had 24 staff deployed at the S/C. For example, Nandi Hadijja as the Town Clerk, Nambuya Annet as the Senior Community Development Officer and Kawele Thomas as the Town Treasurer.

Butalejja Sub County:

The HRM and LLG staff lists had 12 staff deployed at the Sub County. For example, Gesa Tom as the Senior Assistant Secretary, Kigenyi Muhammed as the Senior Accounts Assistant and Weyabo Michael as the Community Development Officer.

Naweyo Sub County:

The HRM and LLG staff lists had 13 staff deployed at the Sub County. For example, Wasukira Enos as the Community Development Officer and the Ag. Senior Assistant Secretary, Kanghanyi Betty Mariam as the Accounts Assistant. .

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The two DDEG funded projects; the District Administration Block and caff cutter were in place as had been reported in the quarter 4 budget performance report, page 34 and 39 for 2022/2023</p>	2
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p><b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b></p>	<p>The 4 sampled LLGs were Busabi S/C, Busolwe S/C, Himutu S/C and Butaleja T/C. These had assessment results as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Busabi S/C scored 88% based on the assessment conducted by the DLG and 52% based on IVA. The deviation between the two was 36%.</li> <li>2. Busolwe S/C scored 81% based on the assessment conducted by the DLG and 69% based on IVA. The deviation was 12%.</li> <li>3. Himutu S/C scored 91% based on the assessment conducted by the DLG and 67% based on IVA. The deviation was 24%.</li> <li>4. And Butaleja T/C scored 87% based on the assessment conducted by the DLG and 72% based on IVA. The deviation was 15%.</li> </ol> <p>All the sampled LLGs had deviations outside the allowed +/-10%. Hence the assessment was 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>The District did not develop a performance improvement plan for the least performing 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 to show that the District had implemented the PIP for the 30% 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 District had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming Financial Year, 2024/2025 on 28th September, 2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
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 District Conducted a tracking analysis of staff attendance on a monthly basis during the Financial Year 2022/2023. For example, a tracking analysis report dated 8th July, 2022 covering the months July, August 2022 and September 2022.</p>	<b>2</b>

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

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

FY: Score 1 or else 0

The District had conducted an appraisal with some HoDs as per the guidelines issued by the MoPS during the Financial Year 2022/2023 as follows;

1. Mr. Taata Samson a Ag. District Planner, was appraised on 3rd July, 2023 by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO.

2. Ms. Were Lamula a District Natural Resources Officer was appraised on 20th June, 2023 by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO.

3. Ms. Dugo Amina, a District Production Officer, was appraised on 8th July, 2023 by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO.

4. Mr. Magombe Kassim a District Community Development Officer was appraised by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO on 5th July, 2023'

5. Mr. Akwoyo Stephen the Ag. District Health Officer was appraised on 5th July, 2023 by Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO.

6. Ms. Adeke Esther the Ag. District Education Officer was appraised on 27th July, 2023 by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO.

Those who were not appraised were;

1. Mr. Isiko Moses David the Chief Finance Officer was not appraised because he was on interdiction.

2. Mr. Wasige Richard the Ag. Engineer had no performance report.

3. Ms. Namugangu Annet Lyne the Ag. District Commercial Officer had no performance report.

Save for the DNRO, all other officers were appraised outside the set timelines which was non-compliance.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

The rewards and sanctions committee had handled various cases in the Financial Year under review. For instance;

The meeting held on 29th June 2023 in the water boardroom under Minute No. 04/7/2023 RSC Mr. Bwaga Patrick Andy a secondary school teacher had been sanctioned to be cautioned against abandonment of duty contrary to section F-S (2) (t), f-a (3) (4) of the public service standing orders.

The Officer thanked the committee for giving him the opportunity to express himself, he acknowledged the issue raised against him. He became sick and was not healthy as he expected to be and therefore became irregular school.

The committee recommended that Mr. Bwaga Patrick submits a written letter of apology explaining the issues raised against him and also be reinstated on the payroll and his residual arrears be paid accordingly.



7	Performance management	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.	The District had established a consultative committee on 1st September, 2023 which was functional and appointed members were;	1
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	Score 1 or else 0	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO as Chairperson</li> <li>2. Mr. Hyuha George the PHRO as Secretary</li> <li>3. Twaha Kirya the Land Officer as a Member</li> <li>4. Were Harriet the Senior Labour Officer as a Member</li> <li>5. Nesihwe Betty the Senior Probation and Welfare Officer as a Member</li> <li>6. Hadali Aggrey the District Inspector of Schools as a Member</li> <li>7. Omalla Godfrey a SAS as a Member</li> <li>8. Guloba Andrew a Member</li> <li>9. Gawagwa Stephen Mbaya a Member</li> <li>10. Higenyi Yokasin UNATO representative as a Member</li> <li>11. Tazanya Christine as a Member</li> <li>12. Gimbo Zabina as a Member</li> </ol>	
8	Payroll management	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:	The District had 104 staff recruited in the Financial Year 2022/2023 and not all accessed their salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. For example,	0
	Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	Score 1.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Kaawa Nangobi, Education Assistant was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in September, 2023.</li> <li>2. Kyaterekera Edith, Education Assistant was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in September, 2023.</li> <li>3. Hasahya Samuel, Education Assistant was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in September, 2023.</li> <li>4. Were Michael, Education Assistant was recruited in June</li> </ol>	

2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in August, 2023.

5. Nahyuha Lydia, Education Assistant was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in August, 2023.

Those who did not access in time were,

1. Kantono Evarine, Human Resource Officer was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in November, 2023.

2. Sabano Lydia, a Primary Health Care Worker was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in November, 2023.

3. Misanya Phoebe a Primary Health Care Worker was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in November, 2023.

4. Benjamin Wodeje, Education Assistant was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in November, 2023.

5. Yahaya Biiro , Education Assistant was recruited in June 2023, assumed duty in August, 2023 and accessed salary payroll in November, 2023

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 District had 43 staff who retired in the Financial Year 2022/2023 and not all accessed their pension payroll within 2 months. 10 out of 43 pensioners had been sampled. For instance;

1. Ms. Jenipher Namugawe an Education Assistant retired on 1st May, 2023 and accessed pension payroll in May 2023.
2. Ms. Christine Nassanga an Education Assistant retired on 10th May, 2023 and accessed in May, 2023.
3. Ms. Jenipher Mugaba a Senior Education Assistant retired on 12th March, 2023 and accessed pension payroll in May 2023.
4. Ms. Aisha Mutesi Mubeni an Education Assistant retired on 15th December, 2022 and accessed in February, 2023.
5. Ms. Dorothy Nangale a Nursing Officer retired on 1st December, 2022 and accessed in January, 2023.
6. Mr. Kizito Siraj a District Health Officer retired on 28th April 2023 and accessed April 2023.

Those who did not access in time were,

1. Henry Sagula, a Laboratory Assistant, retired on 22nd August, 2022 and accessed pension payroll in December 2022.
2. Grace Logose, a Senior Education Assistant, retired on 1st January, 2023 and accessed pension payroll in April 2023.
3. Florence Were Assistant Education Officer retired on 5th October, 2022 and accessed pension payroll in in May, 2023.
4. Mr. Patrick Segero, a Parish Chief retired on 12th January, 2023 and he has not yet accessed her pension payroll.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	The LG budgeted and transferred DDEG funds to the LLGs in accordance with the requirements of the budget as follows;	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In quarter 2, UGX 275,409,374 was budgeted and UGX 275,409,374 was released.</li> <li>2. In quarter 3, UGX 337,659,115 was budgeted and UGX 337,659,115 was released.</li> </ol>	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	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).	<p>DDEG funds were warranted to the LLGs as follows;</p> <p>For quarter 2, cash limit date was 13th October 2022, amount was UGX 275,409,374, and warranting was done on 13th October 2022. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>For quarter 3, cash limit date was 27th January 2023, amount was UGX 337,659,115, and warranting was done on 27th January 2023. This was within 1 working day.</p> <p>Warranting was done within 5 working days from the dates of cash limits.</p>	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous Financial Year to LLGs, quarter 2 was within 5 working days and quarter 3 was beyond 5 working days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 was invoiced on 19th October 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 3 was invoiced on 31st January, 2023.</p> <p>Naweyo Sub County:</p> <p>Quarter 2 was invoiced on 16th October, 2022 which was within 5 working days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 was invoiced on 23rd February, 2023 which was beyond 5 working days.</p> <p>Butaleja Sub County:</p> <p>Quarter 2 was invoiced on 17th October, 2022 which was in 5 working days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 was invoiced on 28th February, 2023 which was beyond 5 working days.</p> <p>Nabiganda Town Council:</p> <p>It was a newly established Town council and last financial Year 2022/2023 it was not functional.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had supervised and monitored all LLGs on a quarterly basis. In place were supervision and monitoring reports for the LLGs dated 18th July 2022 for quarter 1, 21st October 2022 for quarter 2, 16th March 2023 for quarter 3 and 30th May 2023 for quarter 4.</p>	2
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the TPC had discussed supervision and monitoring reports. These were discussed in the TPC meetings which were held on 12th October 2022, 25th January 2023, 18th May 2023 and 6th June 2023.</p>	2

**Investment Management**

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><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>	<p>The District had an assets register which covered details on buildings, vehicles and other fixed assets of the District as per the accounting manual last updated on 13th March 2023. Examples of assets contained included;</p> <p>Tractor acquired at a cost of UGX 180,000,000 allocated</p> <p>Hand working tractor at a cost of UGX 11,000,000</p> <p>Motorcycle acquired at a cost of UGX 4,000,000</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The board of survey report for FY 2021/2022 dated 15th August 2022 was in place, however there was no documentary evidence that the LG had used the said report to make assets management decisions including procurement of new assets and disposing off obsolete assets</p>	0
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 District Physical Planning Committee (PPC) 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 10th August 2022 were submitted to MoLHUD on 12th August, 2022.</p> <p>Minutes of the PPC meeting held on 5th December, 2022 were submitted on 12th December, 2022.</p> <p>Minutes of meeting held on 8th February, 2023 were submitted on 15th February, 2023</p> <p>And minutes of the PPC meeting held on 1st April, 2023 were submitted on 5th April, 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; Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG conducted desk appraisals for DDEG projects indicated below;</p> <p>Desk appraisal report for construction of District Administration block phase II dated 5th January 2023. This project was eligible expenditure and derived from LGDP page 114.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects: e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG conducted field appraisals for DDEG projects indicated below;</p> <p>Field appraisal report for construction of District Administration block phase II dated 29th September 2022.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG TPC discussed project profiles on 12th October 2022 under min. 4/10/23. Examples of projects for which project profiles were discussed included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Phased construction of Administration block amounting to UGX 4,500,000,000</li> <li>2. Completion of general ward at Budumba HCIII amounting to UGX 227,000,000</li> <li>3. And construction of 2 classroom at Bwiry P/s amounting to 98,000,000</li> </ol>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening reports for the current FY 2023/2024 DDEG financed projects.</p> <p>Partial Completion of Budumba HC III.</p> <p>Construction of GBV Shelter and CBS.</p> <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>PDU of the DLG had evidence that all infrastructure projects for current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan signed on 22nd Aug 2023 by the DCAO.</p> <p>Some projects included;</p> <p>Partial Completion of Budumba HCIII.</p> <p>Construction of GBV Shelter and CBS under.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had evidence of the Contracts Committee approving all DDEG Projects for current FY contained in a meeting dated 18th Aug 2023. The Projects included;</p> <p>Partial Completion of Budumba HCIII under MIN: BDCC/10/8/23(1)</p> <p>Construction of GBV Shelter and CBS under MIN: BDCC/10/8/23(12)</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not appoint a project implementation Team for DDEG Projects implemented during FY 2022/2023.</p>	0



13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence to show that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical design; Examples of visited project included;  Construction of Butalejja House had a 200mm block wall, 300mm round columns and 200mm by 300mm Columns which in accordance with the designs by the LG Engineer.	<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 Supervision reports by the Engineer, i.e.  Supervision and inspection report on construction of Butalejja House dated 7th Aug 2023, 14th Aug 2023, 21st Aug 2023.  (No evidence showed the supervision of other technical officers)	<b>0</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):  Score 1 or else score 0	The LG did the Project on Force on Account, construction and supervision was done by the DLG Technical people though they did not produce any verification and certifications for the project.	<b>0</b>
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	They did not undergo the Procurement process and therefore they had no Procurement files. (Talking of FY 2022/23, the DLG only had one DDEG project, and that was the Construction of Butaleja House)	<b>1</b>

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of an appointment letter the Grievance Focal Person Mr. Magombe Kassim (DCDO) dated 7/10/2022 from the former CAO Mr. Maley Ben Lawrence availed by Senior Labour Officer.</p> <p>There was evidence of appointment letters for the Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) members. These included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Fred Mukasa, current CAO (Chairperson).</li> <li>- Mr. Magombe Kassim, DCDO (Secretary).</li> <li>- Ms. Were Harriet, S. Labour Officer.</li> <li>- Ms. Musenero Hilder, Head teacher.</li> <li>- Ms. Nakimera Irene Sanyu, SHR.</li> <li>- Mr. Odeng George, Head teacher Nampologoma Primary School.</li> <li>- Ms. Alice Negesa, Chairperson Women Council.</li> <li>- Mr. Nangoli Godfrey, NGO World Vision.</li> </ul> <p>There were 4 sets of GRC meeting Minutes from meetings held on 16/8/2022, 17/03/2023, 29/06/2023 and 22/11/2022 at the Water Boardroom.</p>	2
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 Grievance log in the form of log sheets named "Case management register". However, the information was not clear for reference for on-ward action and the grievance redress framework from reporting to feedback was not well defined.</p> <p>There was no Grievance Redress Mechanism in place. The one availed had was just a statement that Register your complaint of Grievance Redress Committee to your Sub county focal person.</p>	0

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	There was no clear Grievance redress mechanism displayed with clear information on how the aggrieved party can report and get redress.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0	The one pinned on the Social Based Services (at DCDO's office) department was just a statement that Register your complaint of Grievance Redress Committee to your Sub county focal person with no clear referral and redress path.	
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that environment, social and climate change interventions had been integrated into the LG development plans, annual work plan and budget for FY 2023/2024. for instance the said issues were reflected on page 93 of the LGDP, and work plan page 22, in the budget page 42 and there was a budget provision of UGX 5,000,000	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	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	No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):	There was no evidence of the Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening report and ESMP for the DDEG financed project for FY 2022/2023.	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	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:	The construction of Butaleja House at the District Headquarters (Phased project).	
		score 3 or else score 0	Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	

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 one no ESMP availed to identify which Environmental, social and climate change impacts that were identified initially for the construction of Butaleja House to verify if there was any addition climate change impact that was identified and costed.	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	There was evidence of proof of land ownership for the land where Butaleja House was constructed.  The land title for 0.2290 hectares of land in Butaleja Town-Council on Plot 14, Buluba Road at Babone Cell dated 24/08/2021 was availed.	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 any monitoring report availed during assessment.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of an Environmental and Social compliance certificate for the construction of Butaleja House.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0

## Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Butaleja DLG had reconciled its accounts up to 30th June 2023. Examples of the accounts and their balances by that time were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Butaleja District General Fund account no. 0193501005650 in DFCU bank Mbale, closing balance was UGX -14,922,787</li> <li>2. Butaleja District UWEP Account no. 3100049173 in DFCU bank Mbale, closing balance was UGX 1,654,350</li> <li>3. And Budaka District Youth Livelihood account no. 001113650474191 Bank Mbale Branch, closing balance was UGX 10,279,270</li> </ol> <p>The LG was not compliant as reconciliation was supposed to have been done up to November 2023, which was the month preceding 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>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 LG produced all the quarterly internal audit reports during the FY 2022/2023. These were dated; 24th October 2022 for quarter 1, 19th January 2023 for quarter 2, 24th May 2023 for quarter 3 and 25th 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>There was no documentary evidence relating to the submission of information on the status of implementation of internal audit findings was availed to the assessment team for review</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 and LG PAC on 24th October 2022 for quarter 1, 19th January 2023 for quarter 2, 24th April 2023 for quarter 3 and 25th July 2023 for quarter 4.</p> <p>No evidence was provided to show that the LG PAC had reviewed any of the quarterly internal audit reports for 2022/2023.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

**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 440,000,000 Page 17 of draft final accounts</p> <p>Local revenue collected for FY 2022/2023 was UGX 99,452,014</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

Therefore, Budget realisation was 99,452,014/440,000,000 giving 22.6% resulting into a deficit of 77.4% which was outside the required range of +/-10%

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 562,404,936 FY 2021/2022 to UGX 99,452,014 FY 2022/2023 resulting in a decrease of UGX 462,952,922. Percentage decrease</p> <p>462,952,922/562,404,936x100, 82% decrease, this was attributed to lack of revenue registers, poor assessment, lack of revenue enhancement committee</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

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>No evidence was provided on sharing/remittance of local revenue collected to the Lower Local governments.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	--	--	--	----------

**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 2022/2023 were available, endorsed by CAO and Senior Procurement Officer, published on the procurement Notice Board at the District Headquarters. Sampled contracts included;</p> <p>Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Wangale P/S – was awarded to Maweman Enterprises Ltd as the contractor at a contract price of 28,784,330/= and BEB date was on 22nd December, 2022</p> <p>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Busaba Islamic P/S was awarded to Mumago Constructors and Technical Engineers Ltd as the contractor at a contract price of 85,374,500/= and BEB date was on 22nd December, 2022</p> <p>Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine for boys at Leresi P/S was awarded to Lynne General Services Ltd as the contractor at a contract price of 23,700,000/= and BEB date was on 22nd December, 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 Butaleja for 2022 were posted on the District website; <a href="http://www.budaka.go.ug">www.budaka.go.ug</a>, on 4th August 2023. The same were also displayed on the notice boards of the District.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG conducted discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation through;</p> <p>Radio talk show held on 22nd/10/2022 on Bugwere FM discussing measles rubella and child days and the main discussants were the District Health Inspector, District Health Educator and the cold chain technician</p>	1
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no publicising information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures at the District Notice boards or website</p>	0

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure

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

The LG did not have any IGG issues to respond to during the previous FY 2022/2023



**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, 5,013 pupils sat for PLE of whom 3,128 passed in divisions 1, 2, and 3. The pass rate was 62%.</p> <p>In 2022, 6,149 pupils sat for PLE and 3,399 passed in divisions 1, 2, and 3. The pass rate was 55%.</p> <p>There was a decline of 7% between the two years.</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, 973 students sat for UCE of whom 258 passed in divisions 1, 2, and 3. The pass rate was 27%.</p> <p>In 2022, 2,257 students sat for UCE and 270 passed in divisions 1, 2 and 3. The pass rate was 23%.</p> <p>There was a decline of 4% between the two school year.</p>	<b>0</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 LLG performance assessment results for FY 2022 were not availed, the results for FY 2023 were 93%, therefore there was no basis for comparison</p>	<b>0</b>

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0	The LG had a UGIFT grant of UGX 905,709,665. This was used for construction of Muhula Seed Secondary School.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		The LG also received an SFG of UGX 404,740,681. This was utilized as follows;	
			1. Construction of classroom blocks at Nampologoma P/S, Busaba Islamic P/S and Mulandu P/S all at UGX 183,908,851	
			2. Construction of latrines at Bugosa P/S, Leresi P/S, Wangale P/S, Busaba Project P/S and Malangha P/S all at UGX 78,906,855	
			3. Renovation of classrooms at Hasahya P/S, Busabi P/S, Nahagulu P/S and Hahoola P/S all at UGX 120,675,275	
			4. Completion of classroom at Bulinda P/S at UGX 14,150,660	
			5. And retention on 2021/2022 projects of UGX 7,098,947	
			All the development grant was utilized on eligible expenditure	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	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	There was evidence to show that the relevant Officers certified works before payments were made	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		1. On the payment certificate No. 1 dated 4th May 2023, for construction of Muhura Seed School, the DEO, District Engineer, CDO and Environmental officer all certified on 15th June 2023.	
			2. On the payment certificate dated 17th May 2023, for construction of a 2 classroom block at Nampologoma P/S, the DEO, District Engineer, CDO, Environment Officer all certified on 17th May 2023.	
			3. And on the payment certificate date 30th May 2023 for construction of a 2 classroom block at Mulando P/S, the DEO, District Engineer, CDO and Environmental Officer all had certified works on 30th May 2023.	
			All the required officers certified works before payments were made to the contractors.	

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled projects were as follows:	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineer's Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate)	
			Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Wangale P/S - was budgeted at UGX 30,000,000/=, actual contract price was UGX 28,784,330/= with a variation of UGX 1,215,670/= represented by 4.05%.	
			Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Busaba Islamic P/S was budgeted at UGX 85,000,000/=, actual contract price was UGX 83,347,500/= with a variation of UGX 1,652,500/= represented by 1.94%.	
			Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine for boys at Leresi P/S was budgeted at UGX 25,000,000/=, actual contract price was UGX 23,700,000/= with a variation of UGX 1,300,000/= represented by 5.2%.	
			In conclusion,	
			The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual.	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	The 4th quarter Budget performance report did not show the percentage of completion of the Project.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>		

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 information on staffing structure and staffing level for the primary schools was not availed for assessment.</p>	0
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>Butaleja LG had 102 primary schools and 13 secondary schools giving a total of 115 government schools;</p> <p>According to the consolidated assets register for 2022/2023, there were 1,341 classrooms, 891 latrine stances, 20,784 desks, 14 laboratories and 1,002 staff houses for the 102 primary schools and 269 classrooms, 338 latrine stances, 4,112 desks, 108 laboratories and 291 staff houses for the 13 secondary school.</p> <p>According to calculations done by the District Inspector of Schools and during the school inspection for term II 2023, 107 of the 115 government schools met the basic requirements and minimum standards set out in DES, giving 93%.</p>	3

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The education department accurately reported on all teachers and their deployment. From the sampled schools;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The staff list for Dube Rock P/S obtained at the Education Department had 24 teachers of whom 12 were male and 12 were female .</li> <li>2. Hasahya P/S staff list had 16 teachers of whom 5 were male and 11 were female.</li> <li>3. And the staff list for Nampologoma P/S had 30 teachers of whom 25 were male and 5 were female.</li> </ol>	2		
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>All the reported teachers in the staff lists at the Education office were found to be consistent with the staff that were deployed at the above three sampled schools, evidenced by the staff lists in the Head teachers' offices and the staff attendance registers.</p>	5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The consolidated assets register for the Education Department for the FY 2022/2023 captured all the school assets which included 1,341 classrooms, 891 latrine stances, 20,784 desks, 14 laboratories and 1,002 staff houses for the 102 primary schools, and 269 classrooms, 338 latrine stances, 4,112 desks, 108 laboratories and 291 staff houses for the 13 secondary schools.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>For the sampled schools, the consolidated assets register had the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nampologoma Primary School; 14 classrooms, 24 latrine stances, 205 desks and no staff house.</li> <li>2. Dube Rock Primary School; 12 classrooms, 12 latrine stances, 219 desks and 4 staff houses.</li> <li>3. And Hasahya Primary School; 6 classrooms, 9 latrine stances, 188 desks and no staff house.</li> </ol>	<p>The assets reported in the consolidated assets register for the Education Department was found to be consistent with the assets that were found in the sampled schools upon visiting the said schools.</p>				

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

All registered primary schools submitted their annual reports and budgets to the Education Department, complete with signatures of the Head teachers and SMC chair persons. Examples of schools that submitted their annual budget performance reports, work plans and budgets included;

1. Dube Rock Primary School
2. Nampologoma Primary School
3. Hasahya Primary School
4. Nasinyi Primary School
5. Leresi Primary School
6. Hahoola Primary School
7. Bulinda Primary School
8. Busibira Primary School
9. Bubbalya Primary School
10. And Busaba Project Primary School

It was noted however that the dates of submission of the said reports and budgets from the primary schools were not registered at the Education Department. It was therefore not possible to determine whether these had been submitted on time.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:

- If 50% score: 4
- Between 30- 49% score: 2
- Below 30% score 0

There was no documentary evidence at the District to show that the Education Department had supported schools in preparing and Implementation of the School Improvement Plans, much as in the sampled schools, SIPs had been prepared by the said schools.

6

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:

- If 100% score: 4:
- Between 90 - 99% score 2
- Below 90% score 0

Butaleja District had 102 UPE schools and 13 secondary schools. In the EMIS data submitted by the LG to the Ministry of Education and Sports, on 2nd December 2023, there was evidence that data for all the 115 schools had been collected and compiled, representing 100%.

According to the EMIS data compiled, there were 117,913 pupils in all the 102 primary schools and 10,027 students for the 13 secondary schools.

Also the list of schools submitted was consistent with the list of schools in the performance contract.

4

## Human Resource Management and Development

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

a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:

Score 4 or else, score: 0

The LG had a wage budget of UGX 9,915,281,605 as per the Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2023/2024. This was to cater for 102 head teachers and 1,338 classroom teachers.

4

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>From the staffing list obtained from the Education Department, it was observed that all schools had a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers as per the staffing guidelines which required that each school had a headteacher and a minimum of 7 teachers for schools going up to P7.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>From the sample schools;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dube Rock Primary School had a head teacher and 23 teachers.</li> <li>2. Nampologoma Primary School had a head teacher and 29 teachers.</li> <li>3. And Hasahya Primary School had a head teacher and 15 teachers.</li> </ol>	
			<p>All the above sampled schools were up to Primary Seven.</p>	
7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Teacher deployment data was displayed at District notice boards. Also in the sampled schools which included Hasahya P/S, Dube Rock P/S and Nampologoma P/S, teacher deployment data was displayed in the respective head teachers' offices.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all primary school head teachers had been appraised in the Financial Year 2022/2022.</p> <p>The District had 102 appraisal reports for head teachers and 10 were sampled, for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ms. Lunyolo Annet head teacher, Queen of Peace primary school was appraised on 9th September, 2022 by Mr. Wasukira Enos Ag. SAS Naweyo Sub County.</li> <li>2. Ms. Nyaddi Christine head teacher, Busaba Project primary school was appraised on 18th December by Mr. Lujja Mayiland SAS Busaba Sub County.</li> <li>3. Mr. Sanya Humphrey head</li> </ol>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			



teacher Busolwe Township primary school was appraised on 15th December, 2022 by Koire Asuman Edube Town Clerk Busulwe Town Council.

4. Ms. Nawibo Irene Magambo head teacher Memorial primary school was appraised by Hibombo Apollo SAS on 14th September, 2022 .

5. Mr. Odeny George head teacher Nampologoma primary school was appraised on 5th December, 2023 by Nandi Hadijja Nbiganda Town Council.

6. Higenyi Peter Isaac head teacher Namawa Primary school was appraised on 6th December, 2022 by Nabwire Magret SAS Kachonga Sub County.

7. Mr. Hasaya Wilson head teacher Kapisa primary school was appraised on 30th December, 2022 by Omalla Godfrey SAS.

8. Nanringhi Betty head teacher Bubbalya primary school was appraised by Himbo Apollo on 30th December, 2022.

9. Tazanya Christine head teacher Busibira primary school was appraised by Gesa Tom SAS Butaleja S/C on 30th December, 2022.

10. Masyeze Keefa head teacher Mawanga primary school was appraised by Nabwire Magret Ag. SAS Kachonga S/C on 30th December, 2022.

It was noted that some head teachers were appraised early, in September 2022, barely before the year ended.

8

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

There was no evidence about the appraisals reports of secondary school head teachers at the time of assessment. The Principal Human Resource Officer acknowledged that the secondary school Head teachers don't submit the appraisal reports to the LG.

0

8

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 2. Else, score: 0

0

The staff in the Education department had been appraised against their performance plans in the Financial Year 2022/2023. For example;

1. Mr. Musima Sumaya Education Officer was appraised by the Ag. DEO Ms. Adeke Ester on 27th July, 2023.

2. Ms. Akol Janet Christine an Inspector of Schools

was appraised by Ms. Adeke Ester on 25th July, 2023.

3. Mr. Hadali Aggrey an Inspector of Schools was appraised by Ms. Adeke Ester the Ag. DEO on 26th July, 2023.

4. Mr. Wandera Albert David a sports officer was appraised by Ms. Adeke Ester the Ag. DEO on 26th July, 2023.

5. Ms. Adeke Ester the Ag. DEO was appraised by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence CAO on 19th July, 2023.

All appraisal reports were done past the required timeframe of 30th June.

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level, score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Education Department had a training plan for FY 2022/2023 dated 20th February 2023. In it, the Department planned to train School Management Committee members and BoG on policy issues in education, roles of SMC and BOG, and how to enhance performance in schools 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. If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG wrote to the Ministry of Education and Sports on 2nd December 2023, confirming the lists of UPE and USE schools and their enrollment data which included a total of 117,913 for UPE and 10,027 for USE.</p>	2
---	---	--	---	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The department received an inspection and monitoring grant of UGX 54,552,848 which was allocated as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. UGX 14,700,000 was allocated towards the DEO's monitoring</li> <li>2. And UGX 39,852,848 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>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence relating to School's capitation was provided at the time of assessment</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>UPE capitation releases according to the DEO were communicated in head teacher's meetings. However, the minutes during which the said communications were made were not availed for assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Inspection planning meetings were held on 5th October 2022 for term III 2022, 29th March 2023 for term I 2023 and 23rd August 2023 for Term II 2023.</p> <p>The education department also had prepared inspection plans for term 3, 3 2022, Term 1 2023 and term 2 2023 (all not dated).</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>The LG has a total of 102 registered UPE schools. The schools were inspected and monitored as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Term 3, 2022 102 schools; 100%</li> <li>2. Term 1, 2023 54 schools; 53%</li> <li>3. Term 2, 2023 48 schools; 47%</li> </ol> <p>The overall percentage for the three terms is 67%.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Education Department discussed inspection reports for term III 2022 and term I 2023 under Min. no. 2/19/7/2023, and the following were the recommendations made;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There was need to allocate more resources for teacher's recruitment, and construction of classrooms in most schools to reduce on the unbearable ratios</li> <li>2. School head teachers needed to be regular and committed to their responsibilities.</li> <li>3. There is need for constant involvement of parents in the affairs of the schools.</li> <li>4. And Head teachers needed to mobilize and encourage teachers to have schemed and plans before teaching among others.</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>
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 Education department prepared inspection reports which were dated 7th October 2022 for term III 2022, 19th July 2023 for term I 2023 and 9th September 2023 for term II 2023.</p> <p>No evidence however, waw provided to show that the inspection reports above had been submitted to DES.</p>	<b>0</b>

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0

The committee responsible for education sat and discussed service delivery issues during the previous FY as follows;

Q1 meeting held on 13th September 2022 under minute 10/educ/09/2022 and discussed the following key issues, inadequate staff due to lack of a functional DSC

Q2 meeting held on 27th November 2022 under minute 15/Educ/11/2022 and discussed the following key issues ordinance on ending child marriages and teenage pregnancies

Q3 meeting held on 28th March 2023 under minute 20/Educ/03/2023 and discussed the following key issues; delays in procurement processes

Q4 meeting held on 16th May 2023 under minute 25/Educ/05/2023 and discussed the following key issues; inadequate classrooms for schools within the District

11

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

*Maximum 2 points on this performance measure*

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,

*score: 2 or else score: 0*

There was evidence that the Education Department had conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children in school. This was done via radio talk shows which were conducted as follows;

1. On 16th November 2022, the DEO and the District Sports Officer held a radio talk show on Big FM Radio Mbale between 7:00PM and 8:00PM and the topic of discussion was; enrolling all learners into school (nursery, primary and secondary schools.

2. On 23rd November 2022, the DEO and District Sports Officer held another radio talk show on Bugwere FM between 7:00PM and 8:00PM and the topic of discussion was access, retention, and completion of learners in government and private schools.

3. On 15th June 2023, the DEO held a talk show on Open Gate FM Mbale between 6:00PM and 7:00PM and the topic of discussion was rolls of different stakeholders in the enrollment of learners in schools.

## **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 Education department had an up to date consolidated assets register with the following; 1,341 classrooms, 891 latrine stances, 20,784 desks, 14 laboratories and 1,002 staff houses for the 102 primary schools, and 269 classrooms, 338 latrine stances, 4,112 desks, 108 laboratories and 291 staff houses for the 13 secondary schools.</p> <p>For the sampled schools;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nampologoma Primary School; 14 classrooms, 24 latrine stances, 205 desks and no staff house.</li> <li>2. Dube Rock Primary School; 12 classrooms, 12 latrine stances, 219 desks and 4 staff houses.</li> <li>3. And Hasahya Primary School; 6 classrooms, 9 latrine stances, 188 desks and no staff house.</li> </ol>	2
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>No documentary evidence was provided to show that a desk appraisal had been conducted for the Education Sector projects.</p>	0
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>No documentary evidence was provided to show that a field appraisal had been conducted for the Education Sector projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no Seed Secondary School incorporated in the FY 2023/24 Approved Procurement Plan.</p>	1



13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was evidence of the school infrastructure that was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General;  MoES – UGIFT/wrks/2021-2022/00005 Construction of Muhula Seed Secondary School. Contracts Committee approval of the Project Under Min:612/DCC/2022of meeting that sat on 04th March 2022. The solicitor General clearance was on 05th Aug 2022.	<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 LG did no appoint a Project Implementation Team for the works executed during FY 2022/2023.	<b>0</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 evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the Mo ES for Muhula Seed Secondary School.  For the few sampled areas;  The roofing iron sheets were gauge 26 as required by the design  The classroom dimensions were 8810x6970mm as in the design.  Main Entrance doors were 1200x2400mm  Windows on the classroom block were 1200x1500mm as shown on the MoES designs.	<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 evidence of some site meetings that were conducted, but the meetings were not held on a monthly basis as laid out below.  Minutes of site meetings dated, 15th Dec 2022, 17th Mar 2023 and 19th June 2023.	<b>0</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There were no supervision reports availed to the assessment team.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show that projects were executed and contractors were paid within time frame of 2 months;</p>	1
			<p>1. Voucher N0 5898884 dated 15th June 2023 to M/s. Custom Engineering Company limited for construction Muhura Seed school, contractor raised request on 17th April 2023, Certificate N01 dated 4th May 2023 was signed by DEO, DE, CDO, Environmental officer and Internal Auditor and payment was effected on 15th June 2023, after 28 working days</p> <p>2. Vouchor N0, 5900460 dated 15th/06/2023 to Ndagogaba Consultants Company Ltd for construction of 2 classroom with office at Mpologoma P/s, contractor raised request on 2nd May 2023, certificate dated 17th/05/2023 signed by DEO, DE, CDO, Environment Officer and payment effected on 15th June 2023, after 31 working days</p> <p>3. Voucher No. 6415542 dated 27th June 2023 amounting to UGX 10,046,590 to Ndinayisa civil network Ltd for construction of 2 classroom block at Mulando P/s, contractor raised request for payment on 28th/05/2023, certificate dated 30th May 2023 was signed by DEO, DE, CDO, Environment Officer and payment effected 27th June 2023, after 21 working days</p>	
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 LG Education department submitted its Procurement Plan on 22nd May 2022 which was past the deadline according to PPDA Law.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0	There evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school Infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA  MoES – UGIFT/wrks/2021-2022/00005 Construction of Muhula Seed Secondary School. Approval of the evaluation report Under Min:612/DCC/2022 of the contracts committee which sat on 04th March 2022. The contract was awarded to M/s Custom Engineering Ltd and the Contract was signed on 30th Aug 2022.	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0	In the centralized grievance log no complaints were recorded from the implementation of Education projects for the FY 2022/2023 as none arose during the implementation process.	<b>3</b>
15	Safeguards for service delivery.  <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation  <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	The Department confirmed that they had not disseminated any Education guidelines on Environment. In the sample Schools that is; Dube Rock, Nampologoma and Hasahya Primary Schools the same guidelines were not available during the time of assessment.	<b>0</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0	There were no ESMPs availed during assessment time to verify their incorporation in their respective ESMPs.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	<b>0</b>

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was not any documentary evidence in the form of land ownership documents for the primary schools where projects were implemented.	<b>0</b>
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There was not any evidence of monitoring reports availed during assessment.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	<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>	No information availed  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	<b>0</b>

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG did not register a 20% higher population accessing health care services.</p> <p>The sampled health facilities had the following deliveries</p> <p>FY 2021-2022</p> <p>Nabiganda HCIV - 1451</p> <p>Naweyo HC III 792</p> <p>Nakwasi HC III 440</p> <p>TOTAL 2683</p> <p>FY 2022-2023</p> <p>Nabiganda HC IV - 1364</p> <p>Naweyo HC III 703</p> <p>Nakwasi HC III 369</p> <p>TOTAL 2436</p> <p>%age change = <math>(2436 - 2683)/2683 * 100\%</math></p> <p>= - 9.2%</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 98%</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 was 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 variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled projects were as follows:</p> <p>Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineer's Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))</p> <p>Buta 826/wrks/22-23/00015 Partial Completion of a general Ward at Budumba HCIII was Budgeted at 94,317,925/=, actual contract price was UGX 92,024,100/= with a variation of 2,293,825/= represented by 2.43%.</p> <p>MoH/UGIFT/Wrks/22-23/00001 Partial Construction of Mazimasa HCIII was Budgeted at 920,000,000/=, actual contract price was UGX 889,255,031/= with a variation of 30,744,969/= represented by 3.34%</p> <p>In conclusion,</p> <p>The variations were 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>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 4th quarter Budget performance report had no clear indication of the Completion status of the projects. Therefore, it was hard to tell if the project was complete as per the work plan or not.</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 variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled projects were as follows:</p> <p>Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineer's Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate))</p> <p>Buta 826/wrks/22-23/00015 Partial Completion of a general Ward at Budumba HCIII was Budgeted at 94,317,925/=, actual contract price was UGX 92,024,100/= with a variation of 2,293,825/= represented by 2.43%.</p> <p>MoH/UGIFT/Wrks/22-23/00001 Partial Construction of Mazimasa HCIII was Budgeted at 920,000,000/=, actual contract price was UGX 889,255,031/= with a variation of 30,744,969/= represented by 3.34%</p> <p>In conclusion,</p> <p>The variations were 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>The 4th quarter Budget performance report had no clear indication of the Completion status of the projects. Therefore, it was hard to tell if the project was complete as per the work plan or not.</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 District had 10 HC III and 1 HC IV and had recruited staff for all HC III and HC IV as per the staffing structure.</p> <p>HC III had a ceiling of 190, filled was 147</p> <p>HC IV had a ceiling of 48 and filled was 35 that is,</p> <p><math>190+48 = 238</math>, <math>35+147= 182</math></p> <p><math>182/238*100 = 76.4\%</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 LG health infrastructure project met the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs; For the Construction of Mazimasa HCIII</p> <p>Sampled areas included;</p> <p>The iron sheets were of 26 gauge.</p> <p>Entrance Verandah was 2.4m in width</p> <p>Male ward was 3.5x5m</p> <p>The Record room was 2.2mx1.8m.</p> <p>All the above areas were in correspondence to the MoH technical 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 DHOs office, the information was accurate for the sampled health facilities as detailed below.</p> <p>Nabiganda HC IV had 36 staff on the DHO's deployment; this was similar to the facility list.</p> <p>Naweyo HC III had 15 staff on the deployment list and at the facility it also had the same number of staff displayed.</p> <p>Nakwasi HC III had 16 staff on the deployment list and the same staff were found on the facility list which was pinned on the notice board.</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>There was no facility constructed or upgraded during FY 22/23</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 Performance Improvement support.</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 health facilities submitted Annual work plans of FY 2023/24 to the DHO timely as stated below</p> <p>Nabiganda HC IV submitted on 31st/3/2023</p> <p>Nakwasi HC III submitted on 31st/3/2023</p> <p>Naweyo HC III submitted on 23rd/3/2023</p>	2
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>This evidence was not provided</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>This evidence was not provided</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end</p>	<p>Health facilities submitted monthly HMIS 105 and 106 quarterly reports as detailed below. Some reports were not submitted on time.</p>	2

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

of each month and quarter) If 100%,

- score 2 or else score 0

July 2022

Nabiganda HCIV - 6/8/2022

Naweyo HCIII - 5/8/2022

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/8/2022

August 2022

Nabiganda HCIV - 6/9/2022

Naweyo HCIII - 6/9/2022

Nakwasi HCIII - 5/9/2022

September 2022

Nabiganda HCIV - 5/10/2022

Naweyo HCIII - 6/10/2022

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/10/2022

October 2022

Nabiganda HCIV - 6/11/2022

Naweyo HCIII - 6/11/2022

Nakwasi HCIII - 4/11/2022

November 2022

Nabiganda HCIV - 4/12/2022

Naweyo HCIII - 6/12/2022

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/12/2022

December 2022

Nabiganda HCIV - 6/1/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/1/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/1/2023

January 2023

Nabiganda HCIV - 5/2/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/2/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 4/2/2023

February 2023

Nabiganda HCIV - 6/3/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/3/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/3/2023

March 2023

Nabiganda HCIV - 4/4/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/4/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/4/2023

April 2023

Nabiganda HCIV - 4/5/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 5/5/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/5/2023

May 2023

Nabiganda HCIV - 6/6/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/6/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/6/2023

June 2023

Nabiganda HCIV - 5/7/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/7/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/7/2023

Quarterly 106

July-Sept 2022

Nabiganda HCIV - 5/10/2022

Naweyo HCIII - 6/10/2022

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/10/2022

Oct-Dec 2022

Nabiganda HCIV - 6/1/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/1/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/1/2023

Jan-March 2023

Nabiganda HCIV - 4/4/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/4/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/4/2023

April-June 2023

Nabiganda HCIV - 5/7/2023

Naweyo HCIII - 6/7/2023

Nakwasi HCIII - 6/7/2023

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>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> <p>The report for quarter 1 was submitted on 14th December 2022</p> <p>The quarter 2 report was submitted on 25th February 2023</p> <p>The quarter 3 report on 15th April 2023</p> <p>And quarter 4 report on 2nd August 2023 .</p> <p>Only the quarter 3 report was submitted within the timeline of end of the first month of the following quarter, the rest were submitted outside the timeline.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	---------------------------------------	----------

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided</p>	<b>0</b>
---	--	--	---------------------------------------	----------

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG budgeted Ugx 7,299,114,000/= in FY 2023/24 for 352 health staff as detailed in the annual budget on page 24 of the PBS annual budget for FY 2023/24</p>	<b>2</b>
---	---	---	---	----------

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 66.5% 352 staff positions were filled out of the required 529.</p>	0
	<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 for the 3 sampled health facilities</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Nabiganda HC IV had 36 staff on the DHO's deployment list and 33 staff could be found on the facility attendance register. 3 staff were on study leave.</p>	
			<p>Naweyo HC III had 15 staff on the DHO's deployment list and 13 staff could be found on the facility attendance register. 2 staff were on study leave.</p>	
			<p>Nakwasi HC III had 16 staff on the DHO's deployment list and 8 staff could be found on the facility attendance register, 1 staff was on annual leave, 1 staff was on sick leave and 1 staff was on maternity leave at the time of assessment.</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.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>From the 3 sampled health facilities Nabiganda HC IV had 36 staff on the DHO's deployment list and this was publicised on the facility notice board.</p>	
			<p>Naweyo HC III had 15 staff on the deployment list and this was publicised on the facility notice board.</p>	
			<p>Nakwasi HC III had 16 staff on the deployment list and this was publicised on the facility notice board.</p>	

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

There was evidence that the District had conducted appraisals on some Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans, for instance;

1. Wabbula Moses Mugwabi a Senior Clinical Officer at Kangalaba HCIII was appraised by Owor Godfrey Samuel a SAS on 6th July, 2023 .

2. Amusungut Sarah an Assistant Nursing Officer at Bugalo HCIII was appraised by Wangira Wilson a SAS on 27th June, 2023.

3. Maliro Rogers William an Assistant Nursing Officer was appraised on 10th July, 2023 by Hibombo Apollo SAS Busolwe S/C .

4. Gumula Ivan Kakuku a Senior Clinical Officer was appraised on 3rd July, 2023 by Lujja Mayiland SAS.

5. Muwanga Mariam, a Senior Clinical Officer was appraised on 29th September, 2023 by Wosukira Enos SAS Naweyo S/C.

6. Mukama Nathan was appraised on 1st July, 2023 by Wagira Wison

Those who were not appraised were,

1. Kagoda Tonny, a Nursing Officer.

2. Etyang Denis a Senior Clinical Officer.

However, majority of appraisals were conducted past the deadline of 30th June, 2023.

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. 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>The Health Facility In-charges had appraised the Health facility workers against the agreed performance plans in the Financial Year 2022/2023 as indicated below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jamuhenge Judith Enrolled Midwife Buteleja HCIII was appraised by Nambuga Proscovia on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>2. Wetali Brenda Enrolled Midwife Busabi HCIII was appraised by Kagoda Tonny a Senior Clinical Officer on 12th June, 2023.</li> <li>3. Tino Lydia Enrolled Nurse was appraised by Makana Lawrence Medical Clinical Officer on 26th June, 2023.</li> <li>4. Bukenya Fred a Laboratory Technician Busolwe Hospital was appraised by Maliro Jackson Vicks a Senior Clinical Officer on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>5. Byogero Zainabu a Health Assistant was appraised by Hasahya Joseph a Senior Clinical Officer on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>6. Kasana Suzan Enrolled Nurse was appraised by Lyaka Juliet Enrolled Nurse on 13th June, 2023.</li> <li>7. Lunyolo Violet Enrolled Midwife Butaleja HCIII was appraised by Namboga Proscovia Assistant Nursing Officer on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>8. Twanza Esther Enrolled Midwife was appraised by Kakungulu Joel Assistant Nursing Officer on 30th June, 2023.</li> <li>9. Mughairwa Thomson Porter was appraised by Odongo William Laboratory Assistant Nabiganda HCIV on 30th June, 2023.</li> </ol>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>According to the appraisal reports there was no evidence of any corrective actions taken.</p>	0



8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence on conducting training of health workers</p>	<b>0</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>This evidence was not provided</p>	<b>0</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 (GoJ 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 CAO communicated to the Ministry of Health PS through a letter dated 29th/8/2023 detailing 24 health facilities receiving Non-wage PHC grant. The letter was received by MoH on 6/9/2023.</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 DHO' s office the LG allocated UGX 5,787,000 towards monitoring of service delivery and management out of the total PHC non-wage recurrent budget of UGX 10,080,000. This amounted to 58%.</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>Details of warranting of PHC NWR grant to the health facilities was not provided at the time of assessment.</p>	0
	<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>Details of invoicing and communication of the PHC NWR grant transfers were not provided for assessment.</p>	0
	<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>The LG did not provide evidence that release of PHC NWR grant had been publicized</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>	<p>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>This evidence was not 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>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>This evidence was not provided</p>	<b>0</b>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG supervised HC IVs' and hospitals as detailed below.</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q1 Nabiganda HC IV supervised on 14th/9/2022; Mulagi HC IV supervised on 15th/9/2022; Busolwe Hospital supervised on 13th/9/22</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q2 Nabiganda HC IV supervised on 18th/11/2022; Mulagi HC IV supervised on 18th/11/2022; Busolwe Hospital supervised on 16th/11/2022</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q3 Nabiganda HCIV supervised on 20th/3/2023; Mulagi HC IV supervised on 20/3/2023; Busolwe Hospital supervised on 15th/3/2023</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q4 Nabiganda HCIV supervised on 20th/6/2023; Mulagi HC IV supervised on 14th/6/2023; Busolwe Hospital supervised on 12th/6/2023</p>	<b>1</b>
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>The HSD carried out support supervision</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q1 Naweyo supervised on 28th/7/2022, Nakwasi supervised on 27th/7/2022, Kachonga supervised on 4th/8/2022</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q2 Naweyo supervised on 18th/10/2022, Nakwasi supervised on 17/10/22, Kachonga supervised on 12th/10/2022</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q3 Naweyo supervised on 18/1/23, Nakwasi supervised on 17th/1/2023, Kachonga supervised on 12th/1/2023</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q4 Naweyo supervised on 26th/6/2023, Nakwasi supervised on 20/6/23, Kachonga supervised on 23rd/6/2023</p>	<b>1</b>

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>This evidence was not provided</p>	0
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 LG carried our medicines management supervision to facilities as detailed below.</p> <p>MMS - SPARS support supervision reports to the DHO detailed below had all health facilities supervised on medicines management submitted by MMS Otaget Gideon</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q1 on 19th/10/2022</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q2 on 12th/1/2023</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q3 on 7th/4/2023</p> <p>FY 2022/23 Q4 on 14th/7/2023</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 LG allocated UGX 3,822,000 towards health promotion and prevention activities out of the total PHC non-wage recurrent budget of UGX 5,500,000. This amounted to 69%.</p>	2
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT/CHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities was not provided</p>	0

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	Evidence of follow—up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues was not provided	<b>0</b>
	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 LG had an Asset register at the DHO’s office. Facilities sampled had the equipment needed as per the basic standards  Nabiganda HC IV Asset register dated 25th/7/2023 had a microscope, weighing scale, oxygen cylinder, and height metre.  Nakwasi HC III- Asset register dated 27th/7/2023 had a BP machine, stethoscope and weighing scale.  Naweyo HC III - Asset register dated 27/7/23 had a BP machine, stethoscope and weighing scale.	<b>1</b>
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII); (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):	There was evidence that LG carried out desk appraisal as per the reports below  Desk appraisal report for completion of General ward at Budumba HC III dated 10th/2/2023  Desk appraisal report for construction of Mari Masa HC III dated 10th /2/2023  All the projects were derived from LGPD page 152	<b>1</b>
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else score 0		

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>There was evidence that LG carried out field appraisal as per the reports below</p> <p>Field appraisal report for completion of General ward at Budumba HCIII dated 16th/3/2023</p> <p>Field appraisal report for construction of Mari Masa HCIII dated 16th /3/2023</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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 were Environmental and Social Screening reports and costed ESMPs for only two of the four Health projects for the Current FY 2022/2023 signed by the DCDO and Environment Officer.</p> <p>There were screening reports and ESMPs for;</p> <p>The construction of a 2-stance pit latrine with bathroom at Madungha HCII dated 09/08/2023 and costed ESMP at UGX. 4,687,000/=.</p> <p>The Construction of a 2-stance pit latrine with bathroom at Nakasanga HCII dated 10/08/2023 and costed ESMP at UGX. 4,687,000/=.</p> <p>However;</p> <p>There were no screening reports and ESMPs for;</p> <p>The repair of DHO's water borne toilets and water connection.</p> <p>The fencing of Bugalo HC II.</p> <p>The above copies/ information was availed by the Sector Accountant Health.</p> <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Health department timely submitted all its infrastructure requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan,</p> <p>As per a copy of the health sector Procurement Plan for FY 2022/23 prepared by the DHO, date of submission to PDU 30th April 2023 which was before 30th April as required by PPDA laws. Below were the planned projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Completion of general Ward at Budumba HC III</li> <li>● Construction of 2 stance pit latrine at Naksanga HC II</li> <li>● Repair of DHO’s office waterborne toilet</li> <li>● Fencing of Bungalo HC III</li> <li>● Partial Completion of OPD at Mazimasa HC III</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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; that was on 4th September, 2023.</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Contracts Committee approved the Construction of Mazimasa HCIII Under MIN:634/DCC/2022 of the sitting that took place on 04th October, 2022 and the project was cleared by the Solicitor General, signed and stamped on 14th December, 2022</p>	<b>1</b>

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG did not appoint a Project Implementation Team for all Health projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health infrastructure project met the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs; For the Construction of Mazimasa HCIII</p> <p>Sampled areas included;</p> <p>The iron sheets were of 26 gauge.</p> <p>Entrance Verandah was 2.4m in width</p> <p>Male ward was 3.5x5m</p> <p>The Record room was 2.2mx1.8m.</p> <p>All the above areas were in correspondence to the MoH technical designs</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>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence of some reports from the Clerk of Works for the construction of Mazimasa HC III dated 30th June 2023, 31st May, 2023, 30th April, 2023, 15th April, 2023, but Budumba HC III Had no Progress reports from the Clerk of Works.</p>	0



13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility, the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that showed they Held site meetings on 31st January, 2023 and 26th June, 2023 but these meetings were not monthly.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no Supervision Reports availed.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that LG verified works and initiated payments to the contractors within the required 2 weeks as follows;;</p> <p>Payment voucher NO. 5905175 dated 15th June 2023 amounting to UGX 82,447,200 to Khaupe Beverages and contractors for roofing of Budumba HCIII, contractor raised request on 25th/05/2023 and the payment was initiated by the DHO on 1st /06/2023. This was within the timeline of 2 weeks.</p> <p>Payment voucher NO,6909414 dated 27th June 2023 amounting Ugx 263,568,627 to M/s Baisonga and sons Co Ltd for construction of Mazi Masa HC III, contractor raised request on 21st/06/2023 and the payment was initiated by the DHO on 22nd June 2023. This too was within the timeline of 2 weeks.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. Examples include;	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure		MoH-UgiFT/wrks/22-23/00001 Construction of Mazimas HC III; was awarded to M/s Baisonga and sons Co. Ltd as the contractor. Approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 14th October, 2022 Under minute number MIN: 634/DCC/2022 and Contract signing was done on 02nd January, 2023.	
			Buta 826/wrks/22-23/00015 Partial Completion of a general ward at Budumba HCIII; was awarded to M/s Khaupe Beverages and Contractors Ltd as the contractor. Approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 22nd December, 2022 Under minute number MIN: BDCC/32/12/2022 (i) (6) and Contract signing was done on 27th January, 2023.	

### Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	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	In the centralized grievance log no complaints were recorded from the implementation of Health projects for the FY 2022/2023 as none arose during the implementation process.	2
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0	There was evidence of Guidelines on Medical/ Health care waste management. However; there was no evidence of the dissemination of the guidelines to the Health Facilities and the evidence on follow up of their implementation. The contact person informed the Assessor that these documents were under lock and key and the responsible person had gone to Mbale for a workshop.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHO's Office informed the assessor that there was a contracted registered company to handle medical waste (collection, transportation and final disposal) that was, M/s Green Label Services Ltd. however it picks from Busolwe Hospital only however, the waste transfer forms were not availed.</p> <p>But still as the other option of medical waste management;</p> <p>There was evidence of incinerators as another option in absence of a waste collector picking waste from a particular facility. There was an incinerator at Nabuganda HC IV, Naweyo HC III and Nakwasi HC III.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no training report on medical waste management availed by assessment time.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The costed ESMPs for the health projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023 were not incorporated in their BoQs/ contract documents.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of proof of land ownership for land where the Health projects for FY 2022/2023 were implemented.</p> <p>There was a land sale agreement for Mazimasa HCIII and a land title for Budumba HCIII (lies on Budumba Sub-county land) for 11.7530 hectares of land in Bunyole West on Plot 214, Block 3 at Nyabuyanja dated 28/11/2018.</p>	2

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	There were no monitoring reports availed for the Health projects implemented in the FY 2022/2023.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence of Environmental and Social Compliance Certificates for two Health projects.  The Environmental and Social Compliance Certificate for the Construction of OPD at Mazimasa HC III dated 20th/06/2023 and signed by the Environment officer and DCDO.  However;  The Environmental and Social Compliance Certificate for the roofing of OPD at Budumba HC III was completed and signed after contractor payment.  The Environmental and Social Compliance Certificate for the roofing of OPD at Budumba HC III signed on 20th/06/2023 by the Environment Officer and DCDO whereas the contractor was paid on 15th/06/2023.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The functionality of rural water sources was 92% according to the MIS data report for 2022/2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The functionality of water and sanitation committees was 95% according to the MIS data report for 2022/2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The average score for LLG under water and environment was not provided at the time of assessment.</p>	<b>0</b>

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The safe water access at the time of preparation of the Annual Work Plan for 2022/2023 was 60%. The sub counties with safe water coverage below this were; Butaleja S/C at 53% and Muzimasa at 53%.

The District Water Office implemented the following projects in the Financial Year 2022/2023.

1. Napindo community borehole in Budumba Sub County

2. Bulimba community borehole in Butaleja Sub County

3. Magengere community borehole in Himutu Sub County

4. Mahindu community borehole in Himutu Sub County

5. Nabigo community borehole in Himutu Sub County

6. Leseri community borehole in Butaleja Town Council

7. Butunga community borehole in Butaleja Town Council

8. Hanjehe community borehole in Butaleja Town Council

9. Nasinyi B community borehole in Naweyo Sub County

10. Budira community borehole in Naweyo Sub county

11. Kato community borehole in Mazimasa Sub County

12. And extension of Nabiganda piped water scheme in Mazimasa Sub County.

5 of the 12 implemented water projects were in the sub counties with safe water access below that of the District, amounting to 41.7%.

Note that according to the DWO, Butaleja Town Council which was supposed to benefit from Urban Water did not have National Water and as such continued to benefit from the District Rural Water Grant.

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If within +/-20% score 2</li> <li>o If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Three contracts in the Water department were assessed and had variations as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extension of Nabiganda piped water system was estimated and UGX 208,000,000 and was contracted at UGX 207,763,000. The variation was 0.1%</li> <li>2. Borehole siting and drilling (6 No.) was estimated at UGX 162,000,000 and was contracted at UGX 146,816,400. The variation was 9.4%.</li> <li>3. And borehole siting and drilling (5 No.) was estimated at UGX 135,000,000 and was contracted at UGX 123,725,000. The variation was 8.4%</li> </ol> <p>All variations were within +/- 20% of the engineer's estimates.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</li> <li>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the work plan for 2022/2023, Butaleja planned to drill 11 new boreholes, rehabilitate 12 boreholes, and extend the Nabiganda piped water system. All the planned 24 water projects were implemented before the end of the financial year indicating 100% completion.</p> <p>In addition to the planned WSS infrastructure projects above, the District also drilled 1 extra borehole and rehabilitated another using money that was saved on procuring of the contractors for the planned facilities.</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If there is an increase: score 2</li> <li>o If no increase: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The functionality of rural water sources was 91% in 2021/2022 and 92% in 2022/2023. There was an increment of 1%.</p>	2

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>The functionality of water and sanitation committees was 94% in FY 2021/2022 and 95% in FY 2022/2023. There was an increment of 1%.</p>	<b>1</b>
---	---	--	--	----------

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>The facilities visited in the field included the water kiosk at Nampologoma trading centre (on Nabiganda piped water scheme), Nabigo community borehole in Himutu Sub County and Butunga community borehole in Butaleja Town Council. All the sampled facilities were in place and were functioning as had been reported in the fourth quarter report.</p>	<b>3</b>
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG water office collected quarterly information on sub county water supply and sanitation evidenced by the quarterly form 4 monitoring reports for the sub counties of Busabi, Kachonga, Naweyo, Nawanjofu, Busolwe, Busolwe T/C and Mazimasa seen on file.</p>	<b>2</b>
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO updated the District MIS on a quarterly basis. There were quarterly District MIS reports which were dated; 14th October 2022 for quarter 1, 4th January 2023 for quarter 2, 30th March 2023 for quarter 3 and 30th June 2023 for quarter 4.</p>	<b>3</b>



5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LIG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>No evidence was provided at the time of assessment</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water &amp; Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation &amp; hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) &amp; 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District Water Officer had budgeted for Civil Engineer (Water), Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization and Sanitation, Engineering Assistant (Water) and Borehole Maintenance Technician.</p> <p>However, the planner acknowledged that the budget did not specify allocations for sectors all was allocated to administration.</p>	0
---	---	--	---	---

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer had budgeted for the Environment Officer, Forestry Officer and Natural Resources Officer. However, the Planner acknowledged that the budget did not specify allocations for sectors all was allocated to administration.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>Mr. Wasige Richard, the DWO and also acting District Engineer was appraised by Mr. Himigu Herbert, the Deputy CAO on 25th July 2023. This was outside the timeline of end of June.</p> <p>There were no other staff in the Water Department to be appraised.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>Following appraisal of the DWO, no capacity needs gaps were identified to call for capacity training.</p>	3
---	--	---	--	---

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

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> </li> </ul>	<p>The safe water access for Butaleja District was 60% at the time of preparation of the Annual Work Plan for FY 2023/2024 . The sub counties which had their safe water access below that of the District were Butaleja at 53%, Mazimasa at 52% and Nawanjofu at 59%.</p> <p>For the Financial Year FY 2023/2024, Butaleja District planned the following water infrastructure projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extension of Nabiganda piped water system in Mazimasa and Kachonga Sub County at UGX 190,294,804</li> <li>2. 11 new boreholes each at UGX 27,500,000 in the sub counties of Naweyo (2), Busolwe (2), Budumba (2), Butaleja (1), Butaleja T/C (2), Himutu (1), Mazimasa (1) and Kachonga (1).</li> <li>3. 1 production well in Himutu Sub County at UGX 45,000,000</li> <li>4. Design of Nalusaga Township piped water system in Himutu S/C at UGX 12,000,000</li> </ol> <p>UGX 244,794,804 was allocated to the underserved sub counties out of the development budget of UGX 644,460,804 (less of retention). This amounted to an allocation of 38.0 %.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

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

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

Communication was made during sub county advocacy meetings according to a report on the same which was dated 30th November 2023. According to the DWO, the water source allocation lists for the respective sub counties and town councils were shared during those meetings as follows;

The meeting for Budumba S/C was held on 25th October 2023 and was informed of its allocation of a single borehole in Wenge village.

The meeting for Busolwe S/C was held on 20th October 2023 and was informed of its allocation of a single borehole in Bubalya North village

The other allocations included 1 borehole allocated to Butaleja Sub County in Mulandu Village and 1 to Mazimasa at Kapisa village among others.

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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

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

- If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2

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

Quarterly monitoring reports were seen for the following sub counties; Busabi, Kachonga, Naweyo, Nawanjofu, Busolwe, Busolwe T/C and Mazimasa, which collectively had a total of 399 point water sources out of the total of 691. There was evidence that only 57.7% of the water facilities had been monitored in each of the 4 quarters.

The monitoring reports not seen were for the sub counties of Budumba, Busaba, Butaleja, Butaleja T/C and Himutu.

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>The DWO conducted DWSCC meetings on 3rd November 2022 for Q1, 11th January 2023 for Q2, 6th April 2023 for Q3 and 7th July 2023 for Q4. In the minutes of said meetings, isolated issues identified during routine monitoring were discussed; for example, communities that were not willing to pay for piped water systems and those willing to give land among others.</p> <p>However, key issues like the number of functional/ non-functional water facilities and water and sanitation committees per sub county, being the major items monitored on, were not discussed in any of the four quarterly meetings.</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>The water source allocations per sub county for the Financial Year 2023/2024 were displayed on the notice board of the District Water Office. The allocations included; 2 boreholes to Naweyo Sub County, 1 borehole to Mazimasa Sub County, and extension of Nabiganda piped water system in Mazimasa and Kachonga Sub Counties among others.</p>	2
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DWO allocated UGX 28,458,156 towards software activities, out of the NWR budget of UGX 71,145,388. This amounted to an allocation of 40.0%.</p>	3

- 10 Mobilization for WSS is conducted  
*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*
- 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.
- Training of water and sanitation committees was conducted on 25th January, 2023 for Butaleja Sub County, 24th January 2023 for Butaleja Town Council, 28th January 2023 for Budumba Sub County, and 27th January 2023 for Himutu Sub County among others. The content of the training included the roles of each of the committee members which included collection of O&M funds and working with the hand pump mechanics for minor repairs for the chairperson, organizing community meetings for the secretary, and keeping financial records by the Treasurer among others.
- For the sampled boreholes which included Nabigo borehole in Himutu S/C and Butunga borehole in Butaleja T/C, the interviewed committee members agreed that the said trainings had been conducted and also demonstrated recall of the said information which included collection of user fees and conducting meetings.
- For the piped water system, the kiosks installed were run privately by the operators who collected water fees per jericans collected and as such, were not considered community water points to require a water user committee.

### Investment Management

- 11 Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively  
*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*
- a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0
- The LG had an assets register with all point water sources in the District. It was also up to date with facilities which were implemented in the Financial Year 2022/2023 which included; Mahindu BH in Himutu S/C, Bulimba BH in Butaleja S/C, Nabigo BH in Himutu S/C and Nasinyi A BH in Naweyo S/C among others.

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDP/III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not provide documentary evidence to the assessment team for review</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>In place were community applications for projects planned for the FY 2023/2024. Examples of applications included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mululu A village in Busolwe S/C applied for a borehole on 21st November 2023.</li> <li>2. Namulo village in Himutu S/C applied for a borehole on 4th July 2023.</li> <li>3. Wenge village in Budumba S/C applied for a borehole on 5th July 2023.</li> <li>4. Kasui village in Butaleja S/C applied for a borehole on 5th June 2023</li> <li>5. And Namubi village in Butaleja S/C applied for a borehole on 4th June 2023.</li> </ol>	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that field appraisals were done for water sector projects as indicated below;</p> <p>Report on field appraisal for siting, drilling, casting and installation of hand pumps dated 13th July 2023</p> <p>Report on field appraisal for siting, drilling, casting and installation of 1 production well dated 4th July 2023</p> <p>Report on field appraisal report on extension of Nabiganda piped water system dated 7th July 2023</p>	2

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>No information availed during the Assessment.</p> <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure investments for previous FY were incorporated in the LG procurement plan endorsed by CAO on 11th August, 2022. Projects included;</p> <p>Extension of Nabiganda Piped water system</p> <p>Siting, Drilling, Pump testing, Casting and Installation of 5 Boreholes (Lot 2)</p> <p>Siting, Drilling, Pump testing, Casting and Installation of 6 Boreholes. (Lot 1)</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure projects for the FY 2022/2023 were approved by the contracts committee before commencement as indicated below.</p> <p>Extension of Nabiganda Piped water system Ref: Buta 826/wrks/2022-2023/00038. Approval of the evaluation report by the Contracts Committee was done Under Min: BDCC/16/10/2022 (3) was done on 04th Oct 2022</p> <p>Siting, Drilling, Pump testing, Casting and Installation of 5 Boreholes (Lot 2). Ref: Buta 826/wrks/2022-2023/00002. Approval of the evaluation report by the Contracts Committee was done Under Min: BDCC/16/10/2022 (2) was done on 04th Oct 2022</p> <p>Siting, Drilling, Pump testing, Casting and Installation of 6 Boreholes. (Lot 1). Ref: MBAL891/works/2022-2023/00001. Approval of the evaluation report by the Contracts Committee was done Under Min: BDCC/16/10/2022 (1) was done on 04th Oct 2022</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the WSS infrastructure projects for the previous FY were approved by the contracts committee and appointment made by the CAO on 20th July 2022 before commencement of works, but the Team was not Properly Constituted because it lacked the Clerk of works.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>The Team Members included; Wasige Richard Ag. DE/DWO Wandera Tom (Environment) Magombe Kasimu (CDO) Were Harriet (Labour Officer) Isogoli Henry (Health Inspector)</p>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>For Nabiganda piped water system (extension) a total of 5 water kiosks were built. The design dimension was 3.2 by 3.2m. The kiosk at Nampologoma trading centre was measured and this had a dimension of 2.34 by 1.88m hence not constructed as by the design issued to the contractor.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>The LG. Did not have Supervision reports</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>			



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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2

o If not score 0

There was evidence to show that DWO verified works and made payments within timeframe

1. Payment voucher N0.KLRJUN03 dated 15th June 2023 amounting to UGX 111,343,500 to KLR ( U) Ltd for drilling of 5 bore holes with Butaleja District, contractor raised request on 17th March 2023, certificate signed by DWO, CDO, environment officer on 10th April 2023 and payment was effected on 15th June 2023. This was outside the timeline of 2 months.

2. payment voucher No. hand 22 dated 27th June 2023 amounting UGX 19,298,200 to District hand pumps mechanics association for borehole rehabilitation works, contractor raised request on 21st June 2023, certificate signed by DWO, CDO, environment officer on 21st June 2023 and payment was effected on 27th June 2023, after 5 working days and within the timeline of 2 months.

3. payment voucher No. Aqua-may01 dated 15th June 2023 amounting to UGX 13,421,300 to M/s Aquatect Enterprise (U) Ltd for bore hall drilling and installation, contractor raised request on 15th May 2023, certificate signed by DWO, CDO, Environment officer on 15th May 2023 and payment was effected on 15th June 2023, after 21 working days and within the timeline of 2 months.

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

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

The DLG had evidence of complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments as required by PPDA law;

Extension of Nabiganda Piped water system Ref: Buta 826/wrks/2022-2023/00038. Approval of the evaluation report by the Contracts Committee was done Under Min: BDCC/16/10/2022 (3) was done on 04th Oct 2022. The contract was given to Shelter Hitech Ltd and the Contract was signed on 21st Oct 2022.

Siting, Drilling, Pump testing, Casting and Installation of 5 Boreholes (Lot 2). Ref: Buta 826/wrks/2022-2023/00002. Approval of the evaluation report by the Contracts Committee was done Under Min: BDCC/16/10/2022 (2) was done on 04th Oct 2022. The contract was given to East Africa Boreholes Ltd and the Contract was signed on 21st Oct 2022

Siting, Drilling, Pump testing, Casting and Installation of 6 Boreholes. (Lot 1). Ref: MBAL891/works/2022-2023/00001. Approval of the evaluation report by the Contracts Committee was done Under Min: BDCC/16/10/2022 (1) was done on 04th Oct 2022. The contract was given to KLR Ltd and the Contract was signed on 11th Nov 2022.

## Environment and Social Requirements

Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework

*Maximum 3 points this performance measure*

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

In the centralized grievance log no complaints were recorded from the implementation of Water projects for the FY 2022/2023 as none arose during the implementation process.

14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of Guidelines on Water Source Protection and there was evidence of their dissemination to CDOs by the DWO and Environment Officer as evidenced from the minutes from Social Mobilisers meeting held on 26th/09/2023 at Butaleja District Headquarters.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>No information availed during assessment.</p> <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the District implemented water facilities on land with proof of consent from the land owners. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Walita Wilber of Budira village in Naweyo S/C gave land for a borehole on 20th December 2022.</li> <li>2. Manghundo Sylvester of Kato village in Mazimasa Sub County gave land for a borehole on 21st November 2022</li> <li>3. Were Matia of Mulagi village in Busaba S/C gave land for a borehole on 8th January 2023.</li> <li>4. Ochal Emmanuel of Bulimba village in Butaleja S/C gave land for a borehole on 5th January 2023</li> <li>5. And Bore Michale of Hanjehe village in Butaleja T/C gave land for a borehole on 20th December 2022 among others.</li> </ol>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There were no Environmental and Social Compliance certificates completed and signed by the DCDO and the Environment Office availed to compare against the contractor payment certificate dates.</p> <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.</p>	0

Safeguards in the  
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on  
this performance  
measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

No information availed during  
assessment.

Both the Environment Officer and  
CDO were not available neither  
represented for the two days of  
Assessment.

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Butaleja district had up to date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between microscale beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries as below</p> <p>FY 2021/20222</p> <p>microscale beneficiaries had 0 acres and non-beneficiaries where at 7024 acres of land</p> <p>FY 2022/2023</p> <p>microscale beneficiaries had 7.5 acres and non-beneficiaries were at 7581 acres of land as per report 19/01/2022.</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Butaleja district had increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY 2022/2023 acres as compared to previous FY but one FY, there was an increase of 564.5 acres.</p> <p>percentage increase=8.03%</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The average score for Butaleja DLG in LLG assessments for FY 2022/2023 was 89%</p>	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0	Not applicable, Butalega was a phase 2 DLG at the time of assessment FY 2022/2023 where the micro scale grant was 100% complementary.	2
Maximum score 6				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable for Butaleja district was a phase 2 DLG at the time assessment.	1
Maximum score 6				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>The variations in the contract price were within/-20% of the Agricultural Engineers estimates, where;</p> <p>contract price (for all the 3 sites) was 68,725,556/=</p> <p>Engineers estimates (for all the 3 sites) was 68,100,000/=</p> <p>Percentage variation = (68,100,000 - 68,725,556)</p> <p>variation was -625,556</p> <p>percentage variation was -0.9%</p>	1
Maximum score 6				

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY	There was evidence that micro—scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed and completed within the previous FY.	2
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	The completion certificate of works (for all the 3 demonstration sites) was awarded to satisfy completion of supply and installation of microscale equipment which had commenced on 02/03/2023 was completed on 22/06/2023. payment was done after verification of the sites on 27/06/2023 as per the payment Voucher No: 5905749 for the contract Agreement signed on 16/11/2022	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure	The LG had recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure. The staff list had a ceiling of 75 extension workers and filled were 20.	0
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	$20/75 * 100 = 26.6\%$ That was below 75%	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF	From the 3 sampled demo sites, the micro-scale irrigation equipment was not in line with the standards as defined by MAAIF, for example;	0
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	At Busabi S/C (Mandaa James - the host farmer) had 3 systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rain gun -0.5 acres</li> <li>● Drag hose -0.5 acres</li> <li>● Drip irrigation -0.25 acres</li> </ul> The tank assembly involved; a metallic tank stand, a tank of capacity 5000 litres. <p>There was a submersible solar powered pump.</p> The demo site lay out and establishment was as per Engineers design.	

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

From the 3 sampled demo sites, there was evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY were 100% functional.

For example,

At Busolwe demo site ( Nandi Grace the -host farmer), there were 3 irrigation systems, two hydrants distributed 30 m apart for drag horse and 18 sprinklers spaced at 8m between the sprinklers and 10m between the laterals, Drip line with a coupling at each line and all were functional at the time of assessment.

Drag hose irrigation was on 0.5 acres, with 2 water hydrants functional.

2

### 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

The Information on the position of extension workers filled was accurate. Three LLGs were sampled, Butaleja S/C, Naweyo S/C and Nabiganda T/C.

Butaleja Sub County:

The HRM staff list not dated had 3 extension workers Hiisa George Nyangale an Agriculture Officer, Mutume Tito as an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer and Othieno Polycarp as a Bee Assistant Master.

The LLG staff list revealed the same Information.

Naweyo Sub County:

The HRM and LLG staff lists had 2 extension workers Wooli Yoweri as an Assistant Agriculture Officer and Metenga Julius as an Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer..

Nabiganda Town Council:

The LLG had 2 extension workers who were caretakers Negesa Jack Veterinary Officer and Wooli Yoweri Assistant Agricultural Officer which information tallied with that at the DPO.

2



5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the 3 sampled demo sites, there was evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY were 100% functional and inaccurate. ( insufficient pressure to support sprinkler irrigation technology.)</p> <p>For example,</p> <p>At Busolwe demo site ( Nandi Grace-host farmer), there were 3 irrigation systems, two hydrants distributed 30 m apart for drag horse and functional.</p> <p>18 sprinklers spaced at 8m between the sprinklers and 10m between the laterals functional but not accurate due to low pressure i.e. throw radius of 2m,</p> <p>Drip line with a coupling control at each line functional and accurate.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of Complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest as below;</p> <p>During one, the Ddistrict had not received funds,</p> <p>During quarter 2 report dated 19th/02/2023, the Ddistrict started on complementary services as per the target action plan with awareness raising of local leaders where 227 people participated.</p> <p>During quarter 3 report dated 19th/04/2023, there were awareness raising for farmers where 1655 farmers participated, EOI was 403 where 339 were successful and 64 unsuccessful, conducted 64 farm visits, of which 58 where successful,5 on going and 1 unsuccessful.</p>	2

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	The LG had entered up to-date LLG information into MIS where for example Muyonjo Josepoh from Nawanjofu S/C was registered on 07th/11/2023 with a total EOI= 426 surpassing the target of 224	1
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	During quarter 1 and 2, no EOI was registered and no farm visit was conducted.  During Quarter 3, 64 farm visits were conducted, EOI was 403 of which 339 were registered successful.	1
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	No evidence was available at the time of assessment.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	No evidence was available at the time of assessment.	0

## Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	The LG had budgeted UGX 130,512,600 /=for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norm.	1
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	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	According to sampled LLGs the LG did not deploy extension workers as per the guidelines. The staffing norms of a Sub County was 3 extension but Butaleje and Naweyo S/C had 2 extension workers	0
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	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	<p>Three LLGs were sampled, Naweyo S/C, Butaleja S/C and Nabiganda T/C and it was evident that extension workers were working in the LLGs they were deployed. For example;</p> <p>Naweyo Sub County:</p> <p>The HRM and LLG staff lists had 2 extension workers deployed at the sub county Wooli Yoweri Assistant Agricultural Officer and Metenga Julius Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer.</p> <p>All their names appeared in the attendance book and had submitted a copy of monthly monitoring reports to the SAS.</p> <p>Butaleja Sub County:</p> <p>The HRM and LLG staff lists had 3 extension workers deployed at the sub county, Hiisa George Nyangale Agriculture Officer, Mutume Tito Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer and Otheino Polycarp Bee Assistant Master.</p> <p>All their names appeared in the attendance book and had submitted a copy of monitoring reports to the SAS.</p>	2
Maximum score 6				

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

In all the 3 sampled LLGs it was evident that the deployment of extension workers had been publicised and disseminated to LLGs by displaying the staff list on the LLG notice board.

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

Maximum score 4

a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:

i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0

The District Production Coordinator had conducted a performance appraisal of all extension workers against the agreed performance plans.

However, most of the appraisals were conducted past the deadline of 30th June. For example;

1. Mutenga Julius Godfrey AAHO was appraised by Wosukira Enos Ag. SAS Naweyo S/C on 30th June, 2023.

2. Wabeyi Eri AAHO was appraised by Hussein Falib Mulongo SAS Busabi S/C on 24th October 2023.

3. Mutenge Godfrey AAO was appraised by Owor Samuel Godfrey SAS Himutu S/C on 17th July, 2023.

4. Mbogo Andrew AAO was appraised by Owor Samuel Godfrey SAS Himutu S/C on 16th August, 2023.

5. Atwooki Christine AO was appraised by Mr. Waweyo Abdunass Mudanya T/C Butaleja T/C on 27th June, 2023.

6. Mutusa Yonnah Agricultural Officer was appraised by Kazaabu Sylvia SATC Busolwe Town Council on 13th August, 2023.

7. Dr. Twebaze Ndahayo Jackson Veterinary Officer was appraised by Mr. Waweyo Abdunass Mudanya Town Clerk Butaleja Town Council on 13th July, 2023.

8. Mutume Tito AAHO was appraised by Gesa Tom SAS Butaleja S/C on 30th June, 2023.

9. Were Fred AO was appraised by Wangira Wilson SAS Nawanjovu S/C on 30th June, 2023.

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	According to appraisal reports corrective actions were taken like dogs and cats were vaccinated.	1
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	Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level as evidenced by awareness creation on MSI under UgiFT that was held 11th/11/2022 where 77 people participated according to 4 attendance sheets.	1
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	There was no evidence that the training activities were documented in the training database.	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	The LG had appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant Ugx 599,009,646 between;  (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment) 75% was Ugx 449,257,235  (ii) complementary services 25% was Ugx 149,752,412	2
---	--	--	---	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The budget allocations made towards complementary services were in line with the sector guidelines i.e.</p> <p>(i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture was Ugx 37,438,103 (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders was Ugx 22,462,862 and maximum 10% procurement. Monitoring and Supervision was Ugx 14,975,241)</p> <p>(ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers. Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools) was Ugx 112,314,309</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The co—funding of Ugx 500,000,000 was reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines in the work plan for the FY 2023/2024 vote 826 page 22 of 63.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Butaleja district was a phase 2 DLG at the time assessment.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding as evidenced by the minute to meeting held on 11th/11/2022, Min v which involved presentation on overview of MSI project.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>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>	<p>There was evidence that the DPO had monitored the installations on monthly basis for example</p> <p>Monitoring report dated 27th/03/2023 where it was reported that the contractor had started on works and had requested to first complete the two sites so that he would be paid some money before he would proceed.</p> <p>Monitoring report dated 26th/04/2023, the contractor had completed part of the installations for the two demo sites, where installation works were started on 02nd/03/2023 and were expected to be completed by 30th/05/2023.</p> <p>Monitoring report dated 30th/05/2023, The two sites were completed with drag horse and drip technologies functional except that the pressure for the sprinklers was low and works at the other sites had commenced.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable for Butaleja which was a phase 2 DLG at the time of assessment/ No approved farmers.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as evidenced by a joint sensitisation meeting on MSI project that was held on 14th/10/2022 where 31 extension workers including the CDO participated according to 2 attendance sheets</p>	2



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 for Butaleja district which was a phase 2 DLG at the time of assessment	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.  Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was awareness creation and enrolment of farmers on MSI at LLG report dated 18th/06/2023, where for example 309 farmers participated according to 15 attendance sheets.	2
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	There was an awareness creation conducted in Bingo Parish which targeted technical staff and political leaders at District and LLG level which was held on 28th/02/2023 where 447 people participated.	2

### 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	No evidence was provided.	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines  Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	The LG had an up-to—date database of applications for both current and previous FY, for example  Lyada Syodo Stephen from Kachonga T/C registered on 17th/02/2023  Nakasi Jacqueline Sheila from Busaba S/C registered on 02nd/01/2023.  Muyonjo Joseph from Nawanjofu S/C registered on 07th/11/2023	2

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	Farm visits were conducted and farmers signed agreement forms to proceed for quotation.	2
	Maximum score 8		For example  Musemba Alfred signed on 19th/04/2023  Gwali Agrey signed on 17th/04/2023  Munghesi Stephen signed on 23rd/11/2023	
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	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	According to the sampled Sub Counties there was no proof that the District Agricultural Engineer had publicized eligible farmers that were approved by posting on the LLGs noticeboards.	0
	Maximum score 8			
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.	There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan endorsed by the CAO on approved on 22nd Aug 2023 for the FY 2023/24 stated as;	1
	Maximum score 18		Design, Supply and Installation of Micro Scale irrigation Systems.	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	There LG did not request for quotation from prequalified suppliers but they advertised for open Bidding on 15th Aug 2023 in the new vision.	0
	Maximum score 18			

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>There was evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria. I.e.; in the evaluation report, technical compliance selection Methodology was used i.e. screening through the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Preliminary stage</li> <li>· Detailed Evaluation</li> <li>· Financial comparison</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were approved by the Contracts Committee. Below were the approved projects.</p> <p>Proc Ref: Buta 826/wrks/2022-2023/00002 Supply and installation of 3 Small scale irrigation systems. Approval of Evaluation Report was on 04th October 2022 Under Min: BDCC/16/10/2022 (22).</p>	<b>1</b>
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Two firms responded to the invite, that is; M/s Namika Investments Ltd (65,570,450) and Rain Kan General Consults Ltd. Rain Kan General Consults Ltd (87,586,680) failed in the Preliminary stages and Namika was found Compliant through the Detailed stage and coincidentally it was the Lowest priced technically responsive bidder.</p>	<b>2</b>

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 because Phase 2 DLGs received standard designs from MAAIF.	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	Sites were supervised as regularly as evidenced by the site books For Example demonstration sites in Busabi S/C were monitored on 07th/05/2023 and 20th/06/2023 on progress and verification of the installations.	2
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	There was a verification report of 03 irrigation technologies dated 22nd/06/2023 which was done after installation of all the sites contracted by M/s Namika Investment Ltd	1
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	There was an evidence of delivery, supply, and installation of Low pressure Low-pressure sprinklers, drag horse etc. irrigation technologies report which was verified by DPO and SAE on 15th/05/2023	1
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	Information was not provided at the time of assessment	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with oil records required by the PPDA Law</p> <p>Proc Ref: Buta 826/wrks/2022-2023/00002 Supply and installation of 3 Small scale irrigation systems. Approval of Evaluation Report was on 04th October, 2022 Under MIN: BDCC/16/10/2022 (22). The Contract was awarded to M/s Namika Investments Ltd and agreement signed on 16th November, 2022.</p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

**Environment and Social Safeguards**

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a GRM displayed on the production department at the time of assessment.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>In the centralized grievance log no complaints were recorded from the implementation of Micro-scale irrigation projects for the FY 2022/2023 as none arose during the implementation process.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>In the centralized grievance log no complaints were recorded from the implementation of Micro-scale irrigation projects for the FY 2022/2023 as none arose during the implementation process.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>In the centralized grievance log no complaints were recorded from the implementation of Micro-scale irrigation projects for the FY 2022/2023 as none arose during the implementation process.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	---	--	--	----------

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>In the centralized grievance log no complaints were recorded from the implementation of Micro-scale irrigation projects for the FY 2022/2023 as none arose during the implementation process.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	---	---	--	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of dissemination of MSI guidelines as per the minutes to the meeting that was held at the production department on 11th/11/2022, MIN V.</p> <p>Some farmers also signed MOUs, for example Nandi Grace signed on 17th/02/2023.</p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no Environmental and Social Screening reports availed by assessment time.</p> <p>There were no ESMPs availed by assessment time to verify their incorporation in the contract document/ BoQ.</p> <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	--	---	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	No information availed during assessment.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	No information availed during assessment.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	No information availed during Assessment.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District had substantively appointed Mr. Isiko Moses David as the Chief Finance Officer on 25th May, 2021 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 55/2021(d)(i), signed by Lucy Frances Amulen, the CAO.	<b>3</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The District did not have a substantively appointed District Planner however, Mr. Taata Samson, a substantive Senior Planner was assigned duties of a District Planner on 6th January, 2022 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 101/2021(a) (iii), signed by Nambozo Loyce Joyce the CAO.	<b>0</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Mr. Wasige Richard, the Civil Engineer (Water), was assigned duties of the District Engineer on 11th October, 2022 through letter reference CR/101/1 endorsed by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO.	<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	Ms. Were Lamula was substantively appointed as the District Natural Resources Officer on 30th May, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 25/04/DSC/2023(b), signed by the CAO Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence.	<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	Ms. Dugo Amina was substantively appointed as the District Production Officer on 16th April, 2019 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 2/2019 (16), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.	<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.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The District had substantively appointed Mr. Magome Kassim as the District Community Development Officer on 15th March, 2021 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 29/2021 endorsed by the CAO Mr. Lucy Frances Amulen.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District did not have a substantively appointed District Commercial Officer but Ms. Namugangu Annet Lyne a Senior Commercial Officer was assigned in acting capacity as a District Commercial Official on 24th May, 2023 through letter reference CR/161/1 endorsed by the CAO Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence.	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.	Mr. Hibbombo Kainan was substantively appointed as the Senior Procurement Officer on 28th July, 2010 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 32/2010 (b), signed by the CAO Mr. Ndifuna Mathias.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	Ms. Hatemere Sarah was substantively appointed as the Procurement Officer on 20th July, 2016 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 17/2016(1), endorsed by the CAO Mr. Ekachelan Esau.	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The District had substantively appointed Mr. Hyuha George as the Principal Human Resource Officer on 19th March, 2018 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 29/2018 (7), endorsed by the CAO Mr. Alex Felix Majembe.	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	This position was not filled at the time of assessment and there was no formally seconded person from Central Government to fill the vacancy.	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>According to the approved structure of Butaleja DLG of 7th June, 2017 they did not have the position of a Senior Land Management Officer but had a Land Management Officer.</p> <p>Mr. Kiirya Twaha was substantively appointed as the Land Management Officer on 19th March 2018 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 29/2018 (2), signed by the CAO Mr, Alex Felix Majeme.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>This position was vacant at the time of assessment, and there was no formally seconded person from the Central Government.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Mr. Nakisa Fred was substantively appointed as the Principal Internal Auditor on 16th April, 2019 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 2/2019(20), signed by the CAO Mr. Alex Felix Majema.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The District did not have a substantively appointed PHRO (Secretary DSC) but Mr. Hibombo Apollo, a Senior Assistant Secretary, was assigned duties of a Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) on 10th November, 2023 through letter reference CR/101/1, endorsed by the CAO Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence.</p>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG 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 District had 15 LLGs which constituted 10 Sub Counties and 5 Town Councils that is Himutu S/C, Nawanjofu S/C, Busabi S/C, Butaleja S/C, Kachonga S/C, Mazimasa S/C, Naweyo S/C, Buduba S/C, Busaba S/C, Nabiganda T/C, Busaba T/C, Butaleja T/C, Busowelo T/C and Kachumo T/C.</p> <p>The District appointed 12 substantive Senior Assistant Secretaries as follows;</p> <p>1. Mr. Omalla Godfrey deployed at Mazimasa S/C was</p>	0

substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 26th August, 2008 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 48/2008, endorsed by F. A. O. Oluka the CAO.

2. Mr. Owor Samuel Godfrey deployed at Himutu S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 6th December, 2018 as directed by DSC Minute No. 29/2018(i), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

3. Mr. Lujja Mayiad deployed at Busaba S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 10th June, 2013 as directed by DSC Minute No. 111/2013 (iii) (e), signed by Mr. Ndifuna Mathias the CAO.

4. Mr. Wangira Wilson deployed at Nawanjovu S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 10th June, 2013 as directed by DSC Minute No. 111/2013 (i) (f), signed by Mr. Ndifuna Mathias the CAO.

5. Mr. Waweyo Abdunass Mudanya deployed at Butaleja T/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 20th April, 2021 as directed by DSC Minute No. 38/2021(a)(i), signed by Lucy Frances Amuren the CAO.

6. Mr. Hyuha Sadrac Paul was substantively appointed as the Town Clerk on 13th May, 2015 as directed by DSC Minute No. 27/2015,8 (ii), signed by the CAO Mr. Francis Odap.

7. Mr. Mulongo Hussein Talib deployed at Busolwe S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 13th May, 2015 as directed by DSC Minute No. 27/2015,8 (i), signed by Francis Odap the CAO.

8. Mr. Gesa Tom was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 10th June, 2013 as directed by DSC Minute No. 111/2013(iii) (e), signed by the CAO Mr. Ndifuna Mathais and was deployed at Butaleja T/C.

9. Mr. Hasahya James Stephen

was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 6th December, 2018 as directed by DSC Minute No. 29/2018(i), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

10. Ms. Kazaabu Sylvia was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 16th April, 2019 as directed by DSC Minute No. 2/2019 (a) (i) signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

11. Mr. Hirya Julius was substantively appointed as the Town Clerk on 22nd July, 2020 as directed by DSC Minute No. 41/2019 (a) signed by the CAO Lucy Frances Amuren

12. Mr. Hibombo Apollo was substantively appointed as the Senior Assistant Secretary on 31st December, 2009 as directed by DSC Minute No. 40/2009 (ii) signed by the CAO Mr. Francis A. O. Oluka.

Those who were not substantive were,

1. Ms. Nandi Hadija an assistant Town Clerk was assigned duties of a Town Clerk on 2nd July, 2021 through letter reference CR/101/1 as signed by Mr. Epene Godfrey the CAO.

2. Mr Koire Asuman a Senior Assistant Secretary was assigned duties of a Town Clerk on 18th May, 2023 through letter reference CR/161/1 as signed by the CAO Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence.

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The LG appointed 14 substantive Community Development Officers. For example;

1. Ms. Namusonge Suzan Daphne was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 2nd December, 2009 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 38/2009(k), signed by Francis A.O. Oluka the CAO and deployed at Himutu S/C.

2. Mr. Malinga Ivan was substantively appointed as the

0

Community Development Officer on 24th April 2019 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 2/2019(12)(iii), endorsed by the CAO Alex Felix Majema and deployed at Nawanjovu S/C.

3. Mr. Sekyoya Paul was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 16th April, 2019 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 2/2019 (12) (ii), signed by Mr. Alex Felix Majeme the CAO and deployed at Busabi S/C.

4. Ms. Nsenye Sarah was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 16th April, 2019 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 2/2019 (12) (i), signed by Mr. Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

5. Ms. Neunje Diana was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 26th August 2008 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 40 (xvi) 2008, signed by Mr. Francis. A. O. Oluka the CAO and deployed at Kachonga S/C.

6. Mr. Hamya Julius was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 2nd December, 2008 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 70 (a) (v)/2008, signed by Mr. Francis. A. O. Oluka the CAO and deployed at Busowelo S/C.

7. Mr. Wafula Peter Waya was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 15th March, 2021 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 22/2021 (a) (i), signed by Lucy Frances Amulen the CAO and deployed at Mazimasa S/C.

8. Barchor Waseega Eria was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 22nd January, 2009 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 40 (iii)/2008, signed by Francis. A. O. Oluka the CAO.

9. Ms. Nampii Anne Nambuya was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 29th June, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 45/2023 (5) (ii), signed by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO and deployed at Nabiganda T/C.

10. Mr. Wosukira Enos was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 16th April, 2019 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 2/2019 (12) (iii), signed by Mr. Alex Felix Majeme the CAO and deployed at Naweyo S/C.

11. Mr. Weyawo Michael was substantively appointed as the Senior Community Development Officer on 29th June, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 45/2023 (s) (i), signed by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO and deployed at Busaba T/C.

12. Ms. Nabwire Margret was substantively appointed as the Senior Community Development Officer on 29th June, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 45/2023 (s) (iii), signed by Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO and deployed at Butaleja T/C.

13. Mr. Muhono Christopher was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 24th June, 2022 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 155/2022 (a) (vi), signed by Ms. Namboozo Loyce Joyce the CAO and deployed at Busolwe S/C.

14. Mr. Wasota Peter was substantively appointed as the Community Development Officer on 22nd July, 2020 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 41/2019(p) (i), signed by Lucy Frances Amulen the CAO.

15. Ms Khadehe Apophia was assigned Duties of as the Community Development Officer on 4th October, 2023 through letter reference CR/101/1 as signed by the CAO Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence.

2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

The District had appointed 15 substantive Senior Accounts Assistant in all the LLGs as follows;

1. Mr. Joogo Andrew deployed at Busabi S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 25th May, 2021 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 55/2021 (e)

5

(i), signed by the CAO Lucy Frances Amulen.

2. Mr. Sande Anatoli Tabu deployed at Busaba T/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 21st November, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 9/2017 (e) 3 (xv), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

3. Mr. Were John deployed at Himutu S/C, was substantively appointed as the Accounts Assistant on 21st November, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 9/2017 (e) 4 (i), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

4. Mr. Himwero Stanley deployed at Butaleja T/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 21st November, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 9/2017 (e) 3 (ix), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

5. Ms. Nawaho Tabitha deployed at Busaba S/C was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 13th May, 2015 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 27/2015,1(ix), signed by Mr. Francis Odap the CAO.

6. Waholi Ignatius deployed at Kachonga S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 31st May, 2021 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 63/2021 (a) (v), signed by Lucy Frances Amulen the CAO.

7. Ms. Hamba Juliet deployed at Busolwe T/C was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 21st November, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 9/2017 (e) 3 (xii), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

8. Mr. Kigenyi Muhammed deployed at Butaleja S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 21st November, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 9/2017 (e) 3 (ii), signed by Mr. Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

9. Ms. Kanghanyi Betty Miriam deployed at Naweyo S/C, was substantively appointed as the Accounts Assistant on 22nd

April 2022 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 132/2022 (a) (i), signed by Ms. Nambozo Loyce Joyce the CAO.

10. Mr. Weere Aggrey Mujeere deployed at Nawanjovu S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 22nd January, 2020 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 5/2019 (b), signed by Mr. Madele Richard the CAO.

11. Mr. Kifude Canary Charles deployed at Kachumo T/C was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 21st November, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 9/2017 (e) 3 (xvi), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

12. Mr. Ouma Geoffrey deployed at Buduba S/C, was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 21st November, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 9/2017 (e) 4(ii), signed by Mr. Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.

13. Mr. Wafula Emmanuel deployed at was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 25th May, 2021 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 55/2021 (e) (i), signed by the CAO Lucy Frances Amulen.

14. Ms. Nabagega Caroline deployed at Masimasa S/C was substantively appointed as the Senior Accounts Assistant on 25th May, 2021 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 41/2019 (t) (i), signed by the CAO Lucy Frances Amulen.

15. Mr. Kawere Thomas deployed at Nabiganda T/C, was substantively appointed as the Accounts Assistant on 20th April, 2021 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 38/2021 (b) (i), signed by the CAO Lucy Frances Amulen.

## **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 LG budgeted UGX 179,174,134, warranted amount was UGX 70, 607,600, actual released was UGX 70,607,600, therefore the LG used 100% of the warranted amount on Natural Resources department	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 LG budgeted UGX 137,794,175, warranted amount was UGX 113,565,463, actual released was UGX 113,565,463, therefore the LG used 100% of the warranted amount on Community Based Services department	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 no evidence of the Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening report for the DDEG financed project  The construction of Butaleja House at the District Headquarters (Phased project).  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days period of Assessment.	0
	Maximum score is 12			
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0	There was no need of preparing a full ESIA report for the construction of the Butaleja House since it lies under projects listed in Part 2 of Schedule 4 of the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019 thereby requiring preparation of an Environmental and Social Management Plan.	4
	Maximum score is 12			

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;	There was no evidence of the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for the DDEG financed project availed.	0
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0	The construction of Butaleja House at the District Headquarters (Phased project).	
			Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	

### Financial management and reporting

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;	Butaleja District LG had an unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2022/2023	10
	Maximum score is 10	If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5		
		If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0		
6	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).	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),	There was no documentary evidence that the LG had provided information to PS/ST on the Status of implementation of Auditor General's findings FY 2021/2022. However, the LG had provided information to Chairperson PAC on 13th April 2023 which was not the requirement as per the manual	0
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.	Similarly, the was no documentary evidence that the LG had submitted information to PS/ST on the status of implementation of internal Auditor General's findings for FY 2021/2022	
7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,	The Annual Performance Contract was submitted on 21st June 2023 via online submission (PBS)	4
	Maximum Score 4	score 4 or else 0.		

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 2nd August 2023 via PBS online submission system</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted its quarterly budget performance reports as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quarter 1 report was submitted on 31st December 2022</li> <li>2. Quarter 2 report was submitted on 23rd February 2023</li> <li>3. Quarter 3 report was submitted on 15th May 2023</li> <li>4. And quarter 4 report was submitted on 2nd August 2023.</li> </ol> <p>All the submissions were made within the set timeline of 31st August 2023.</p>	4

**Education 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 substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The LG did not have a substantively appointed District Education Officer but Ms. Adeke Ester an Inspector of Schools was assigned duties of a District Education Officer on 29th July, 2022 through letter reference CR/161/1, signed by Ms. Namboze Loyce Joyce the CAO.	<b>0</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.  <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The District had substantively appointed 4 Inspectors of Schools as provided for in the approved staff structure,  1. Mr. Opendi Bernard was substantively appointed an Inspector of Schools on 29th June, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 45/2023 (t) (ii), signed by the CAO Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence.  2. Ms. Nahirya Dorothy was substantively appointed as an Inspector of Schools on 29th June, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 45/2023 (t) (i), signed by the CAO Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence.  3. Ms. Hadah Aggrey was appointed an Inspector of Schools on 22nd July, 2020 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 41/2019(c) (i), endorsed by Lucy Frances Amulen the CAO.  4. Ms. Akol Christine was substantively appointed as an Inspector of Schools on 13th May,2015 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 27/2015,23 (i), endorsed by Francis Odap the CAO.	<b>40</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There were no Environmental and Social screening reports for the Education projects for FY 2022/2023. The construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Wangale Primary School.  The construction of a 2-classroom block with an office and store at Mpologoma Primary School.  The construction of a 2-classroom block with an office and store at Busamba Islamic Primary School.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0
	The Maximum score is 30			

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	There were no ESMPs availed for the Education projects for FY 2022/2023.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0
	The Maximum score is 30			

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The District did not have a substantively appointed District Health Officer but Mr. Akwoyo Stephen substantive a Senior Health Educator was assigned duties of a District Health Officer on 12th May, 2023 through letter reference CR/161/1, signed by Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO.	<b>0</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>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0	Ms. Musumbachali Esther, a Nursing Officer, was assigned duties of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal Child Health and Nursing on 31st August, 2021.	<b>0</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>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.	This position was vacant at the time of assessment and there was no formally seconded staff to fill the position.	<b>0</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>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.	This position was vacant at the time of assessment and there was no formally seconded staff to fill the position.	<b>0</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>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Akwoyo Stephen was substantively appointed as a Senior Health Educator on 30th May, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 25/04/DSC/2023(b) (ii) as signed by the CAO Mr. Marley Ben Lawrence.	<b>10</b>

1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>Mr. Were Luke Hibinga was substantively appointed as a Biostatistician on 28th March, 2008 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 10/2007 i (a), signed by the CAO Mr. Francis. A. O. Oluka.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District had substantively appointed Mr. Hasahya W. Aggrey as a Cold Chain Technician on 6th February, 2013 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 29/2013(16) (i), signed by Ndifuna Mathias.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>		

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of Environmental and Social screening reports for the two health projects implemented in the previous FY projects availed by the Sector Accountant Health.</p> <p>However, they were with dates for the current FY 2023/2024.</p> <p>The screening reports were signed by the DCDO and Environment Officer and were for;</p> <p>The construction of OPD at Mazimasa HCIII dated 8th /8/2023 yet it was for FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The Roofing of Budumba HCIII OPD dated 8th/08/2023 yet it was for FY 2022/2023.</p>	0
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence of the ESMP for the roofing of Budumba HCIII OPD (partial completion) dated 10th/09/2022 signed by DCDO and Environment Officer and costed at UGX. 2,737,000/=.</p> <p>The construction of OPD at Mazimasa HCIII required preparation of an Environmental and Social Project Brief and Submit it to NEMA for approval since it lies under Part 1 of Schedule 4 of the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019. However; this was not adhered to and only an ESMP was developed dated 10th/09/2022 by the DCDO and Environment Officer and costed at UGX. 9,906,000/=.</p> <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment however, the copies were availed by the Sector Accountant Health.</p>	0



**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	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The District had substantively appointed Mr. Swama Charles as a Senior Agriculture Engineer on 21st August, 2017 as directed by the DSC Minute No. NDSC/40.11/2017, signed by the CAO Mr. Ekachelan Esau.</p>	<b>70</b>
<b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was no documentary evidence availed during assessment.</p> <p>Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.</p>	<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.	Mr. Wasige Richard was substantively appointed as the Civil Engineer (Water), on 13th June, 2018 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 20/2018 (i), signed by Alex Felix Majeme the CAO.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	This position was vacant at the time of assessment and there was no formally seconded person to fill the vacancy.	<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.	This position was vacant at the time of assessment and there was no formally seconded person to fill the vacancy	<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.	The District did not have a Natural Resource Officer but had a DNRO. Ms. Were Lamula was substantively appointed as a DNRO on 30th May, 2023 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 25/04/DSC/2023 (b) (i), signed by Marley Ben Lawrence the CAO.	<b>15</b>
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Wandera Tom was substantively appointed as an Environment Officer on 15th May, 2008 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 13/2008 i(c) , signed by the CAO Mr. Francis A. O. Oluka.	<b>10</b>

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Mr. Banamwita Charles was substantively appointed as a Forestry Officer on 1st August, 2008 as directed by the DSC Minute No. 55/2008 (ii), signed by Francis A. O. Oluka the CAO.	10
---	--	--	--	----

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG:  a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	No information availed during assessment  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	No information availed during assessment.  Both the Environment Officer and CDO were not available neither represented for the two days of Assessment.	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	Nabiganda piped water system in Nabiganda Sub County was extended to Mazimasa. There was no abstraction permit acquired by the District for it.	0