



LGMSD 2022/23

Fort-Portal city

(Vote Code: 855)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	67%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	30%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	41%
Educational Performance Measures	53%
Health Performance Measures	48%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The infrastructure project implemented using USMID funding is a multi-year project that was still incomplete at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Mugoma (0.9Kms) and Millane (0.7kms) Road Works. Overall Progress was 46.74%.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By more than 5%, score 3 1 to 5% increase, score 2 If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The City Council average score in the overall LLG performance assessment for 2023 improved by 1% compared to LLG performance assessment for 2022.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>OPAMS Data Generated by OPM</p> <p>Average Overall LLGPA Scores for 2023= 76%</p> <p>Average Overall LLGPA Scores for 2022= 75%</p> <p>Calculation</p> <p>Variance Average Overall LLGPA (2023-2022) = 76-75=1%</p>	2

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"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>A review of the Annual Budget and Annual Budget Performance Report for FY2022/23 revealed that the City Council completed the planned Urban Discretionary Equalization Development Project for FY2022/23 at 47%.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>The USMID project is a multi-year project whose contract was signed on 14 April 2022 and is scheduled to end in December 2023. It was behind schedule time at the time of assessment i.e</p> <p>Overall Progress 46.74%. VIDE: Fort Portal Tourism City- Construction Works for Selected Infrastructure Sub Projects in Cluster 7- Fort Portal City. Monthly Progress Report No.12</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>A review of Budget Estimates FY2022/23 and Annual Budget Performance Reports FY2023 revealed that the City Council spent the Urban Discretionary Equalization Development Grants on ineligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Budget Estimates FY2022/23</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Media - Exhibitions, Expos and Trade Fairs- UGX 40,000,000- Ineligible. 2. Workshops, Meetings, Seminars -Training (Others)- UGX 16,000,000- Eligible. 3. Consultancy- Strategic Planning Services- UGX 122,280,000- Eligible. 4. Travel Inland - Allowances for Monitoring- UGX 15,000,000- Eligible 5. Consultancy- Monitoring and Evaluation Services- UGX 500,000,000- Eligible 6. Facilitation of Implementation of Works- UGX 10,000,000- Eligible 7. Roads and Bridges - Acquisition- UGX 4,358,668,000- Eligible 	0

Investment
Performance

Maximum 4 points on
this performance
measure

b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,

score 2 or else score 0

The city had one (01) USMID-funded infrastructure project/contract in the previous FY, that is, construction of works for selected infrastructure sub-projects in cluster 7 - Fort Portal Tourism City. Contract reference number: HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS/CL-7/2020-2021/00001. The works contract was availed and contract amount was UGX 20,946,043,145/=, signed on April 14th, 2022.

The contract had the following components:

>>> Construction of water supply road (0.7 km)

>>> Construction of Mugoma road (0.9 kms)

>>> Construction of Millane road (0.7 kms)

>>> Installation of solar street lights - 106 No.

No engineer's estimate presented, the work plan provides budgets allocated for the USMID project in the previous FY. The city receives partial amounts each FY towards the infrastructure investments. ***The work plan is not the suitable document to review to compare variations for this indicator; the engineer's estimate for the project would be the perfect document to refer to, to score this indicator, but it was not availed.***

For DDEG-funded infrastructure projects,

>>> Rehabilitation of the office block, budgeted for UGX 6,200,000/= according to the updated procurement plan dated 14/04/2023. ***This project was not contracted/procured although it was planned for.***

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported
information

Maximum 4 points on
this Performance
Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

A review of the MoPS(28th April 2022) approved structure and staff establishment providing for minimum staffing standards and the staff list 2023 and LLG notice boards was undertaken. No staff lists were found displayed on the Division noticeboards. The Division structure provided for twenty-nine staff without health workers. The soft copy staff list provided categorized staff by the departments and not actual stations of deployment. For instance, under production the staff list showed there were two extension staff namely Stanley Businge and James Mugabe who are both agricultural extension workers while the structure provided for veterinary officer and assistant animal husbandry officer. Further to that there was no record of the posting /deployment station. In view of the foregoing, it was difficult to ascertain the staffing accuracy at the LLGS as it was further compounded by an absentee officer being assessed.

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. 	<p>The rehabilitation of the office block using DDEG funds was not contracted/procured in the previous FY although it was planned for.</p> <p>Note: The City had planned for one project, that is, rehabilitation of the office block using DDEG funds.</p>	2
	<p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>			
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>The City Council conducted a credible assessment of LLGs for 2023 as verified by the IVA team during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Sampled Divisions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Central Division - City Council score was 66% and IVA score was 70%. The deviation was +4% i.e. Credible 2. Nothern Division - City Council score was 85% and IVA score was 85%. The deviation was 0% i.e. Credible 	4
	<p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p>			
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>No Performance improvement plan was provided for the assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>			

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	No Performance improvement plan was provided for the assessment as a result implementation could not be verified.	0
---	---	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.	0
---	--	---	---	---

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	FCC did not provide evidence of having conducted a tracking an analysis of staff attendance for the period under review.	0
---	--	--	--	---

7	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	Out of the seven Heads of Department under assessment three (City Planner, City Production Officer and City Commercial Officer) were found to have been duly appraised as seen in their Annual Performance Reports (APRs) as detailed hereunder thereby not meeting the scoring requirement. 1. City Finance Officer - Mr. Karamagi Simon evidenced by the letter of appointment on promotion to the position of City Chief Finance Officer dated 13th January 2023 referenced under the City Service Commission Min. No. 1/2023. At the time of assessment, the CCFO was not found to have been duly appraised. The performance agreement for the year under review was found on file. 2. City Planner - Mr. Nayakatura Fred currently leads the Department on a recommendation of the Technical Planning Committee as evidenced by Min6F: CC/TPC/21/09/2023 dated 5th October 2023. Mr. Nyakatura is substantively a Senior	0
---	--	--	---	---

Economist/Planner as found in appointment letter on promotion to Senior Economist/Planner dated 10th November, referenced under Fort Portal City Service Commission Min No.214/2022. At the time of assessment, the said Officer was appraised for the year under review as found in the APR for FY 2022/2023 dated 30th June 2023.

3.City Engineer – Eng. Kaihura Robert evidenced by the letter of appointment on promotion to City Engineer dated 11th October 2023 referenced under the CSC Min. No. 59/2023(iii). At the time of assessment, the CE was found not duly appraised. On file was FY 2021/22 APR.

4. City Natural Resources Officer - No substantive head. Ms . Natugonza Gladys Mirembe holds the office in acting capacity. However, the appointment to that effect was not provided. She is substantively the Senior Natural Resources Authority as evidenced by letter of retention in service and re-designation as Senior Natural Resources Officer referenced under CSC. Min.No. 243/2022. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found not to have been duly appraised as no record was on file.

5. Fort Portal City Council does not have a substantive **City Production Officer**. The Officer was being held in Ag. Capacity by Dr. Businge Stanley the substantive Senior Veterinary Officer as appointed in service to promotion to Senior Veterinary Officer dated 10th November 2022 referenced under CSC Min No. 272/2022. There was no evidence provided to warrant the acting capacity appointment. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for the FY under review dated 30th June 2023.

6. Fort Portal City Council has a substantive **Community Development Officer** – Mr. Ruragane Binta Joachim evidenced by the letter of retention in service as Principal Community Development Officer accelerated promotion dated 10th November 2022 referenced under the City Service Commission Min. No. 237/2022. At the time of assessment, the DCDO was found not to have been duly appraised for the year under review.

7. Fort Port City Council has a substantive **Principal Commercial Officer**- Mr. Karwani Kayanja Michael as evidenced by letter of retention in service dated 10th November 2022 referenced under CSC Min.No. 259/2022. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found not to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for the FY under review dated 30th June 2023.

7	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	FCC has a substantive Rewards and Sanction Committees as evidenced by letter dated 14th September 2023 appointing amongst others Mr.Binta Joachim Ruragane, Principal Community Development Officer as the new Chairperson of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee. The functionality of the R&S committee was evidenced by Minutes of a meeting held on 25th March 2022 by the previous committee..	1
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	FCC does not have a Consultative Committee in place.	0
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	No staff were recruited during the year under review.	1
9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1.	At the time of assessment, no evidence of staff that retired during the year under review was provided.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	A review of the FY2022/23 Annual Budget Estimates and Cost Centre List & LLG allocation release for FY2022/23 provided by MoFPED revealed that the City Council transferred DDEG for FY2022/23 to LLGs in full. EvidenceFort Portal Central Division. Fort Portal Central Division- Budgeted UGX 116,626,344. Remitted UGX 116,626,344 Fort Portal North Division- Budgeted UGX 102,154,682. Remitted UGX 102,154,682	2
----	--	--	---	---

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).	A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions revealed that in the FY2022/23, the City Council warranted LLG Direct DDEG transfers more than 5 working days after cash limits were communicated by the PS/ST.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	<p>Evidence</p> <p>Q2 FY2022/23. Communication of cash limit on 30 September 2022. City Council warranted on 19 Oct 2022 i.e. 5+ working days.</p> <p>Q3 FY2022/23. Communication of cash limit on 29 December 2022. City Council warranted on 18 January 2023. i.e. 5+ working days.</p> <p>Note: Information on cash limit uploads by MoFPED could not be accessed.</p>	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	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:	No evidence of the Town Clerk invoicing and communicating releases to the LLGs was provided at the time of assessment.	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	The City Council did not provide evidence of supervising or mentoring all LLGs at least once per quarter in FY2022/23 consistent with guidelines.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	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:	The City Council did not provide evidence confirming that the TPC discussed the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits for FY2022/23 and used these results/reports to make recommendations for corrective actions.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>A review of the Fixed Assets Register revealed that the City Council maintained an up-to-date Fixed Asset Register at the time of Assessment.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Draft Final A/c Page 42 Additions during FY2022/23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Residential Buildings UGX 1,926,763,095 • Residential Buildings UGX 206,570,517 <p>VIDE: Fort Portal Asset Register as at 30 June 2023- 25 July 2023. Example of entries made in FY2022/23.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rubingo HCII - Kiguma HCII - Karambi PS
----	---	---	--

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 City Council did not use the Board of Survey FY2021/22 as a source of guidance for making asset management decisions.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>VIDE: CR/108/1- Submission of Board of Survey Report for the Financial Year 2021/2022 from Fort Portal City. Received by PS/ST on 29 August 2022.</p> <p>Some Recommendations made in Board of Survey FY2021/2022 and status of implementation of previous year recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 9- Boarding off unserviceable items i.e. Grounded Vehicles, Scrap Motorcycles, Old Spare Parts, Computers Equipment, Obsolete Furniture, and Electrical Materials, and all in the City Yard Store. Recommendations in previous year- No action was taken. • Page 27- Engraving of assets in CBS Department- No evidence that this was done. 	0
----	---	---	---	---

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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.

The City Council provided evidence that the Physical Planning Committee was functional, however, the Committee submitted minutes of their meetings held in Q2-Q4 of FY2022/23 to MoLHUD. The minutes of the Q1 FY2022/23 meeting were not submitted.

Evidence

Appointment of Members VIDE: CR/214/33

1. Mr Muhumuza Michael - Health Inspector was appointed on 30 July 2021.
2. Mr Musana Samuel - Senior Physical Planner was appointed on 30 July 2021.
3. Mr. Bright Peter - Architect was appointed on 12 August 2021.
4. Ms. Busobozi Olivia Bahwayo - Physical Planner was appointed on 12 August 2021.
5. Mr. Ssemambo Joseph - Physical Planner (Private Practice) was appointed on 12 August 2021.
6. Ms. Natugonza Gladys Mirembe - Senior Environment Officer was appointed on 30 July 2021.
7. Mr. Kaihura Herbert - Ag. City Engineer was appointed on 30 July 2021.

Submission of Minutes to MoLHUD Kabarole MZO

No evidence of minutes for the Q1 FY2022/23 meeting was presented at time of assessment.

Q2 FY2022/23. The meeting was held on 18 October 2022 and submission of the minutes to MoLHUD was made on 8 November 2022.

Q3 FY2022/23. The meeting was held on 16 March 2023 and submission of the minutes to MoLHUD was made on 18 April 2023e

Q4 FY2022/23. The meeting was held on 16 June 2023 and submission of the minutes to MoLHUD was made on 10 July 2023.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council did not provide evidence confirming that desk appraisals for all prioritized investment projects financed by Urban Discretionary Equalization Development Grants in the budget FY2023/24 were conducted as per funding source.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council did not provide evidence confirming that field appraisals for Urban Discretionary Equalization Development Grants financed projects implemented in FY2022/23 were conducted to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The City did not provide evidence confirming that project profiles with costing for all investments in the AWP for FY2023/24 were developed and discussed in the TPC as per the planning and DDEG guidelines.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Fort Portal City did not have any USMID projects for the current FY. The projects being implemented were a continuation of the previous financial year. The projects included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of the Rwengoma- Mugoma road network in the central division, 2. The Construction of Millane Road in the central division 3. The construction of the water supply- Kahungabunyonyi road. <p>There was no evidence that all the DDEG-funded projects for the current FY had been screened for E&S and mitigation measures put in place. The DDEG projects that were not screened included,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation of solar lights in the central division 2. Repair of shallow wells in North Division 3. Repair of water sources in Central Division 	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>The current FY procurement plan was availed received by PPDA on 14/7/2023, and the USMID-funded infrastructure projects were included as listed below:</p> <p>>>> Completion of the construction of water supply road, budgeted for UGX 3,000,000,000/=.</p> <p>>>> Completion of construction of Mugoma road, budgeted for UGX 3,201,312,124/=</p> <p>>>> Completion of the construction of Millane road, budgeted for UGX 3,000,000,000/=</p> <p>DDEG-funded infrastructure projects were also included as listed below:</p> <p>>>> Installation of solar lights in central division, budgeted for UGX 20,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Construction of a toilet in the North Division, budgeted for UGX 30,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Repair of a shallow wells in North Division, budgeted for UGX 15,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Repair of water sources in Central Division, budgeted for UGX 20,000,000/=</p>	1

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that the USMID-funded infrastructure projects included in the previous FY procurement plan were approved by the contracts committee.

USMID-AF projects (roads):

>>> According to the procurement file for the project, 'construction of works for selected infrastructure sub-projects in cluster 7 - Fort Portal Tourism City; Contract reference number: HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS/CL-7/2020-2021/00001,' the sitting/minutes date was 23/04/2021, under minute number: MIN39/HC/CC/04/21, the project was approved.

DDEG-funded infrastructure projects:

>>> Rehabilitation of the office block, budgeted for UGX 6,200,000/= according to the updated procurement plan dated 14/04/2023. This project was not contracted/procured although it was planned for.

<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>Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines for all projects not availed.</p> <p>>>> Letter dated 30/03/2023, reference number: CR/105/2, Town Clerk appointed the senior education officer, head teacher Kahinju P/S, Ag. City engineer, senior environmental officer, Ag. town clerk central division, and senior community development officer as PIT for construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Kahinju P/S. No labour officer appointed.</p> <p>>>> Letter dated 30/03/2023, reference number: CR/105/2, Town Clerk appointed the Ag. city health officer, in-charge Kagote HC IV, Ag. City engineer, senior environmental officer, Ag. town clerk central division, and senior community development officer as PIT for extension of a maternity ward at Kangote HC III. No labour officer appointed.</p> <p>The PIT for other projects was not availed. These included USMID and DDEG projects as follows:</p> <p>Construction of works for selected infrastructure sub-projects in cluster 7 - Fort Portal Tourism City.</p> <p>>>> Completion of the construction of water supply road.</p> <p>>>> Completion of construction of Mugoma road.</p> <p>>>> Completion of the construction of Millane Road.</p> <p>>>> One DDEG-funded infrastructure projects that the LG implemented that is rehabilitation of the office block.</p>
---	---	---

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	<p>There was evidence that the USMID-funded infrastructure project followed the technical designs issued by Ministry of Lands, Housing, and Urban Development.</p> <p>According to the progress report No. 12, dated July 2023, the works are rated 46.74% complete. The city followed the designs as issued by the design review/supervision consultant, M/S Continuum Engineering Ltd in association with Center for Infrastructure Consulting Limited.</p> <p>Note: The entity had one USMID-funded contract, 'construction of works for selected infrastructure sub-projects in cluster 7 - Fort Portal Tourism City; Contract reference number: HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS/CL-7/2020-2021/00001,' with all roads included.</p> <p>For DDEG,</p> <p>>>> Rehabilitation of the office block was not contracted/procured in the previous FY although it was planned for.</p>
----	--	---	--

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	<p>The 3 sampled contracts/projects were as follows:</p> <p>>>> A review of the contract for construction of Ibaale HC II 3-stance VIP latrine, the contractor requested payment on 27/05/2023 and works were certified on 16/06/2023; payment certificate No. 1. In a report dated 22/05/2023, the CDO and environmental officer inspected and verified works and report dated 23/05/2023, the engineer supervised and verified works on the 12/05/2023 prior to payment.</p> <p>>>> A review of the contract for the upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HC II to III, the contractor requested payment on 29/05/2023 and works were certified on 16/06/2023; payment certificate No. 1. In a report dated 12/05/2023, a joint team of technical officers (city engineer, environmental officer and CDO) supervised and verified works on the 12/05/2023 prior to payment.</p> <p>>>> A review of the contract for the renovation of a 3-classroom block at Burungu P/S, the contractor requested payment on 17/04/2023 and works were certified on 5/05/2023; payment certificate No. 1. In a report dated 28/04/2023, a joint team of technical officers (city engineer, environmental officer and CDO) supervised and verified works prior to payment.</p>
----	--	---	--

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	>>> A review of the contract for construction of Ibaale HC II 3-stance VIP latrine, the contractor requested payment on 27/05/2023 and works were certified on 16/06/2023; payment certificate No. 1. This was within the stipulated time. >>> A review of the contract for upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HC II to III, the contractor requested payment on 29/05/2023 and works were certified on 16/06/2023; payment certificate No. 1. This was within the stipulated time. >>> A review of the contract for renovation of a 3-classroom block at Burungu P/S, the contractor requested payment on 17/04/2023 and works were certified on 5/05/2023; payment certificate No. 1. This was within the stipulated time.	1
----	--	--	---	----------

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	<p>USMID-funded project file - construction of works for selected infrastructure sub-projects in cluster 7 - Fort Portal Tourism City; Contract reference number: HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS/CL-7/2020-2021/00001.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation report, missing 2. Contracts committee meeting minutes, available dated 23/04/2021. 3. Works contract, available dated 2/3/2023. 	0
----	--	---	--	----------

Health sector files

Sampled contract 2: Upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HCIIIs to HCIIIs in North Division of Fort Portal City.

1. Evaluation report, dated 26/12/2022
2. Works contract **available with amount UGX 1,889,403,098/=**. The agreement was signed on 2/03/2023; contractor was M/S RMF Engineering Contractors Limited.
3. Contracts committee meeting minutes, **missing.**

Sampled contract 3: Extension of a maternity ward at Kagute HC II in Central Division of Fort Portal City

1. Works contract, dated 17/3/2023
2. Evaluation report, dated and signed on 6/2/2023, approved by contracts committee on 7/2/2023.
3. Contracts committee minutes, signed on **7/2/2023**

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 evidence that Fort Portal city designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant;</p> <p>Ms. Kajobe Eunice was appointed as a focal point person to coordinate response to grievances per the appointed letter dated 21/11/2022 by the Town Clerk- Mr. Kagaba Ndora.</p> <p>The grievance redress committee was appointed as evidenced by the appointment letter dated 21/11/2022 by the Town Clerk, Mr. Kagaba Ndora. The members of the committee included;</p> <p>Natugonza Gladys- Senior Natural Resource Officer- Chairperson</p> <p>Mr. Nsita William- Principal Internal auditor-member.</p> <p>Ms. Kajobe Eunice- Principal Assistant Town Clerk-secretary</p> <p>Ms. Komuntaro Alice - Senior Community Development Officer- member.</p> <p>Mr. Aisha Saidi - Senior personal secretary.</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>Fort Portal City had a complaints log book in which grievances had been recorded. However, there were no minutes to show that the GRC sat and discussed the grievances registered therein.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the City had publicized the grievance redress mechanism per the GRM pathway notice dated 21/11/2022 displayed on the city main notice board with the name and contact of the focal person- Ms. Kajobe Eunice including the guidelines to seek redress.</p>	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council did not provide evidence that environment, social, and climate change interventions were integrated into the City Council DP III, AWP FY2023/24, and budget FY2023/24.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Environment, social, and climate change intervention activities identified in the DP III- Pages 75 but not integrated into the AWP and Budget Estimates FY2023/24 i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration of degraded ecosystem after project implementation. 	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The City Council provided evidence confirming that enhanced DDEG guidelines and adaptation and social risk management were disseminated to LLGs.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Emailed to Division Town Clerks and Heads of Department on 12 June 2023.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that for projects financed from the USMID other than health, education, water, and irrigation the City had ESMPs incorporated in the BoQs for the previous FY;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of Mugoma road had a costed ESMP UGX: 8,504,905 2. Construction of Millane Road had a costed ESMP of UGX: 6,336,618 3. Construction of water supply along Kahungabunyonyi road had a costed ESMP of UGX: 6,841,852. <p>Overall the projects under the USMID contract had combined ESMPs of;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental protection and waste disposal UGX: 509,400,000 2. Occupational health and safety, HIV/AIDS/ gender UGX: 63,250,000 <p>The proposed DDEG project which was the rehabilitation of the administration office block was not procured.</p>	3

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	Fort Portal city did not have any project that required additional costing due to the impact of climate change for the previous FY.	3
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 no evidence that all USMID projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership. The city is in the process of titling the land of the USMID projects.	0
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	Fort Portal City conducted monthly monitoring for projects under the USMID. The following projects under Education and Health were not monitored monthly; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a five-stance lined VIP latrine at Kahinju primary school in the central division. 2. Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Kitumba primary school in the central division. 3. Renovation of a three-classroom block at Burungu Primary School. 4. Upgrade of Rubingo HCII to HCIII in North Division. 5. Upgrade of Kiguma HCII to HCIII 6. Renovation of the theatre at Bukuku HCIV. 7. Construction of pit latrine at Ibaale HC II 8. Extension of the maternity ward at Kagote HCIII. 	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 evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO before payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects; For all USMID projects- Interim payment certificate No.1 addressed to chain Railway 18th Bureau Group Company Ltd was signed by the Environment Office and CDO on 06/04/2023. For all USMID projects- Interim payment certificate No.2 addressed to chain Railway 18th Bureau Group Company Ltd was signed by the Environment Office and CDO on 16/06/2023.	1

Financial management

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0	The City Council maintained up-to-date bank reconciliations up to the time of the assessment. Evidence Bank of Uganda, A/c No. 012370168000001. Bank Reconciliation Statement for July 2022. Report Date 09 August 2022 Bank of Uganda, A/c No. 012370168000001. Bank Reconciliation Statement for June 2023. Report Date 09 July 2023. Bank of Uganda, A/c No. 012370168000001. Bank Reconciliation Statement for October 2023. Report Date 03 November 2023.	2
17	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90 Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	The City Council provided evidence to confirm that the Internal Auditor produced 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY2022/23. Evidence Q1 FY2022/23 VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Fort Port City Council Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 July- 30 September 2022. Produced on 28 October 2022 with 9 issues. Q2 FY2022/23 VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Fort Port City Council Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 October- 31 December 2022 Produced on 30 December 2022 with 9 issues. Q3 FY2022/23 VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Fort Port City Council Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 January- 31 March 2023. Produced on 27 April 2023 with 7 issues. Q4 FY2022/23 VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Fort Port City Council Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 April- June 2023 Produced on the 04 August 2023 with 7 issues.	2

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

Score 1 or else score 0

The City Council provided evidence that information on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY2022/23 was provided to the Council Chairperson and City PAC.

Evidence

Submissions were made to the City Clerk, Speaker of the City Council, and PAC.

Q1 FY2022/23

VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Fort Port City Council Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 July- 30 September 2022. Follow up on implementation status of previous audit recommendations Q4 FY2021/22.

Q2 FY2022/23

VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Fort Port City Council Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 October- 31 December 2022. Follow up on recommendations of previous audit Q1 FY2022/23.

Q3 FY2022/23

VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Fort Port City Council Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 January- 31 March 2023. Follow up on recommendations of previous audit Q1-Q2 FY2022/23.

Q4 FY2022/23

VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Fort Port City Council Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 April- June 2023. Follow up on recommendations of previous audit Q1-Q3 FY2022/23.

VIDE: AUD/251/2022/01. Q1 FY2023/24 Fort Portal City Council Draft Internal Audit Report for the Period 1 July to 30 September 2023. Follow up on recommendations of previous reports i.e. 4 Quarter 2022-2023 Report.

17

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

Score 1 or else score 0

The City Council provided evidence confirming that internal audit reports for FY2022/23 were submitted to the City Clerk, Speaker of the City Council, and PAC. However, these reports were not reviewed by PAC.

Evidence

During FY2022/23, PAC only reviewed internal audit reports for FY2021/22 i.e.

• Fort Portal City Accounts Committee (PAC) Report on Q1, Q2, and Q3 Audit Report for FY2021/22 Examined in Meeting held on 16 December 2022 at Musisa Hall. Received by City Speaker on 16 December 2022.

• Fort Portal City Accounts Committee (PAC) Report on Quarter Four Audit Report for FY2021/22 Examined in Meeting held on 16 December 2022 at Musisa Hall submitted to City Speaker on 7 October 2022. Received by the Speaker on 10 October 2022.

Local Revenues

18

LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

A review of City Council Annual Budget Estimates FY2022/23 and Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 revealed that the local revenue collected by the City Council for FY2022/23 was less than budget by 18% (i.e. not within +/-10% threshold)

Evidence

Annual Budget Estimates FY2022/23. Page No 1

Local revenue amount budgeted was UGX 2,770,000,000

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23. Page No 35

Local revenue amount collected was UGX 2,250,858,183

Calculation

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

(2,250,858,183-2,770,000,000)/ 2,770,000,000*100 = -18.4%

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

Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.

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

- If more than 10 %: score 2.
- If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.
- If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.

A review of the City Council's Draft Final Accounts for FY2022/23 disclosed that the City Council's OSR collection improved by 15% between FY2021/22 and FY2022/23

Evidence

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 Page No 25-26

OSR Collection FY2022/23 was UGX (663,301,276+1,402,589,856+184,967,051) = UGX 2,250,858,183

OSR Collection FY2021/22 was UGX (780,712,631+954,261,201+215,061,000) = UGX 1,950,034,832

Calculations

Change in OSR in %age

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

$(2,250,858,183 - 1,950,034,832) / 1,950,034,832 * 100 = 15.4\%$

Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

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

A review of the City Council's Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 and remittances to LLGs for FY2022/23 disclosed that the City Council remitted less than the 50% mandatory LLG share of local revenues FY2022/23, as mandated in Section 85 of the LG Act CAP 243.

Evidence

Draft Final Accounts FY2022/23 Page No 25

Local revenue collections was UGX 2,250,858,183

Remittances made during the FY2022/23

EFT	UGX
1139148	148,762,781
1139149	9,117,491
675128	11,387,702
675127	226,954,004
6419024	110,300,126
6419025	11,384,056
5291679	4,245,307
5291678	98,803,462
3688242	2,634,500
3688241	85,111,633
2401497	21,070,335
2401496	207,016,416
2906710	130,018,598
2906711	15,182,107
Total	1,081,988,518

Calculations

Remittances/Total Local Revenue Mandatory for Sharing*100=

$1,081,988,518 / 2,250,858,183 * 100 = 48.1\%$

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>There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts were published on noticeboards. A sample of 3 projects is listed below:</p> <p>>>> Renovation of Bukuuku HC IV, best evaluated bidder (BEB), M/S Zeta Engineering Services Ltd, was displayed on 9/02/2023, ending 24/02/2023</p> <p>>>> Construction of a 3-classroom block at Burungu P/S, best evaluated bidder (BEB), M/S Frabed builders Ltd, was displayed on 9/02/2023, ending 24/02/2023</p> <p>>>> Construction of a 3-unit staff house at Kitumba P/S, best evaluated bidder (BEB), M/S Mubuna Investments Ltd, was displayed on 9/02/2023, ending 24/02/2023</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 City Council did not provide evidence of publishing performance assessment results and implications for 2022.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council did not provide evidence confirming that discussions were conducted with the public during FY2022/23 to provide feedback on the status of activity implementation.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council provided evidence to confirm that information on Tax Rates, Collection Procedures, and Procedures for Appeal were made public at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Displayed on the Notice Board opposite the Revenue office.</p>	1

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 City Council provided evidence to confirm that the IGG made several correspondences of alleged fraud, however, no evidence was adduced to establish the status of actions taken on these allegations.

Evidence

Allegations in IGG File with no information on status of actions taken

FPT/ADM/13/180/01 Dated 2 June 2023- List of All Public Institutions and Projects in Your Area of Jurisdiction.

FPT/03/05/2022 Dated 22 November 2022- Use of Forged Academic Documents by Mr. Clovis Caxton Mugasa, A Town Agent, Fort Portal City.

FPT/7/0/2018 Dated 26 September 2022- Alleged Irregular Appointment of Ms. Annet Kamukama, A teacher at Kagote Seed Secondary School, Fort Portal City

FTP/1/11/2016 Dated 13 October 2022. Alleged Irregular Attendance to Duty by some staff in Health Unit of Fort Portal Municipal Council and Kabarole District.

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>We reviewed PLE results released by UNEB in 2020 and 2022 for Fort Portal City and we noted the following:</p> <p>In 2020, the City performed as follows; Div. I: 652; Div. II: 1520; and Div. III: 100; totaling to 2272 pupils against 2379 candidates (in 30 primary schools) that sat for PLE that year. This translates to 95.5% pass rate (2272/2379).</p> <p>In 2022, Fort Portal City performed as follows; Div. I: 760; Div. II: 1724 and Div. III: 136 totaling to 2620 pupils against 2697 candidates (in 30 primary schools) that sat for PLE that year. This translates to 97.1% pass rate (2620/2697)</p> <p>There was an increase in performance of 1.6 % (97.1% - 95.5%).</p> <p>Due to the COVID 19 pandemic, UNEB did not conduct PLE in 2021 hence the comparison between school years, 2020 and 2022 instead of 2021 and 2022 as guided by MoES.</p>	2
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>We reviewed UCE results released by UNEB in 2020 and 2022 for USE schools and we noted the following:</p> <p>In 2020 Fort Portal City performed as follows; Div. I: 08; Div. II 42; and Div. III:111 totaling to 224 pupils against 352 candidates (in seven (7) secondary schools) that sat for UCE that year. This translates to 69.3% pass rate (244/352).</p> <p>In 2022 Fort Portal City, performed as follows; Div. I: 147 ; Div. II 364; ; and Div. III; 370: totaling to 881 pupils against 1564 candidates (in seven (7) secondary schools) that sat for UCE that year. This translates to 56.3 % pass rate (881/1564)</p> <p>There was a decline in performance of 12.7 % (56.3% - 69.3%).</p> <p>Due to COVID 19 pandemic, UNEB did not conduct UCE Exams in 2021. Hence the comparison between school years 2020 and 2022, instead of 2021 and 2022 as guided by MoES.</p>	0

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>The LG average score in the Education LLG performance assessment for 2023 improved by 20% compared to LLG performance assessment for 2022.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 2 • Between 1 and 5%, score 1 • No Improvement, score 0 	<p>Evidence</p>	
			<p>OPAMS Data Generated by OPM</p> <p>Average Overall LLGPA Scores for 2023= 75%</p>	
			<p>Average Overall LLGPA Scores for 2022= 55%</p>	
		<p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>Calculation</p>	
			<p>Variance Average Overall LLGPA (2023-2022) = 75-55=20%</p>	
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the Education Sector, Planning Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Local Governments FY 2022/23 to determine eligible activities and the Q4 budget performance report.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>We established evidence that, the development grant was used in accordance with sector guidelines i.e. supply of desks, construction of latrines, construction of classrooms and construction of teacher's houses. The activities conducted were;</p>	
			<p>— Construction of a five (5) stance with a shower for girls at Kahinju P/S</p>	
			<p>— Renovation of a three (3) classrooms block at Burunga P/S and</p>	
			<p>— Construction of a teachers house at Kitumba P/S</p>	
			<p>According to the Q4 performance report signed on 24/08/2023 page 49, the City Council spent UGX 172,000, 000 against a budget of UGX 484,750,000 implying a 36 % performance rate.(The contractor for construction of a teachers house at Kitumba P/S was yet to be paid, because he had earlier provided a wrong A/C and the payment bounced. A letter referenced, OPM/DM/002 and dated 30th August 2023, addressed to the City Town Clerk, from the Permanent Secretary OPM, under the subject; Construction of a 2 Unit staff house at Kitumba P/S under funding of Luwero- Rwenzori, giving guidance on how to go about the process of payment again, refers</p>	

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

We obtained payment vouchers for all
education construction projects contracts for
the previous FY 2022/2023 in Fort Portal
City, to establish whether certification of
works was done by the; CDO and
Environment Officer before the LG made
payments to contractors.

We established the following details;

1. Payment of UGX 30,624,068 was made,
vide voucher No 5851574 dated 24 June
2023, for construction of a 5 stance VIP
latrine with a shower for girls at Burungu
P/S, certified by the ; DEO, and Engineer.
The CDO and Environment certified the
works, but did not date the certification,

2. Payment of UGX 9,465,835 was made
vide voucher No 6419837, dated; 28 June
2023 for construction of a five stance
classroom block at Kahinju P/S was certified
by the; DEO, CDO, Environment and District
Engineer. but not dated by CDO and
Environment officer.

3. Construction of a staff house at Kitumba
P/S had not been paid yet because the
earlier payment had bounced in the bank
due to a wrong A/C given by the
Payee/contractor as above explained in
(2a). .

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	<p>The sampled projects/contracts are as follows:</p> <p>>>> Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Kitumba P/S. Contract reference number: Fort602/Wrks/22-23/00011, Contractor was M/S Mubuna Investments Uganda Limited, contract amount UGX 189,913,550/= . Contract signed on 17/03/2023. <i>The project was not planned for according to the updated procurement plan presented, dated 14/04/2023, signed and stamped by the Town Clerk.</i></p> <p>>>> Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Kahingi P/S; contract sum was UGX 28,997,556/= according to the contract and the procurement plan presented dated 14/04/2023, signed and stamped by the Town Clerk, the latrine had a budget of UGX 28,997,556/=. This represented a variation of 0% of the MoWT estimate.</p> <p>>>> Renovation of a three classroom block at Burungu P/S; Contract reference number: Fort602/Wrks/22-23/00004; Contractor: M/S Frabed Builders Limited; Contract amount UGX 56,535,676/= as reviewed from the contract agreement dated 10/3/2023. According to the updated procurement plan dated 14/04/2023, signed and stamped by the Town Clerk, the project was planned for UGX 56,535,676/=. <i>This represented a variation of 0% of the MoWT estimate.</i></p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Pass</p>	2
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	The city did not have a seed secondary school constructed in the previous FY.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 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>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>We reviewed the staffing structure of primary school teachers from HRM and noted that Fort Portal City had recruited 448 (77.3%) staff in position against a staff ceiling of 579 teachers in 30 UPE schools as per the guidelines prescribed by MoES i.e. a ratio of 1:53 (teacher: pupil ratio) and a teacher per class plus a head teacher for a P7 school.</p>	1
---	---	---	---	---

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>We reviewed a list of registered 30 UPE and seven(7) USE schools and their consolidated schools asset registers for FYs 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 from the MEO, which revealed evidence that, none of the 30 UPE schools or (0%) and none of the seven (7) USE schools or (0%) respectively, met the Basic requirements and minimum standards.</p> <p>All schools required; extra classrooms and/or rehabilitation, latrines, teacher's house and desks.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>We reviewed the teacher deployment list from the City education office and noted that Fort Portal City had accurately reported on 448 (100%) staff in position, including where they were deployed.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; St Peter and Paul P/S (semi- urban) there were 21 teachers, in Kanzingo P/S (rural) there were 21 teachers and in Buhinga P/S (urban), there were 30 teachers.</p> <p>This information was collated with the teacher's arrival books at the three schools, the staff lists for 2022/23 from the education office and the staff lists found at the sampled schools. The three sources of information were accordant.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

We reviewed the school asset registers of all 30 UPE schools to determine whether there was accuracy on reporting on the infrastructure and verified the information at the sampled schools, which revealed evidence that Fort Portal City had a consolidated school asset register accurately reporting on infrastructure in all the 30 schools (100% accuracy).

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

— St Peter and Paul P/S (semi-urban) there were three (3) classroom blocks with 15 classrooms; five(4) latrine blocks with 21 stances, 200 three-seater desks and two (2) teachers houses in permanent material, accommodating two (2) teachers.

— In Kazingo P/S (rural), there were, five (5) classroom blocks with 13 classrooms, six (2) latrine blocks with 16 stances ,215, four-seater desks and one (1) teacher's house block in permanent material accommodating three (3) teachers.

— In Buhinga P/S (urban) there were five (5) classroom blocks with 22 classrooms, three (3) latrine blocks with 12 stances, 283, three-seater desks.

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

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

The education department did not avail copies of the annual school reports and budgets submitted to the CEO, in the previous FY 2022/2023.

Therefore, there was no evidence that schools had complied with the requirement of all registered primary schools (UPE) submitting the Annual School Report to the City Education Office within the timeline of on/or before 30 January 2023.

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>We reviewed inspection reports for; Term III, 2022 dated 30 September 2022, Term 11, 2023 dated 30 June 2023 and Term 1, 2023, dated 1 April 2023 of FY 2022/2023 to identify the schools that had submitted the SIPs. The findings were that none of the 30 schools had submitted SIPs.</p> <p>None of the three sampled schools i.e. St Peter and Paul P/S (semi-urban), Buhinga (urban) P/S and Kazingo (rural) had a copy of the SIP.</p> <p>Therefore, there was no evidence that schools were supported to develop SIPs and also that they had submitted copies to the City Education Officer (CEO).</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 - 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>We obtained and reviewed the OTIMS extract from MOES and noted that Fort Portal City submitted data (30.708) pupils for 30 primary schools.</p> <p>We reviewed the attachments of the LG performance contract for FY 2022/23 which (Performance Contract) was yet to be signed and noted a list of 30 schools. Therefore, the LG collected and compiled data for all registered schools (UPE) in the city and submitted it accordingly.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Fort Portal City budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of seven teachers for 30 schools with P7 to the tune of UGX 5,027,242,000 for FY 2023/2024 as per the approved budget estimates 2023/2024.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the teacher's staff list and there was evidence that the education department had deployed 448 staff in position as per sector guidelines, i.e. a head teacher and a teacher per class for a P7 school and a head teacher and one teacher for each class for a school below P7, in 30 primary schools.</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>In the three sampled schools, we noted the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — St Peter and Paul P/S (semi-urban) - 21 teachers; — Buhinga P/S Urban) - 30 teachers; and — Kazingo P/S (rural) 21 teachers. 	
			<p>This information was corroborated with staff lists at school, teacher's arrival books and staff lists from the education department office, hence found in sync.</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>We reviewed the teacher deployment list and inspected the notice boards in the three sampled schools.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>We established evidence that the teacher deployment had been displayed on the school notice boards of the three sampled schools i.e. St. Peter and Paul P/S (semi – urban in Central Division). Kazingo P/S (rural in North Division) and Buhinga P/S (urban, in Central Division).</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>The following files were provided at the time of assessment and only one of the Head Teachers was appraised thereby not meeting the threshold for the score as shown below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Kajobe Harriet – HT Kitarasa PS, appraised 30th November 2016. 2. Kitembo Charles -Nyakagongo PS, appraised 11th December 2021. 3. Kamwenge Charles, HT Canon Apollo Demonstration School, appraised 19th December 2022. 	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>No files were provided for assessment.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>A review of the staff payroll list for the Department, four staff were provided for. However, only three files were availed for assessment and one staff was duly appraised as detailed hereunder.</p> <p>Ag. City Education Officer. Mr. Alituha Richard (substantive Principal Education Officer) at the time of assessment was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.</p> <p>Senior Inspector of Schools - Ms Manimake Susan at the time of assessment was found duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.</p> <p>Senior Education Officer - Ategeka Patrick at the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG prepared a training plan dated 15th October 2022, to address the gaps identified during inspection. Some of the activities in there included; training head teachers on basic Book keeping and Financial Management and training Senior Women Teachers (SWT) in Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM)</p>	2
<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>				

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Fort Portal City did not write to MoES, regarding the list of schools and enrolment because all data had been captured correctly.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>We reviewed the MoES Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for Primary and Secondary Schools, FY 2022/23, the budget estimates for FY 2022/2023 and the Q4 annual performance report for FY 2022/23, page 107 .</p> <p>Review of the approved budget estimates FY 2022/23 revealed evidence that Fort Portal City allocated UGX 18,112,000 towards inspection and monitoring.</p> <p>Review of the Q4 performance report on page 107 revealed an expenditure of UGX 18.064.000 (99.7 %) on inspection and monitoring activities including the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Conducting inspections, thrice for each school — Conducting follow up inspections to establish whether recommendations were implemented. — Discussion of findings and dissemination of findings <p>We established that the inspection and monitoring activities conducted, complied to sector guidelines.</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>A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of warrant submissions for school capitation grants revealed that the City Council in FY2022/23, warranted more than 5 working days after cash limits were communicated by the PS/ST.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Evidence</p> <p>Q3 FY2022/23. Communication of cash limits made on 29 December 2022. City Council warranted on the 18 January 2023 i.e. 5+ working days</p> <p>Q4 FY2022/23. Communication of cash limit made on 06 April 2023. City Council warranted on 11 May 23 i.e. 5+ working days</p> <p>Q1 FY2023/24. Communication of cash limits made on 06 July 2023. City Council warranted on 24 July 2023 i.e. 5+ working days.</p>	
			<p>Note- Cash limit uploads by MoFPED could not be accessed.</p>	
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>We obtained and reviewed of copies of MoFPED release circulars for the last three quarters indicating the following dates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 2022/23 Q3: 10 January 2023 — 2022/23 Q4: 24 April 2023 and — 2023/24 Q1: 17 July 2023 	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>The education department did not provide evidence that Fort Portal City made release circulars and invoices of capitation to schools for the last three (3) quarters.</p> <p>At the three sampled schools; Buhinga P/S(urban), St. Peters and Paul P/S (semi-urban) and Kazingo (rural) there was no evidence that the MEO communicated/ publicized within the three working days of the release.</p>	
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>We obtained a copy of the inspection plan for FY 2022/23, dated 5 July 2022. It detailed; Specific activity, objectives, input, verifiable indicators, outputs and timeframe</p> <p>There CIS did not provide evidence that they had held planning meetings to prepare for inspection in the three terms.</p>	0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>We obtained the City inspection and monitoring reports for the three terms; Term III of 2022 dated 30 December 2022, Term II of 2023 dated 31 July 2023 and Term I of 2023, dated, 3 April 2023 respectively.</p> <p>We established that, 30 (100%) UPE schools had been inspected thrice each, in FY 2022/23. The findings were compiled in City Inspectors reports as per indicator 10 (d) below.</p> <p>This information on the list of schools from PBS was corroborated with that in the inspection reports and, it rhymed</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that departmental meetings had taken place to discuss school inspections and therefore making it difficult to establish whether recommendations had been made for corrective actions,</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the CIS had presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to the respective schools, but not submitted the e-generated district reports to DES for terms 1 and 11 of 203.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools; Buhinga P/S (urban) a report dated 27/09/2022 by Ategeka Patrick was left behind. In St. Peters and Paul P/S (semi- Urban), a report dated, 06/10/2022 by Ategeka Patrick was left behind and in Kazingo (rural) a report not dated by Kitembo Charles was left behind.</p>	0

10

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 City Council provided evidence that the General Purpose Committee met and discussed service delivery issues in the education sector in the course of FY2022/23.

Evidence

Minutes of the General Purpose Committee (GPC) Meeting Held on 15 December 2022 at Musisa Hall MINUTE FPCC/GPC/43/12/22 to FPCC/GPC/48/12/22.

FPCC/GPC/47/12/22: Presentation of Departmental/Sectoral Performance Reports for Second Quarter 2022/23

- Mismanagement of Capitation Grant. Recommendation- Breakdown Grants to ascertain disbursements
- Indiscipline in Private Schools
- No provision made in facilities for disabled
- Mountains of the Moon Army Primary School and Burungu Primary- Allocations in the Budget.
- Change of Projects to benefit from funds from OPM- Recommendation- Establish cordial working relationship with OPM to ensure that funding continues for construction of classroom blocks at Mountains of the Moon and Burungu Primary Schools be rolled over in FY2023/24.

Minutes of the General Purpose Committee (GPC) Meeting Held on 25 October 2022 at Musisa Hall MINUTE FPCC/GPC/38/10/22 to FPCC/GPC/43/10/22.

FPCC/GPC/43/10/22: Reactions

- Find out whether the strategy to reduce absenteeism put in place was working
- Details of shares allocated to different schools be provided to Councilors to monitor utilization. Action- To be availed by Ag. Head of Finance.
- Education Department sensitizing School Head Teachers and Teachers on the School Curriculum

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 no evidence provided that Fort-Portal City had conducted any activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school

0

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>We obtained and reviewed the school asset register of the previous FY 2022/23, verified the information and established that there was an up-to-date LG asset register which set out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards.</p> <p>In the three sampled schools, we noted the information below;</p> <p>— St Peter and Paul P/S (semi-urban) there were three (3) classroom blocks with 15 classrooms; five (5) latrine blocks with 21 stances, 200 three-seater desks and one (1) teachers houses in permanent material, accommodating four (4) teachers.</p> <p>— In Kazingo P/S (rural), there were five (5) classroom blocks with 13 classrooms, two (2) latrine blocks with 16 stances, 215 four - seater desks and one (1) teacher’s house block in permanent material accommodating three (3) teachers.</p> <p>— In Buhinga P/S (urban) there were (5) classroom blocks with 30 classrooms, six (6) latrine blocks with 24 stances, 506, four-seater desks and to (2) teachers house accommodating 15 teachers (in a sorry state) .</p> <p>This information was corroborated with the consolidated Asset register at the Education Department office and both were in tandem.</p>	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>The City Council did not provide evidence confirming that the TPC conducted desk appraisals of all sector projects in the budget FY2022/23.</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, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>The City Council did not provide evidence confirming that field appraisals of sector projects in FY2022/23 were conducted to check for their technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and customized designs to suit site conditions.</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, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>Evidence was availed that the city education department budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan,</p> <p>>>> Completion of 2 classroom block at Burungo P/S, budget UGX 63,630,097/=</p> <p>>>> Construction of 5-stance latrine at Bukuuku P/S, budget UGX 30,000,000/=.</p> <p>>>> Renovation of roofs at Kinyamasika P/S, budget UGX 25,718,663/=.</p> <p>>>> Renovation of a classroom block at Kazingo PS, budget 44,803,701/=.</p> <p>>>> Renovation of a classroom block at Kamengo P/S, budget 44,803,701/=.</p> <p>The education procurement plan was received by the Head of Procurement and Disposal Unit on 13/4/2023.</p> <p>No seed school planned in the city.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>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 was availed.</p> <p>For example;</p> <p>>>> Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Kahingi P/S was approved by the contracts committee on 7/2/2023, under minute number CC/22-23/036; contract sum was UGX 28,997,556/=</p> <p>>>> Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Kitumba P/S was approved by the contracts committee on 3/03/2023, under minute number CC/22-23/0047; contract sum was UGX 189,913,550/=</p> <p>>>> Construction of a 3-classroom block at Burungu PS was approved by the contracts committee on 7/02/2023, under minute number CC/22-23/0033; contract sum was UGX 56,535,676/=</p>	1

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>	>>> In a letter dated 30/03/2023, reference number: CR/105/2, Town Clerk appointed the senior education officer, head teacher Kahinju P/S, Ag. City engineer, senior environmental officer, Ag. town clerk central division, and senior community development officer as PIT for construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Kahinju P/S. No labour officer appointed. In addition, no other project's PIT was availed. Conclusion Fail.	0
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>	The city had no seed school constructed in the previous FY.	1
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>	The city had no seed school constructed in the previous FY.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The city did not have a seed school constructed in the previous FY, and there was evidence that in a supervision report dated 28/04/2023, a joint team of technical officers (city engineer, environmental officer, and CDO) supervised works, leading to certification of works for payment certificate number 1 on 5/05/2023, for renovation of a 3-classroom block at Burungu P/S.	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, *score: 1, else score: 0*

A review of AWP and a sample of City Council's payment vouchers for payments to 3 contractors for education Infrastructure projects implemented in FY2022/23 revealed that the City Council initiated and made timely payments to contractors as per contract and implementation results.

Evidence

1. Request for Payment was made by M/s Malidadi Sana Beverages Co. Ltd on 14 April 2023 for the construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a shower at Kahinju Primary School for UGX 16,000,000. The payment certificate was prepared on 17 April 2023 and signed by the City Education Officer on 21 April 2023, the Senior Environment Officer, the Principal Community Development Officer, and the City Engineer. Payment was made on EFT No. 5850110 on 14 May 2023 i.e. This payment was made 21 days after certification by City Education Officer.

2. Request for Payment was made by M/s Malidadi Sana Beverages Co. Ltd on 12 June 2023 for the construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine with a shower at Kahinju Primary School for UGX 1,300,000. The payment certificate was prepared on 16 June 2023 and signed by the City Education Officer on 19 June 2023, the Senior Environment Officer, the Principal Community Development Officer, and the City Engineer. Payment was made on EFT No. 6419837 on 28 June 2023 i.e. This payment was made 9 days after certification by City Education Officer.

3. Request for Payment was made by M/s Frabed Builders Limited on 17 April 2023 for the renovation of a three-class room block at Burungu Primary School for UGX 35,000,000. Payment certificate prepared on 4 May 2023 and signed by City Education Officer on 5 May 2023, Senior Environment Officer, Principal Community Development Officer and City Engineer. Payment was made on EFT No. 5851574 on 28 May 2023 i.e. This payment was made 23 days after certification by the City Education Officer.

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>Evidence was availed that the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, which was availed, and received by PDU on 13/4/2022. The following projects were planned:</p> <p>>>> Construction of a classroom block at Mountains of the Moon P/S, budget UGX 200,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Construction/renovation of a classroom block at Burungu P/S, budget UGX 120,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Kahinju P/S, budget UGX 30,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Construction of a waterborne toilet (5-stances) at Bukuuku Community Secondary School, budget UGX 50,000,000/=.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>The entity did not have a seed school in the previous FY.</p>	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, <i>score: 3, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that grievances had been recorded, investigated, responded to, and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework under Education. There were no minutes for the GRC for the previous FY.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>We obtained and reviewed evidence of dissemination of Education guidelines that were dated 08/08/2022. They were disseminated to a total number of 26 head teachers on 08/08/2022</p>	3

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The City had costed ESMPs incorporated within the BoQs for education projects;</p> <p>Construction of a five-stance VIP latrine at Kahinju primary school in the central division had costed ESMP of UGX: 1,678,000 incorporated in the BoQs.</p> <p>Renovation of a three-classroom block at Burungu had costed ESMP of UGX: 620,000 incorporated in the BoQs.</p> <p>Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Kitumba primary school had costed ESMP of UGX: 830,000 incorporated in the BoQs.</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of land ownership for schools on which the city projects were constructed.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and prepared monthly monitoring reports. Only the renovation of a three-classroom block at Burungu Primary School was monitored and this was done once per monitoring report dated 14/06/2022.</p>	0

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments

Score: 1, else score:0

There was evidence that E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for education projects;

The payment certificate for the construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Kahinju Primary for M/s Malidadi Sana Beverages Co. Ltd was prepared on 17 April 2023 and signed by the Senior Environment Officer, the Principal Community Development Officer on 14 May 2023.

The payment certificate for the construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Kahinju Primary for M/s Malidadi Sana Beverages Co. Ltd was prepared on 16 June 2023 and signed by the Senior Environment Officer, the Principal Community Development Officer on 19 June 2023.

The payment certificate for the renovation of a three-classroom block at Burungu Primary School for M/s Frabed Builders Limited was prepared on 4 May 2023 and signed by the Senior Environment Officer, the Principal Community Development Officer on 5 May 2023.

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
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"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>There was no registered increase in utilization of health care services in deliveries. The sampling done from all the Health facilities conducting deliveries from the health unit annual reports (HMIS 107) for financial years 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 indicated a decrease of -7.6%.</p> <p>In the financial year 2021-2022, total deliveries amounted to 10623.</p> <p>In the financial year 2022-2023, total deliveries amounted to 9808.</p> <p>(9808-10623) divided by 10623, and then multiplied by 100, which equaled -7.6% which was below the required 20% and above.</p>	0
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"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 	<p>The average score in the Health LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 100%.</p>	2
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"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>The indicator was not applicable</p>	0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of the LG’s Annual Budget Performance Report and Annual Budget Estimates for FY2022/23 revealed that the LG Health Development Grant was budgeted and spent on ineligible activities as per the Health Grant and Budget Guidelines.</p>	0
			<p>Evidence</p> <p>Budget Estimates FY2022/23</p> <p>Annual Budget Performance Report FY2022/23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring Capital works UGX 46,000,000 • Professional Engineering Services- Architectural Designs UGX 340,000,000 • Office Equipment Maintenance - Maintenance, Repair and Support Services UGX 70,000,000 	
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 City Council provided evidence that the City Health Officer, Engineer, Community Development Officer, and Environment Officer certified works implemented by the City Council’s Health Department in FY2022/23 before payments were made to contractors.</p>	2
			<p>Evidence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request for Payment was made by M/s RMF Engineering Contractors Ltd on 29 May 2023 for the upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HCII to HCIII for UGX 348,582,456. The payment was made on EFT 6425391 on 28 June 2023. Payment Certificate No. 1 was prepared on 30 May 2023 and signed by the City Health Officer on 16 June 2023 including the Principal Community Development Officer, City Engineer & Senior Environment Officer. 2. Request for Payment was made by M/s RMF Engineering Contractors Ltd on 15 June 2023 for the upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HCII to HCIII for UGX 457,423,058. Payment was made on EFT 6425391 on 28 June 2023. Payment Certificate No. 2 was prepared on 21 June 023 and signed by City Health Officer on 21 June 2023 including the Principal Community Development Officer, City Engineer & Senior Environment Officer. 	

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0

The city had two (02) UglIFT-funded health infrastructure investments in the previous FY contracted by one contractor.

>>> Upgrading of **Kiguma** and **Rubingo HCIIIs to HCIIIs** in North Division of Fort Portal City, works contract amount UGX 1,889,403,098/=. The agreement was signed on 2/03/2023; contractor was M/S RMF Engineering Contractors Limited. The procurement plan dated 14/04/2023, signed and stamped by the Town Clerk had an engineer's estimate of UGX 1,889,403,098/=. **The original procurement plan was not availed. This represented a variation of 0% of the MoWT estimate.**

Other projects not implemented under the UglIFT program included:

>>> Extension of a maternity ward at Kagote HC II. The works contract is dated 17/3/2023, contract reference no. Fort602/Wrks/22-23/00009, contract amount UGX 40,200,210/=. The contractor was M/S Kromaka Engineering Services Ltd. The procurement plan dated 14/04/2023, signed and stamped by the Town Clerk, had an engineer's estimate of UGX 40,200,210/=. *This represented a variation of 0% of the MoWT estimate.*

>>> Construction of a 3-stance VIP Latrine with a urinal and a bathroom at Ibaale HC II. The works contract is dated 7/3/2023. contract reference no. Fort602/Wrks/22-23/00007, contract amount UGX 24,807,382/=. The contractor was M/S Beglo Enterprise Company Ltd. The procurement plan dated 14/04/2023, signed and stamped by the Town Clerk, had an engineer's estimate of UGX 24,807,382/=. **This represented a variation of 0% of the MoWT estimate.**

Conclusion

Pass

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	The report presented as the annual budget performance report for the previous FY , dated 12/05/2023 reported the following:	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>>>> Maternity ward foundation; 100% complete,</p> <p>>>> Staff house foundation; 100% complete,</p> <p>UgIFT project: Upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HCIIIs to HCIIIs in North Division of Fort Portal City, works contract amount UGX 1,889,403,098/= below 70% completion.</p>	
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	The approved structure for HCIV and HC III facilities provides for staffing levels as follows: (i) HC IIIs - 19 and (ii) HC IVs - 49. An analysis of the data provided revealed that the staffing levels at HC IV and HCIII facilities were on average 74.5% each as shown hereunder thereby giving a combined average of 75%.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p><u>Health Centre IV</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bukuuku HC IV - 48/49(98%) 2. Kataraka HC IV - 25/49 (51%) 	
			<p><u>Health Centre III</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kagote HCIII -18/19 (94%) 2. Karambi HCIII - 16/19 (84%) 3. Kasusu HC III - 15/19 (78%) 4.Mucwa HC III- 8/19 (42%) 	
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	Through site visits conducted to Rubingo and Kiguma HC upgrades, the findings indicated that the LG health infrastructure meet the approved MoH facility infrastructure designs.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	The two (02) HC upgraded facilities conformed to the MoH technical designs and no changes were done as far as the MoH design layout is concerned. The facilities constructed at each station included: maternity ward, 2-unit staff houses, and 4-stance VIP latrines with 4 showers. All conformed to the approved MoH standard technical designs.	

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled was accurate. This was evidenced on the deployment staff lists from the CHO of 10th July 2023 and that on the staff lists and attendance registers at the 3 sampled health facilities of Kataraka Health centre IV, Kasusu Health centre III and Mucwa Health centre III as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At Kataraka Health center IV, 23 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the CHO's office corresponded to the 23 staff list of 22nd October 2023. 2. At Kasusu Health center III, 14 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the CHO's office which corresponded to the 14 staff list of 6th July 2023 3. At Mucwa Health center III, 9 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the CHO's office corresponding to the 9 staff list dated 5th July 2023. 	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the health sector had upgrades under the financial year assessed</p> <p>Kiguma health center II and Rubingo health center II were upgraded to Health center IIIs as evidenced on the PBS report.</p>	2

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that the Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Work plans and budgets to the CHO for the previous financial year.</p> <p>The sampled health facilities of , Kataraka, Kasusu and Mucwa Health facilities submitted as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kataraka Health center IV submitted on 27th March 2023 signed by the CHO and approved by the TC on 27th March 2023. 2. Kasusu health center III submitted on 30th March 2023 signed by the CHO and approved by the TC on 30th March 2023 and; 3. Mucwa Health center III submitted on 31st March 2023 signed by the CHO and approved by the TC on 31st March 2023 <p>All the submissions were by 31st March which was within the timeline and also conformed to the prescribed formats.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>Only Katakara HC prepared and submitted to the CHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY which was dated 25th July 2023</p> <p>There was no evidence of submissions by Kasusu and Mucwa Health facilities</p> <p>The submission of Katakara did not comply to the timeline submission by July 15th of the current FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines</p>	0

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- Score 2 or else 0

Ministry of Health rolled out annual comprehensive work plans and budgets (HMIS001) to replace both the work plans and performance improvement plans. This was documented on the exit declaration form as a specific area of concern

The sampled health facilities submitted the annual comprehensive work plan which integrated both the work plan and the facility improvement plans as follows;

1. Kataraka Health center IV submitted on 27th March 2023 signed by the CHO and approved by the TC on 27th March 2023.

2. Kasusu health center III submitted on 30th March 2023 signed by the CHO and approved by the TC on 30th March 2023 and;

3. Mucwa Health center III submitted on 31st March 2023 signed by the CHO and approved by the TC on 31st March 2023

These submissions incorporated performance issues identified in CHMT monitoring and assessment reports as indicated below;

1. Had a client charter printed in the local language that ensured that clients understood their rights.

2. Fully engaged the community and other stakeholders in mobilisation for Covid 19 vaccination

3. Lobby for the ambulance to avoid maternal and neonatal poor outcomes due to delayed referrals.

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>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the health facilities submitted 100% up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter).</p> <p>Monthly and quarterly reports for the 3 sampled health facilities of Katakara, Kasusu and Mucwa health facilities were indicated as below;</p> <p>Katakara health facility submitted as follows; 4th August, 6th September, 6th October, 4th November, 7th December, 6th January, 7th February, 7th March, 5th April, 7th June and 5th July</p> <p>Kasusu health facility submitted as follows; 5th August, 7th September, 6th October, 4th November, 6th December, 7th January, 7th February, 7th March, 5th April, 5th May, 7th June and 7th July</p> <p>Mucwa Health facility submitted as follows;</p> <p>4th August, 7th September, 7th October, 6th November, 7th December, 6th January, 5th February, 7th March, 6th April, 5th May, 7th June and 5th July</p> <p>The submissions of 3 facilities were timely of all monthly (12) and quarterly (4) reports for the previous FY</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>This indicator was not applicable</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>This indicator was not applicable</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council did not provide evidence that the Health Department had compiled and submitted timely Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY2022/23 to the Planner for consolidation.</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>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 that the LG developed a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).</p>	0

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0

There was no evidence that the LG implemented Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities as the PIP was not developed. There was no PIP availed to the assessment team

0

Human Resource Management and Development

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:

i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

The evidence indicated that the LG did not budget for health workers following guidelines / staffing norms.

Under vote 602 of the LG approved estimates, the LG budgeted for 152 health workers. The total number of staff on the approved was 162 on the approved structure. This indicated that $(162 - 152) = 100$ staff who were not budgeted for.

The staffing norms included;

1. DHOs office staff deployed=11
2. 2 HC IVs staff deployed=67
3. 4 HC IIIs staff deployed =56
4. 3 HC IIs staff deployed=18

Total deployed =152 staff.

0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG did not deploy health workers as per guidelines as all the health facilities did not have at least 75% as staff required in accordance with the staffing norms.

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

1. Katakara HC IV had 23/49=46%
2. Kasusu HC III had 14/19=73%
3. Mucwa HC III had 9/19=47%
4. Bukuuku HC IV had 44/49=89%
5. Kagote HC III had 17/19=89%
6. Karambi HCIII had 16/19=84%

Kataraka, Kasusu and Mucwa staffing did not conform to the 75% guidelines.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

This was evidenced on the deployment staff lists from the CHO of 10th July 2023 and that on the staff lists and attendance registers at the 3 sampled health facilities of Kataraka Health centre IV, Kasusu Health centre III and Mucwa Health centre III as indicated below;

1. At Kataraka Health center IV , 23 out of 49 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the CHO's office corresponded to the 23 staff list of 22nd October 2023 that was pinned on the notice board at the facility. For example, Magret Bwemi Rukindo (Assistant Nursing Officer), Lucy Kabasongora (Enrolled Midwife), Titus Tumusiime (Medical Clinical Officer), Wilber Muhumuza (Dispenser), Martha Gonzaga (Porter) and others appeared on the staff lists and CHOs deployment list.
2. At Kasusu Health center III, 14 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the CHO's office which corresponded to the 14 staff list of 6th July 2023 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit. For example, Rose Jolly (Enrolled Nurse), Rouben Kizinge (Akari), Olive Kunihira (Assistant Nursing Officer), Beatrice Tuhaise (Porter) appeared on the staff list and the CHO deployment list
3. At Mucwa Health center III, 9 out of 19 staff were indicated on the deployment list at the CHO's office corresponding to the 9 staff list dated 5th July 2023 that was pinned at the Health facility notice board. For example, Stephen Muhenda (Assistant Nursing Officer), Beatrice Mbabazi (Enrolled Nurse), Monica Katusabe (Laboratory Assistant) appeared both on the staff list and CHOs deployment list.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

1. At Kataraka Health center IV, the 23 staff list of 22nd October 2023 was pinned on the notice board at the facility. For example, Magret Bwemi Rukindo (Assistant Nursing Officer), Lucy Kabasongora (Enrolled Midwife), Titus Tumusiime (Medical Clinical Officer), Wilber Muhumuza (Dispenser), Martha Gonzaga (Porter) and others appeared on the staff lists and CHOs deployment list.

2. At Kasusu Health center III, the 14 staff list of 6th July 2023 was pinned at the Health facility notice board during the time of visit. For example, Rose Jolly (Enrolled Nurse), Rouben Kizinge (Akari), Olive Kunihira (Assistant Nursing Officer), Beatrice Tuhaise (Porter) appeared on the staff list and the CHO deployment list

3. At Mucwa Health center III, the 9 staff list dated 5th July 2023 was pinned at the Health facility notice board. For example, Stephen Muhenda (Assistant Nursing Officer), Beatrice Mbabazi (Enrolled Nurse), Monica Katusabe (Laboratory Assistant) appeared both on the staff list and CHOs deployment list.

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

Nine files of facility In-charges were provided for assessment, and all were not duly appraised as detailed hereunder.

1. Ms. Murungi Monica, Enrolled Nurse, In-charge-Ibaale HC II. Assignment of duties letter dated 7th July 2021. Letter of appointment as Enrolled Nurse dated 27th May 2016. Under DSC Min. No. 65/2016 of Kabarole DSC. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.

2. Ms. Kaahwa Rusoke Rose Jolly, In-charge-Karambi HC III. Staff re-organization letter dated 18th January 2022 transferring Officer to Karambi HCIII. Letter of appointment as SCO dated 6th December 2010 under Kabarole DSC Min. No. 180/2010 of Kabarole DSC. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as

evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.

3. Ms. Natukunda Dorine, Enrolled Nurse, In-charge-Kasusu HC III. Assignment of duties letter dated 7th July 2021. Letter of appointment as Enrolled Nurse dated 9th April 2013 under Kabarole DSC Min. No. 189/2012. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.

4. Mr. Ruhweza Francis Agaba-Clinical Officer, In-charge Bukuuku HC IV. Assignment of duties letter dated 7th July 2021. Letter of appointment as Clinical Officer dated 23rd March 2009 under DSC Min. No. 30/2009 of Kabarole DSC. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2020/2021 found on file.

5. Mr. Tusiime Titus-Clinical Officer, In-charge Kataraka HC IV. Assignment of duties letter dated 7th July 2021. Letter of staff re-organization as In charge dated 8th February 2013 under DSC Min. No. 42/2013 of Kabarole DSC. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have filled partially as found on appraisal form for FY 2022/23. It was not counter signed as stipulated.

6. Ms. Nyakwera Safina-Clinical Officer, Enrolled Nurse In-charge Rubingo HC II. Assignment of duties letter dated 7th July 2021. Letter of appointment as Enrolled Nurse dated 31st August 2015 under DSC Min. No. 158/2015 of Kabarole DSC. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.

7. Ms. Kansiiime Rose -Enrolled Nurse, In-charge Kiguma HC II. Assignment of duties letter dated 7th July 2021. Letter of appointment as Clinical Officer dated 27th May 2016 under DSC Min. No. 65/2016 of Kabarole DSC. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.

8. Ms. Agondeze Betty - Clinical Officer, In-charge Mucwa HC III. Staff re-organization 2022 of duties letter dated 18th January 2022. Letter of appointment as Clinical Officer dated 7th January 2020 under DSC Min. No. 199/2019 of Kabarole DSC. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as

			evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.	
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	9. Ms. Mbabazi Jane – Enrolled Nurse, In-charge Kagote HC III. Staff re-organization 2022 of duties letter dated 18th January 2022. Letter of appointment as Enrolled Nurse dated 27th May 2016 under DSC Min. No. 65/2016 of Kabarole DSC . At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file. No sampled files of health facility workers were provided at the time of assessment.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	No evidence was provided.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District. The Health department did not have a capacity building plan. Hence no plan and training reports were availed to the assessment team.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the LG documented the activities in the training data base as no training was conducted.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the TC confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th as all the government Health facilities and PNFPs received PHC</p> <p>This was evidenced from the letter dated 13th September 2023, ref; CR/350/5 from TC to the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health confirming the correctness of the facility names for all the health facilities.</p> <p>This confirmation was received and acknowledged at MOH on 26th September 2023.</p>	2
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>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>A review of Budget Estimates FY2022/23 revealed that the City Council allocated more than 15% of PHC NWR Grant for Lower Level Facilities FY2022/23 towards monitoring service delivery and management of LG Health services.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>DHO Budget UGX 37,487,867</p> <p>PHC NWR UGX 147,128,244+3,440,321=150,568,565</p> <p>Calculation</p> <p>$37,487,867/150,568,565*100= 24.9\%$</p>	0

N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions of PHC NWR to Health Facilities revealed that the City Council in FY2022/23, warranted more than 5 working days after cash limits were communicated by the PS/ST.

Evidence

Q1 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 08 July 2022. City Council warranted on 9 Aug 22 i.e. 5+ working days.

Q2 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 30 Sept 2022. City Council warranted on 19 Oct 22 i.e. 5+ working days.

Q3 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 29 Dec 2022. City Council warranted on 18 Jan 23 i.e. 5+ working days.

Q4 FY2022/23. Cash limit communication on 06 April 2023. City Council warranted on 11 May 23 i.e. 5+ working days.

Note: Information on Cash limit upload by MoFPED could not be accessed.

N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

A review of transfers to health facilities sampled from the LG Cost Centre List & LLG allocation release provided by MoFPED revealed that the City Council communicated the PHC NWR grant releases for FY2022/23 to health facilities prior to the release of grants.

Evidence

BUKUKU HC IV

Q1 FY2022/23. EFT No. 675075 was paid to HC on 25 Aug 22. Communication made on 23 Aug 2022 i.e. prior to release.

Q2 FY2022/23. EFT No. 1865787 was paid to HC on 03 Nov 22. Communication made on 14 Oct 2022 i.e. prior to release.

Q3 FY2022/23. EFT No. 4248298 was paid to HC on 21 May 23. Communication made on 12 May 2023 i.e. prior to release.

Q4 FY2022/23. EFT No. 4248298 was paid to HC on 21 May 23. Communication made on 12 May 2023 i.e. prior to release.

Kagote HC III

Q1 FY2022/23. EFT No. 683178 was paid on 25 Aug 22. Communication made on 23 Aug 2022 i.e. prior to release.

Q2 FY2022/23. EFT No. 1867850 was paid on 03 Nov 2023 Nov 22. Communication made on 14 Oct 2022 i.e. prior to release.

Q3 FY2022/23. EFT No. 4248918 paid on 04 Feb 23. Communication made on 12 May 2023 i.e. prior to release.

Q4 FY2022/23. EFT No. 4248918 paid on 21 May 23. Communication made on 12 May 2023 i.e. prior to release.

N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Despite the LG has publicizing all the quarterly financial releases and posting on public notice boards, this was done after 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED.

The posted information on the releases was dated;

Quarter one posted on 8th July 2022

Quarter two posted on 30th September 2022

Quarter three posted on 29th December 2022 and;

Quarter four posted on 6th April 2023

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department implemented the actions recommended by the CHMT quarterly performance review meetings held during the previous FY.</p> <p>The recommendations and follow up actions included among others;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Had in place 2 quality improvement projects for every health facility under full monitoring 2. Health facilities used data from the performance review meetings for planning 3. All health facilities documented workplans and budgets 4. Improved ordering and reporting on supplies and medicine 5. Conducted staff meetings regularly <p>These recommendations were implemented as evidenced from the quarterly review meeting minutes and implementation reports dated;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Q1 dated 10th October 2022 2. Q2 dated 8th February 2023 3. Q3 dated 9th April 2023 and; 4. Q4 dated 10th August 2023 	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG performance review meetings involved all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, CHMTs and key LG departments.</p> <p>This was evidenced from the attached attendances of the minutes of the meetings held on;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Q1 dated 10th October 2022 had 26 participants 2. Q2 dated 8th February 2023 had 30 participants 3. Q3 dated 9th April 2023 had 51 participants and; 4. Q4 dated 10th August 2023 had 34 participants. <p>The participants included all Health Facility In-charges, focal persons, Implementing partners and the City Health Team</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG supervised 100% of the 2 general hospitals (PNFP) and the 2 health center IVs (PNFPs) at least once every quarter in the previous FY</p> <p>This was evidenced from the quarterly support supervision reports as indicted below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. QTR 1 dated 30th September 2022 2. QTR 2 dated 17th February 2023 3. QTR 3 dated 30th March 2023 and, 4. QTR 4 dated 13th June 2023. <p>Some of the recommendations included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Had in place 2 quality improvement projects for every health facility under full monitoring 2. Health facilities used data from the performance review meetings for planning 3. All health facilities documented work plans and budgets 4. Improved ordering and reporting on supplies and medicine 5. Conducted staff meetings regularly 	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that CHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY.</p> <p>The LG did not avail reports to the assessment team during the assessment time.</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>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that corrective actions were made as no HSD reports were availed for assessment.</p>	0

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0

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

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

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

1. Building facility teams for better stock management
2. Conducting of routine onsite mentorship
3. Ensuring of correct filling of dispensing logs and envelopes

This was evidenced from the Medicine Management and supervision and monitoring reports of;

Q1 dated 12th October 2022

Q2 dated 11th January 2023

Q3 dated 6th April 2023 and,

Q4 dated 6th July 2023

11

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0

A review of LG's Annual Budget Estimates for FY2022/23 revealed that the City Council allocated more than 30% of the Health office budget to health promotion, education, and prevention (Community Health) activities.

Evidence

DHO Budget UGX 37,487,867

Allocated to health promotion and prevention activities

EFT 2618974- Implementation of vaccination team for South Division UGX 2,970,000

EFT 3739053- Pre- Outreach mobilization UGX 800,000

EFT 2618501- Pre- Outreach mobilization for Covid- 19 Catchup Campaign UGX 900,000

EFT 3403919- Sub County level training for CHD (VHT) UGX 3,920,000

EFT 3403484- SDA's to Health Workers for outreach UGX 3,600,00

EFT 3393720- Implementation of Outreach UGX 4,200,000

EFT 3405537- Implementation of Outreach UGX 3,600,000

EFT 3403563- SAD's to Health Workers for Training UGX 1,340,000

Total UGX 21,330,000

$21,330,000/37,487,867*100= 56.9\%$
(Guidelines stipulate atleast)

1

11

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0

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

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

1. Minutes with cultural and religious leaders on Polio mobilization dated 8th November 2022

2. Integrated child health days on Measles and Rubella report dated 20th December 2022

3. Integrated child health report dated 24th April 2023

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the City health team followed up the actions on health promotion and disease prevention from the quarterly progress reports and minutes of the conducted health promotion activities.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		<p>The follow up actions included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective mobilisation of teachers as a better approach. This was as a result of low turn up of adolescent girls who turned up for HPV vaccination as an issue for strengthening health promotion activities. 2. The cultural and religious leaders effectively mobilised and sensitized the communities. This was as a result of poor turn up of communities for various health activities including child health immunisation, community dialogues and sanitation campaigns. 	

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	There was no evidence that the LG had an updated asset register that set out the health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards as per the format.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		The standard list of medical equipment for Health Facilities and service standards were not availed during the assessment time	
12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	The City Council did not provide evidence to confirm that desk appraisals for all Health sector projects implemented in FY2022/23 were conducted.	0

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council did not provide evidence to confirm that field appraisals for all Health sector projects implemented in FY2022/23 were conducted.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist;</p> <p>Upgrade of Rubingo HCII to HCIII in North Division was screened on 08/09/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX:11,700,000 dated 08/09/2022.</p> <p>Upgrade of Kiguma HCII to HCIII was screened on 08/09/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX:11,700,000 dated 08/09/2022.</p> <p>Renovation of the theatre at Bukuku HCIV was screened on 30/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 12,000,000 dated 30/09/2022.</p> <p>Construction of pit latrine at Ibaale HC II was screened on 11/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX:1,275,000 dated 11/08/2022.</p> <p>Extension of the maternity ward at Kagote HCIII was screened on 16/09/2021 with a costed ESMP of UGX:300,000 dated 11/08/2022.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>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 was availed received by the head PDU on 10/04/2023, signed by Ag. city health officer.</p> <p>>>> Procurement of assorted medical equipment for Kiguma and Rubingo HC III, budget UGX 160,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Procurement of fuel, budget UGX 14,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Procurement of stationary, budget UGX 2,000,000/=</p> <p>>>> Servicing and repair of motor vehicles, budget UGX 4,000,000/=</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>No evidence was availed for this indicator.</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>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>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 was availed:</p> <p>>>> Construction of a 4-stance VIP latrine at Ibaale HC II, Contracts Committee approved on 7/2/2023, under minute number: CC/22-23/037; contract amount UGX 24,807,382/=</p> <p>>>> Upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HCIIIs to HCIIIs in North Division of Fort Portal City, works contract amount UGX 1,889,403,098/=. The agreement was signed on 2/03/2023; contractor was M/S RMF Engineering Contractors Limited. Contracts Committee approved on 17/01/2023.</p> <p>>>> Extension of a maternity ward at Kagote HC II. Contracts Committee approved on 7/2/2023, under minute number: CC/22-23/038.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>No evidence that PIT was established for all health projects was availed. Only one PIT was availed, that is,</p> <p>>>> Letter dated 30/03/2023, reference number: CR/105/2, Town Clerk appointed the Ag. city health officer, in-charge Kagote HC IV, Ag. City engineer, senior environmental officer, Ag. town clerk central division, and senior community development officer as PIT for extension of a maternity ward at Kangote HC III. No labour officer appointed.</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>Both Kiguma and Rubingo HC II upgrades were visited to check conformance to standard technical designs. The facilities under construction were; maternity ward, 2-unit staff houses, and 4-stances VIP latrines. They were all inspected and found complaint with technical designs issued by MoH. The room sizes and materials used are as specified in the drawings and specifications.</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>The project did not have a 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 no evidence that monthly site meetings by project site committee were held</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>From the site instruction books and site visitor's book for Rubingo and Kiguma obtained from the site foreman/construction team, the following was noted:</p> <p>On 14th June 2023, the City Engineer, the Labor officer, the senior environment officer, and the CDO, supervised the works (issued instructions) and signed in the visitor's book.</p> <p>On the 12th October 2023, the city clerk, resident city commissioner (RCC), the senior environmental officer, the City Engineer, the city health officer (doctor) supervised the works (issued instructions) and signed in the visitor's book.</p> <p><i>Although there was an effort to supervise works, it was more periodic and the target of supervising at least monthly aiming at overseeing that works were done properly at critical stages of construction was not achieved (no evidence was availed to show that critical stages were supervised).</i></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>The City Council provided evidence confirming that the LG Health Officer certified and recommended payments to contractors implementing Health Projects in FY2022/23 after 10 working days after the request for payment was made by contractors.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>1. Request for Payment was made by M/s RMF Engineering Contractors Ltd on 29 May 2023 for the upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HCII to HCIII for UGX 348,582,456. The payment was made on EFT 6425391 on 28 June 2023. Payment Certificate No. 1 was prepared on 30 May 2023 and signed by the City Health Officer on 16 June 2023, the Principal Community Development Officer, the City Engineer, and the Senior Environment Officer i.e. This payment request was certified after 14 working days.</p> <p>2. Request for Payment was made by M/s RMF Engineering Contractors Ltd on 15 June 2023 for the upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HCII to HCIII for UGX 457,423,058. The payment was made on EFT 6425391 on 28 June 2023. Payment Certificate No. 2 was prepared on 21 June 2023 and signed by City Health Officer on 21 June 2023, Principal Community Development Officer, City Engineer, and Senior Environment Officer i.e. This payment request was certified after 4 working days.</p>
----	--	--	--

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The procurement files for health infrastructure projects for the previous FY were availed and complete.</p> <p>>>> Upgrading of Kiguma and Rubingo HCII to HCIII in North Division of Fort Portal City, works contract amount UGX 1,889,403,098/=. The agreement was signed on 2/03/2023; contractor was M/S RMF Engineering Contractors Limited. Contracts Committee meeting minutes availed approved on 17/01/2023; evaluation report</p> <p>>>> Renovation of Bukuuku HC IV, works contract dated 17/3/2023, contract amount UGX 64,244,510/=. Contractor: Zeta Engineering Services Ltd, Contracts committee meeting minutes dated 7/02/2023, minute number: CC/22-23/0034, evaluation report dated 31/1/2023 available,</p>	1
----	--	---	---	---

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	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	There was no evidence that the city recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework for projects under Health. There were no minutes for the GRC.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	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 that the LG issued guidelines on medical waste management and followed up on the implementation of the health care waste management guidelines by HCs. This was evidenced from the dissemination report at the CHO's office which indicated that the Health care waste management guidelines were disseminated on 2nd February 2023 where 14 health facilities received the guidelines.	2
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	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	The LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management and a local infrastructure for managing medical waste. Green Label services Ltd was the service provider contracted to manage medical waste. This was evidenced from the Memorandum of Understanding dated 1st October 2022 and signed by the Town Clerk on 5th October 2022	2
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the Health care waste management trainings were conducted. No training reports were availed to the assessment team during the assessment time.	0

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that costed ESMPs were incorporated into BoQs for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY;</p> <p>Bills of quantities for upgrade of Rubingo HCII to HCIII in the North Division had costed ESMP of UGX: 5,000,000 incorporated.</p> <p>Bills of quantities for the renovation of the theatre at Bukuku HCIV had costed ESMP of UGX: 4,660,000 incorporated.</p> <p>Bills of quantities for the construction of pit latrine at Ibaale HC II had costed ESMP of UGX: 2,706,000 incorporated.</p>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	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>There was evidence that all health sector projects were implemented on land where the city had proof of ownership;</p> <p>Letter of allocation of land for Kiguma Health centre III by church of Uganda dated 4th April 2022 and signed by Rev. Kisembo B. Reuben on 4th May 2022 (Trustee of the registered trustees of the church of Uganda Bishop, Diocese of Ruwenzori.</p> <p>Letter of allocation of land for the upgrade of Rubingo HC II dated 30th January 2023 by the Catholic Diocese of Fortportal signed by Musabe Innocent Joseph-secretary -Foertportal Diocese land board.</p>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	<p>There was no evidence of monthly support supervision and monitoring for health projects. The following health projects had no monthly monitoring reports;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upgrade of Rubingo HCII to HCIII in the North Division. 2. The renovation of the theatre at Bukuku HCIV. 3. The construction of a pit latrine at Ibaale HC II. 	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, before payments of contractor invoices. The projects below had no E&S certification forms prepared;

1. Upgrade of Rubingo HCII to HCIII in the North Division.
2. The renovation of the theatre at Bukuku HCIV.
3. The construction of a pit latrine at Ibaale HC II.

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & 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"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	Not Applicable	0
1	<p>Water & 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 & 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"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	Not Applicable	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	The City Council water is connected to the national grid, therefore not applicable for this assessment.	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	Not Applicable	0

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

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3	Not Applicable	0
---	--	---	----------------	---

5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2	Not Applicable	0
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
5	Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0 <i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i>	Not Applicable	0

Human Resource Management and Development

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

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>There is no substantive Office holder. The city is serviced by NWSC</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>There is no substantive Office holder. The city is serviced by NWSC</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>Not Applicable</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>Not Applicable</p>	0
---	---	---	-----------------------	---

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	Not Applicable	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	Not Applicable	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	Not Applicable	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>	Not Applicable	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	Not Applicable	0

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

Investment Management

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (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: Score 4 or else score 0.	The City Council water is connected to the national grid, therefore not applicable for this assessment.	0
----	---	---	---	---

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

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2	The City Council water is connected to the national grid, therefore not applicable for this assessment.	0
----	---	---	---	---

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2	Not applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	---

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

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2	N/A	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0	The City Council water is connected to the national grid, therefore not applicable for this assessment.	0
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 2, If not score 0	N/A	0

Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework: Score 3, If not score 0	Not Applicable.	0
14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0	Not Applicable.	0

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Not Applicable.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0	Not Applicable.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	The City Council water is connected to the national grid, therefore not applicable for this assessment.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	Not Applicable	0

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
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>No report or data on acreage of irrigated land under micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries for two previous FYs.</p>	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>No data on acreage of irrigated land under micro-scale irrigation for the last two previous FYs so as to determine whether there was an increase or not.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>City Councils do not currently implement Micro-Irrigation Projects, therefore not applicable.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	City Councils do not currently implement Micro-Irrigation Projects, therefore not applicable.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence supplier contracts were not signed and no irrigation demonstration equipment was installed during previous FY.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	A review of the staff payroll list July 2023 as provided by the HR department revealed two staff in the production department in the category of extension workers. These included Stanley Businge and James Mugabe. No further details or personal files were provided at assessment. The recruitment of extension workers as per staffing structure could not be verified.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment was installed in different LLGs during previous FY.	0

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment was installed during previous FY.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Given that no personal files were provided at assessment, it could not be ascertained whether the information on position of extension workers filled is accurate.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

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>Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment was installed and no information on accuracy as regards equipment functionality.</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>Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no information collected on functionality of installed irrigation equipment as there were no irrigation equipment installed.</p> <p>Similarly no quarterly information collected on newly irrigated land, provision of complementary services and farmer expression of interests as evidenced by lack of supervision and monitoring reports.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no information entered in MIS / Irritrack on LLGs.	0
Maximum score 6				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	No quarterly reports prepared using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS since there was no information entered in MIS.	0
Maximum score 6				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	The city LG did not develop and approve Performance Improvement Plans for the lowest performing LLGs during previous FY.	0
Maximum score 6				
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	The city LG did not implement any Performance Improvement Plans for the lowest performing LLGs as there were no Performance Improvement Plans developed during previous FY.	0
Maximum score 6				

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	As per the approved budget estimates FY 2023/2024, Ugx 224,400,000/- was allocated to cater for the wages of one Agricultural Officer and one Senior Veterinary Officer in the production Department operating in two City divisions.	0
	Maximum score 6		This means that approximately one extension worker deployed per LLG, yet the guideline requires three extension workers deployed per LLG.	
			Therefore, the City LG budget for extension workers was not in accordance with staffing norm.	
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	The City LG has only two extension staffs one Agricultural Officer and one Senior Veterinary Officer in the production Department operating in two City divisions (North and Central).	0
	Maximum score 6		This means that approximately one extension worker deployed per LLG, yet the guideline requires three extension workers deployed per LLG, hence the deployment was not in accordance with the guideline.	
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	No evidence was obtained at the time of assessment.	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 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	No evidence was obtained at the time of assessment.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	Given that no personal files were provided at assessment, it could not be ascertained whether the extension workers were appraised.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	In the absence of appraisals it could not be established whether corrective action arising therefrom had been undertaken.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Fort portal city has not been enrolled for micro-scale irrigation.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Fort portal city has not been enrolled for micro-scale irrigation.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services):</p>	<p>City Councils do not currently implement Micro-Irrigation Projects, therefore not applicable.</p>	0
Maximum score 10		Score 2 or else 0		
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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):</p>	<p>City Councils do not currently implement Micro-Irrigation Projects, therefore not applicable.</p>	0
Maximum score 10		Score 2 or else score 0		
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>City Councils do not currently implement Micro-Irrigation Projects, therefore not applicable.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
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>City Councils do not currently implement Micro-Irrigation Projects, therefore not applicable.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no information on the use of farmer co-funding was dissemination to the 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>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence Irrigation demonstration equipment were not installed, thus there was no monitoring done.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, Irrigation demonstration equipment were not installed, hence City LG did not oversee approved farmer training and support.</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>No hands on support was provided to the LLGs during implementation of complementary services, because Fort-portal City was not enrolled for micro-scale irrigation program.</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>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence farmer field schools were not established and no information or reports on farmer field schools.</p>	0

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence City LG did not conduct any activity to mobilize and sensitize farmers through farmer meetings and farmer to farmer visits. No demonstrations by irrigation equipment suppliers since irrigation demonstration sites were not installed.	0
----	---	---	--	---

11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence City LG did not train any staff, neither sensitized political leaders at the District and LLG levels.	0
----	---	---	---	---

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no updated register on micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers.	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	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for micro-scale irrigation program, hence no database of applications (EOIs) for current and previous FYs, even no copies of application from LLGs.	0
----	--	---	---	---

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	The Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for micro-scale irrigation program, hence no farmer submitted complete Expressions of Interest, so there were no farm visits made.	0
----	--	---	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The city LG Production Officer did not publicize eligible farmers on the District production notice board and at LLGs (Northern and Central division) notice boards.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>N/A; The city does not have micro-scale irrigation projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>N/A; The city did not have micro-scale irrigation projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>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>N/A; The city did not have micro-scale irrigation projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>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>N/A; The city did not have micro-scale irrigation projects.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	N/A; The city did not have micro-scale irrigation projects.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no micro-scale irrigation demonstration equipment installed and no technical supervision was done.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence no micro-scale irrigation equipment was installed.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	City Councils do not currently implement Micro-Irrigation Projects, therefore not applicable.	0
	Maximum score 18			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	N/A; The city did not have micro-scale irrigation projects.	0
	Maximum score 18			

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation program, hence City LG did not display on the notice boards the details of the nature and avenues to address grievance.	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable.	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable.	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable.	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Fort-portal City has not been enrolled for Micro-Scale Irrigation project, hence no dissemination of micro-scale irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access, proper use of agro-chemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers.	0
----	--	---	---	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable.	0
----	--	---	-----------------	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable.	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	Not Applicable.	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	Not Applicable.	0

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
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	Fort Portal City Council has a substantive CCFO – Mr. Karamagi Simon evidenced by the letter of appointment on promotion to the position of City Chief Finance Officer dated 13th January 2023 referenced under the City Service Commission Min. No. 1/2023 .	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.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Fort Portal City Council does not have a substantive City Planner. Mr. Nyakatura Fred currently leads the Department on a recommendation of the Technical Planning Committee as evidenced by Min6F: CC/TPC/21/09/2023 dated 5th October 2023. Mr. Nyakatura is substantively a Senior Economist/Planner as found in appointment letter on promotion to Senior Economist/Planner dated 10th November, referenced under Fort Portal City Service Commission Min No.214/2022. At the time of assessment, the said Officer was appraised for the year under review as found in the APR for FY 2022/2023 dated 30th June 2023.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Fort Portal City Council has a substantive City Engineer – Eng. Kaihura Robert evidenced by the letter of appointment on promotion to City Engineer dated 11th October 2023 referenced under the CSC Min. No. 59/2023(iii). At the time of assessment, the CE was found not duly appraised. On file was FY 2021/22 APR.	3

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>d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Fort Portal City Council does not have a substantive City Natural Resources Officer.</p> <p>Ms . Natugonza Gladys Mirembe holds the office in acting capacity. However, the appointment to that effect was not provided. She is substantively the Senior Natural Resources Authority as evidenced by letter of retention in service and re-designation as Senior Natural Resources Officer referenced under CSC. Min.No. 243/2022.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found not to have been duly appraised as no record was on file.</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>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Fort Portal City Council does not have a substantive City Production Officer.</p> <p>The Officer was being held in Ag. Capacity by Dr. Businge Stanley the substantive Senior Veterinary Officer as appointed in service to promotion to Senior Veterinary Officer dated 10th November 2022 referenced under CSC Min No. 272/2022. There was no evidence provided to warrant the acting capacity appointment.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for the FY under review dated 30th June 2023.</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>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Fort Portal City Council has a substantive Community Development Officer – Mr. Ruragane Binta Joachim evidenced by the letter of retention in service as Principal Community Development Officer accelerated promotion dated 10th November 2022 referenced under the City Service Commission Min. No. 237/2022.</p>	3

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>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Fort Port City Council has a substantive Principal Commercial Officer- Mr. Karwani Kayanja Michael as evidenced by letter of retention in service dated 10th November 2022 referenced under CSC Min.No. 259/2022.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found not to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for the FY under review dated 30th June 2023 as the appraisal did not have the Supervising Officer had not signing off.</p>	3
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>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>Fort Portal City Council has a substantive Principal Procurement Officer – Ms. Kanda Christine as evidenced by a letter of appointment on retention dated 10th November 2022 referenced under Fort Portal City Service Commission Min No. 180/2022.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the Principal Procurement Officer was found not to have been duly appraised for the period under review dated 30th June 2023. However, the appraisal did not have the Counter signing Officer signing off.</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>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>No file was provided for assessment.</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>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Fort Port City Council does not have a substantive Principal Human Resource Officer. The Office is held in acting capacity by Ms Kihunde Edna Darlin-Senior Human Resources Officer as evidenced by letter of appointment on transfer of service dated 11th October 2023 referenced under CSC Min.No. 55/2023(i).</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for the FY under review dated 30th June 2023. However, the appraisal did not have the Counter signing Officer signing off.</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>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Fort Port City Council does not have a substantive Senior Environment Officer. Ms . Natugonza Gladys Mirembe holds the office in acting capacity. However, the appointment to that effect was not provided. She is substantively the Senior Natural Resources Authority as evidenced by letter of retention in service and re-designation as Senior Natural Resources Officer referenced under CSC. Min.No. 243/2022.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found not to have been duly appraised as no record was on file.</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>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Fort Portal City Council has a substantive Senior Lands Management Officer- Ms. Kansime Beatrice as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion to Senior Land Management Officer dated 10th November 2022 from City Town Clerk referenced under DSC Mi No. 244/2022.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the CLMO was found not duly appraised. On file was FY 2021/22 APR.</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>FCC does not have a staff provision for SA in its structure. It provides for CFO, PA, Accountant and Senior Accounts Assistant. The former City Principal Accountant was promoted to CFO.</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>Fort Portal City Council has a substantive Principal Internal Auditor- Mr. Nsita William as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion to Principal Internal Auditor dated 10th November 2022 from City Town Clerk referenced under CSC Min.No. 233/2022.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the PIA was found not duly appraised. On file was FY 2021/22 APR.</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>Fort Port City Council does not have a substantive Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary CSC). The Office is held by Ms. Kyomuhendo Susan, Assistant Town Clerk as evidenced by letter of staff reorganization dated 17th November 2022 from the City Town Clerk which assigned the Officer duties of Ag. Principal Human Resources Officer-City Service Commission.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the PHRO-CSC was found not duly appraised. On file was FY 2021/22 APR.</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>Fort Port City Council at the time of assessment was found to have recruited and deployed all Senior Assistant Town Clerks in the two divisions (LLGs) but were not duly appraised as shown hereunder.</p> <p>Central Division</p> <p>Kato Saad Basamba – Senior Assistant Town Clerk - as evidenced by letter of retention in service and re-designation as Senior Assistant town clerk dated 10th November 2022 from City Town Clerk referenced under CSC Min.No. 189/2022.Transfer Instruction to Central Division dated 21st November 2022as Ag. Division Town Clerk dated. Officer was found not duly appraised as on file was APR for FY 2019/2020 dated 30th June 2020.</p>	5
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>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Fort Portal City Council at the time of assessment was found to have recruited and deployed CDOs and not appraised as follows:</p> <p>Central Division</p> <p>Mbabazi Grace, Senior CDO.</p> <p>North Division</p> <p>Kobusinge Diana, Senior CDO.</p>	5

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.

Fort Portal City Council at the time of assessment was found to have recruited and deployed Senior Accounts in the two Divisions as shown below:

Central Division:

Kembabazi Magaret- Senior Accounts Assistant, as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion to Senior Assistant Accountant dated 10th November 2022 from City Town Clerk referenced under CSC Min.No. 220/2022. Officer was found not duly appraised as on file was APR for FY 2019/2020 dated 30th June 2020.

North Division:

Kateeba Grace – Senior Accounts Assistant, as evidenced by letter of appointment on promotion to Senior Assistant Accountant dated 10th November 2022 from City Town Clerk referenced under CSC Min.No. 227/2022. Officer was found not duly appraised as on file was APR for FY 2019/2020 dated 16th June 2020.

5

Environment and Social Requirements

3

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

Maximum score is 4

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

a. Natural Resources department,

score 2 or else 0

A review of Draft Final Accounts for FY2022/23 revealed that the City Council released only 95% of funds allocated to the Department of Natural Resources for FY2022/23.

Evidence

VIDE: CR/103- Draft Final Accounts Received by the Office of the Auditor General on 30 August 2023.

Warranted Amount for FY2022/23 was UGX 352,177,620

Revised Budget Amount for FY2022/23 was UGX 369,142,620

Calculation

Warranted Amount/Revised Budget*100=352,177,620/369,142,620*100= 95.4%

0

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>A review of Draft Final Accounts for FY2022/23 revealed that the City Council released only 95% of funds allocated to the Department of Community-Based Services for FY2022/23.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Warranted Amount for FY2022/23 was UGX 176,686,188</p> <p>Revised Budget Amount for FY2022/23 was UGX 186,,595,782</p> <p>Calculation</p> <p>Warranted Amount/Revised Budget *100= 176,686,188/186,,595,782*100= 94.7%</p>	0
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Fort Fortal City carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all USMID projects implemented the previous FY;</p> <p>Completion of Rwengona- Migoma road in Central division was screened on 31/08/2021 with ESMP developed and costed at UGX: 14,500,000 on 31/08/2021.</p> <p>Construction of Millane road in central division was screened on 31/08/2021 with ESMP developed and costed at UGX: 19,000,000 on 31/08/2021.</p> <p>Construction of water supply along Kahungabunyonyi road was screened on 30/08/2021 with ESMP developed and costed at UGX: 18,000,000 on 30/08/2021.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>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),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment and Social Impact Assessment for USMID projects implemented in Fortportal City was carried out as per the ESIA report dated October 2020. The ESIA report was prepared by Pan Arab consulting engineers, Kuwait in conjunction with AWE Environmental engineers. The ESIA report was submitted to the Natural resource officer of Fortportal City for review as per the email dated Friday, February 5, 2021.</p>	4

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Fortportal city had Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented under USMID;</p> <p>Completion of Rwengona- Migoma road in Central division was screened on 31/08/2021 with ESMP developed and costed at UGX: 14,500,000 on 31/08/2021.</p> <p>Construction of Millane road in central division was screened on 31/08/2021 with ESMP developed and costed at UGX: 19,000,000 on 31/08/2021.</p> <p>Construction of water supply along Kahungabunyonyi road was screened on 30/08/2021 with ESMP developed and costed at UGX: 18,000,000 on 30/08/2021.</p>	4
---	---	---	---	---

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The list of LG audit opinions for FY 2022/23 released by OAG confirms that City Council's financial statements for FY 2022/23 was unqualified.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The City Council provided evidence confirming that the information on the implementation status of recommendations in the Internal Auditor General and Auditor General Report for FY2021/22 was submitted to the PS/ST after 28 February 2023.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>VIDE: AUD/251/14. Validated Responses to the Auditor General's Report of Fort Portal City Council for the Financial Year Ended 30 June 2022. Received by MoFPED Registry on 28 April 2023.</p>	0

7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence confirming that the Annual Performance Contract for FY2023/24 was submitted on 24 August 2023. The list of Performance Contract submissions provided by MoFPED also confirmed that the contract for the City Council was endorsed by the PS/ST.</p>	4
8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The City Council submitted their Annual Performance Report for FY2022/23 to MoFPED before 31 August 2023.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Q4 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted to MoFPED on 24 August 2023.</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 City Council submitted all four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPR) for FY2022/23 to MoFPED before 31 August 2023.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>Q1 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 29 December 2022.</p> <p>Q2 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 22 February 2023.</p> <p>Q3 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 20 May 2023.</p> <p>Q4 BPR FY2022/23 was submitted on 24 August 2023.</p>	4

**Education Minimum
Conditions**

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

Human Resource Management and Development

1				0
---	--	--	--	----------

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

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

Fort Port City Council does not have a substantive City Education Officer. Mr. Alituha Richard the Principal Education Officer hold the office in acting capacity. However, no information was provided to warrant the acting capacity.

The Maximum Score of 70

Mr. Alituha is appointed Principal Education Officer as evidenced by letter of retention in service dated 10th November 2022 referenced under CSC Min.No. 2326/2022.

At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FY 2021/2022 found on file.

1				40
---	--	--	--	-----------

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

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

Fort Portal City Council has one substantive Inspectors of Schools as per approved MoPS staff establishment structure as shown below.

The Maximum Score of 70

Ms Manimake Susan – Senior Inspector of Schools evidenced by letter of retention in service as Sen-or Inspector of Schools dated 10th November 2022 referenced under CSC Min No. 236(b) 2022. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have not been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>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)</p> <p>The 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 that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening for all the 3 education projects for the previous FY was carried out;</p> <p>Construction of a five-stance VIP latrine with a shower at Kahinju primary school in Central division was screened on 11/08/2022 with costed ESMP of UGX: 2,750,000 developed on 07/09/2022.</p> <p>Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Kitumba primary school in Central division was screened on 11/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 21,550,000 developed on 07/09/2022.</p> <p>Renovation of a three-classroom block at Bulungu primary school was screened on 31/08/2021 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 8,800,000 developed on 31/08/2021.</p>	15
2	<p>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)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>The projects implemented under Education did not qualify to undergo an ESIA upon being screened for environmental and social safeguards. The projects included;</p> <p>Construction of a five-stance VIP latrine with a shower at Kahinju primary school in Central division was screened on 11/08/2022 with costed ESMP of UGX: 2,750,000 developed on 07/09/2022.</p> <p>Construction of a 2-unit staff house at Kitumba primary school in Central division was screened on 11/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 21,550,000 developed on 07/09/2022.</p> <p>Renovation of a three-classroom block at Bulungu primary school was screened on 31/08/2021 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 8,800,000 developed on 31/08/2021.</p>	15

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.		

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	FCC does not have a substantive CHO. Dr. Solomon Asiimwe the Senior Medical Officer was assigned duties of City Health Officer as evidenced by the letter of appointment on retention of service in promotion as Senior Medical Officer posted to Central Division and assignment of duties as CHO dated 30th January 2023 referenced under Min. No. 262/2022. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 30th June 2023.	0
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	FCC, does not have a substantive Principal Health Inspector. Ms. Kahunde Lucy who holds the substantive position on assignment of duties. The office bearer is substantively appointed on retention in service on promotion as Senior Health Inspector by CSC dated 30th January 2023 under reference of Min.No.268/2022. At the time of assessment, the Office bearer was found to have been duly appraised as evidenced by the Annual Performance Report (APR) dated 17th July 2023.	0

1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	FCC, does not have a substantive Health Educator.	0
---	---	--	---	----------

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) Maximum score is 30	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There was evidence that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change screening for all five health projects for the previous financial year was carried out; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upgrade of Rubingo HCII to HCIII was screened on 08/09/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 11,700,000 dated 08/09/2022. 2. Upgrade of Kiguma HCII to HCIII was screened on 08/09/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 11,700,000 dated 08/09/2022. 3. Renovation of a theatre at Bukuku HCIV was screened on 30/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 12,000,000 dated 30/08/2022. 4. Construction of a pit latrine at Ibaale HCII was screened on 11/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 1,275.000 dated 11/08/2022. 	15
---	--	--	---	-----------

2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) Maximum score is 30	b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	Upon being screened for Environment and Social safeguards the projects under health did not qualify to undergo an Environment and Social Impact Assessment. The projects included; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upgrade of Rubingo HCII to HCIII was screened on 08/09/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 11,700,000 dated 08/09/2022. 2. Upgrade of Kiguma HCII to HCIII was screened on 08/09/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 11,700,000 dated 08/09/2022. 3. Renovation of a theatre at Bukuku HCIV was screened on 30/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 12,000,000 dated 30/08/2022. 4. Construction of a pit latrine at Ibaale HCII was screened on 11/08/2022 with a costed ESMP of UGX: 1,275.000 dated 11/08/2022. 	15
---	--	--	--	-----------

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

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

Human Resource Management and Development

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	Fort Portal City does not have this position in the staff establishment structure.	0
---	--	--	--	----------

Environment and Social Requirements

2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.	Fortportal City had not received funding for microscale irrigation at the time of this assessment.	0
---	--	--	--	----------

**Water & Environment Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
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.	There is no substantive Office holder. The city is serviced by NWSC	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	There is no substantive Office holder. The city is serviced by NWSC	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There is no substantive Office holder. The city is serviced by NWSC	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	There is no substantive Office holder. The city is serviced by NWSC	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There is no substantive Office holder. The city is serviced by NWSC	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There is no substantive Office holder. The city is serviced by NWSC	0

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable under cities and municipalities.	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.	Not applicable under cities and municipalities.	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.	Not applicable under cities and municipalities.	0