



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Hoima city

(Vote Code: 860)

| <b>Assessment</b>                           | <b>Scores</b> |
|---|---------------|
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions             | 74%           |
| Education Minimum Conditions                | 70%           |
| Health Minimum Conditions                   | 30%           |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions      | 0%            |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions   | 0%            |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures           | 47%           |
| Educational Performance Measures            | 68%           |
| Health Performance Measures                 | 52%           |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures    | 0%            |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 0%            |

| No.  | Summary of requirements  | Definition of compliance   | Compliance justification   | Score |
|--|--|--|--|-------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |  |  |  |       |
| 1  | <p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding in FY 2022/2023 were functional and utilized as per purpose of the projects. The circular roads in the following divisions: Central, Karujubi, Kigulya and Nyangahya were functional and utilized for the purpose by users.</p> <p>The projects implemented were:</p> <p><b>Batch 1-Roads</b></p> <p>Upgrading roads in Hoima City as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mandela Sir Tito Winyi</li> <li>Circular Road</li> <li>Perse- Commercial Rd</li> <li>Tayali- Crown- Eka Rd</li> <li>Government Rd</li> <li>Tankahill Rd</li> <li>Kalyabuhiire road</li> </ol> <p><b>Batch 2- Projects</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Kampala drive</li> <li>Military hill</li> <li>Off Kikwite Rd</li> <li>Access to slaughter house at Bulera</li> <li>Kolping &amp; Kabalega drainage construction</li> <li>Box culvert construction for three bridges (Kabalega, Byabacwezi, Sheik Twaha)</li> <li>Modern slaughter house construction at Bulera</li> <li>Bishop Rwakaikara Roads</li> </ol> <p>The above roads in Hoima City are utilized by the community and are functional. This was also witnessed by the assessor as roads were constructed and used for the purpose.</p> | 4     |

N23\_Service Delivery Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.

- By more than 5%, score 3
- 1 to 5% increase, score 2
- If no increase, score 0

NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.

The LLGs provided only performance assessment for 2023 but the performance scores for 2022 were not availed.

Evidence

East Division

2022 score = Not availed

2023 score = 74%

West Division

2022 score = Not availed

2023 score = 27%

N23\_Service Delivery Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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.

- If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3
- If 80-99%: Score 2
- If below 80%: 0

Evidence provided showed the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in FY 2022/2023 were 97.4% complete as per performance contract.

The list of DDEG funded projects implemented in FY 2022-2023 include;

**Batch 1-Roads-98.7% -Completion**

Upgrading roads in Hoima City as below:

- i. Mandela Sir Tito Winyi
- ii. Circular Road
- iii. Perse- Commercial Rd
- iv. Tayali- Crown- Eka Rd
- v. Government Rd
- vi. Tankahill Rd
- vii. Kalyabuhiire road

**Batch 2- Projects-96% -Completion**

- i. New Kampala drive
- ii. Military hill
- iii. Off Kikwite Rd
- iv. Access to slaughter house at Bulera
- v. Kolping & Kabalega drainage construction
- vi. Box culvert construction for three bridges (Kabalega, Byabacwezi, Sheik Twaha)
- vii. Modern slaughter house construction at Bulera
- viii. Bishop Rwakaikara Roads

Investment  
Performance

Maximum 4 points on  
this performance  
measure

a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:

Score 2 or else score 0.

Hoima City budgeted and spent UGX. 20,999,121,000 (ABPR- page 60, AWP- page 14) on DDEG for the FY 2022/2023 on eligible projects and activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation.

The projects and activities were as below:

**Batch 1-Roads**

Upgrading road network in Hoima City as below:

Mandela Sir Tito Winyi

Circular Road

Perse- Commercial Rd

Tayali- Crown- Eka Rd

Government Rd

Tankahill Rd

Kalyabuhiire road

**Batch 2- Projects and activities were:**

New Kampala drive

Military hill

1. Off Kikwite Rd

2. Access to slaughter house at Bulera

3. Kolping & Kabalega drainage construction

4. Box culvert construction for three bridges (Kabalega, Byabacwezi, Sheik Twaha)

5. Modern slaughter house construction at Bulera

6. Bishop Rwakaikara Roads

The above projects were eligible according to DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation guidelines, page 8.

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

Though all the other price variations were below +/-20%, the price variation for USMID was more than the threshold.

Projects sampled for verification as follows:

USMID

- Upgrading of USMID roads of Mandela road, Sir. Tito Winy road, Circular road, Persy road, Government road, Tank Hill road, Bikunyu road. - Engineer's estimate as per PP form 1 was UGX. 40, 427, 000, 000.00 and the contract price was UGX. 30, 414, 652, 348.00 giving an absolute variance of 10, 012, 347, 652.00 and percentage variance of 24.77%

Education

- Construction of 5 - stance lined latrines at Bulemwa P/S - The Engineer's estimate as per PP form 1 dated 25th July 2022 was UGX. 32, 646, 000.00 while the contract sum was UGX. 29, 338, 374.00 giving an absolute variance of 3, 307, 626.00 and percentage variance of 10.13%

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S - Engineer's estimate as per PP form 1 was UGX. 119, 848, 000.00 while the contract sum was UGX. 116, 000, 058.00 giving an absolute variance of 3, 847,942.00 and percentage variance of -3.2%

Health

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III - Engineer's estimate as per PP form 1 dated 14th March 2023 was UGX. 48 million while the contract sum was UGX. 44 million giving an absolute variance of UGX. 4 million. Giving a percentage variance of 8.33%

- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III - Engineer's estimate as per PP form 1 dated 14th March 2023 was UGX. 22 million while the contract sum was 20, 515, 114.00 giving an absolute variance of 1,484,886.00 Giving a percentage variance of 6.75%

- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III - Engineer's estimate as per PP form 1 was UGX. 50 million while the contract sum was 44, 892, 439.00 giving an absolute variance of 5, 107, 561.00. Giving a percentage variance of 10.2%

- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III - Engineer's estimate as per PP form 1 dated 19th April 2023 was UGX. 28 million while the contract sum was 25, 737, 499.00 giving an absolute variance of 2, 262, 501.00 at UGX. Giving a percentage variance of 8.08%

|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>The assessor visited all the two City Divisions and found out that information on staffing obtained from the HRM office was accurate. Hoima East Division had 16 staff and Hoima East Division had 17 staff</p>  | 2 |
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</b></p> | <p>Evidence provided by the City showed the infrastructure constructed using the DDEG in FY 2022/2023 were in place as per reports produced by the LG. Th roads are located in the following East and West Divisions and 100% in place.</p> <p>The projects and activities in place were in the following roads and respective Divisions where they are located in Hoima City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Mandela Sir Tito Winyi –(ABPR, page60) in West Division.</li> <li>ii. Circular Road in East Division.</li> <li>iii. Perse- Commercial Rd in East Division.</li> <li>iv. Tayali- Crown- Eka Rd in East Division.</li> <li>v. Government Rd in East Division.</li> <li>vi. Tankahill Rd in East Division.</li> <li>vii. Kalyabuhiire road in East Division.</li> <li>viii. New Kampala drive in East Division.</li> <li>ix. Military hill in East Division.</li> <li>x. Off Kikwite Rd in East Division.</li> <li>xi. Access to slaughter house at Bulera in East Division.</li> <li>xii. Kolping &amp; Kabalega drainage construction in East Division.</li> <li>xiii. Box culvert construction for three bridges (Kabalega, Byabacwezi, Sheik Twaha) in East Division.</li> <li>xiv. Modern slaughter house construction at Bulera in East Division.</li> <li>xv. Bishop Rwakaikara Roads in West Division.</li> </ul> | 2 |

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 5 | <p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p><b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b></p> | <p>There was no evidence to confirm that the Hoima City conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise. The assessment team assessed the two divisions and found that the Hoima City did not undertake credible assessment. The two assessed Local Level Governments (LLGs) exhibited a deviation within the recommended range of +/-10%, while one LLG was out of the recommended range as outlined</p> <p>1. East Division: The City internal assessment awarded a perfect score of 74%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 61%. <b>This indicated a deviation of -13%.</b></p> <p>2. West Division: The City internal assessment awarded a perfect score of 27%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly higher score of 57%. <b>This indicated a deviation of +30%.</b></p> | 0 |
| 5 | <p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>No evidence was provided to show that Hoima City had developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the previous FY.</p>   | 0 |
| 5 | <p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>No evidence of implementation of a performance improvement plan for poor performing LLGs in the previous FY was provided</p>   | 0 |

## Human Resource Management and Development



|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>No evidence was provided to show that Hoima City consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th 2023</p>   | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>                                       | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>No evidence was provided to show that Hoima City had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance as per guidelines by MoPS. The assessor was informed that the attendance book was with External Auditors</p>  | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>                                       | <p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>                               | <p>Hoima City did not provide performance appraisal reports for previous FY for all Heads of Departments except the Acting City Production Officer (Kajuma Swaleh Ashraf who was appraised late - 2nd August 2023).</p>   | 0 |
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>                                       | <p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>  | <p>There was evidence that Hoima City was implementing administrative rewards and sanctions. Sanctions that were administered consisted of reprimands and warnings to staff with cases of misconduct including absenteeism and persistent late coming. The Rewards and Sanctions Committee was in place and functional. The assessor was availed a file ref. (CR/157/3) which had documents of the Rewards and Sanctions Committee. Minute of meetings which took place on 30th May 2022 and 4th September 2023 were reviewed by the assessor</p> | 1 |

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 7 | Performance management<br><br>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure                    | iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.<br><br>Score 1 or else 0                                      | There was no evidence provided to show that Hoima City had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress.  | 0 |
| 8 | Payroll management<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 1. | The assessor was informed that Hoima City did not recruit any new staff in the previous FY.  | 1 |
| 9 | Pension Payroll management<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 1.  | No evidence was availed to the assessor to demonstrate that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement | 0 |

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

|    |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 10 | N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0 | The evidence availed by Hoima City showed that direct transfers of DDEG were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget as follows: Budgeted for UGX. 226,897,914 (ABPR, page, 4) and transfers to Divisions were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget for FY 2022/2023. All the UGX. 226,897,914 was 100% transferred to Divisions as below:<br><br>1.East, UGX.106,635,887<br><br>2. West, UGX.120,262,027<br><br><b>Total UGX. 226,897,914.</b> | 2 |
|----|--|--|--|---|

|    |   |  |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 10 | <p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG did not timely warrant (Q 3) DDEG transfers to LLGs FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The status was as follows:</p> <p>Q 1- There was no disbursement for DDEG in this quarter</p> <p>Q 2- Warranted on 10/10/2022 and transferred on 03/10/2022. <b>This was 3 days which was within 5 working days.</b></p> <p>Q 3- Warranted on 05/01/2023 and transferred on 27/01/2023. <b>This was 22 days which was beyond 5 working days.</b></p> <p>In Q 3 funds were transferred beyond 5 working days after warranting.</p>   | 0 |
| 10 | <p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>The evidence shows that the LG did not invoice and communicate all DDEG transfers to the LLGs within 5 working days in FY 2022/2023 after the release of funds.</p> <p>Q 1 - No release of DDEG in this quarter</p> <p>Q 2 - Cash release was on 12/10/2022, invoiced and communicated on 12/11/2022, <b>released on the same day.</b></p> <p>Q 3 - Cash release was on 12/01/2023, invoiced and communicated on 18/01/2023, <b>6 days after the release of funds.</b></p> <p>The LG did not invoice and communicate DDEG funds 5 days after the release of funds in Q 3.</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>   | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>There was no evidence provided that indicated the City supervised or mentored Divisions at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines in FY 2022/2023.</p>   | 0 |

|    |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 11 | Routine oversight and monitoring<br><br>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0 | There was no evidence provided that reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in TPC to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up in FY 2022/2023. | 0 |
|----|--|--|--|---|

**Investment Management**

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively<br><br>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0<br><br><b>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</b> | Hoima City provided the assets registers both manual and IFMS system generated for FY 2022/2023 which were maintained to date by the time of assessment on 16th-17th November 2023 by the Principal Finance Officer. The assets registers included; Land, buildings, transport equipment, machinery, ICT equipment, furniture and fittings. These included: description, site, plot number, block number, title number, and plot number, type, date of acquisition, cost, department section, physical location and status of date of registration for all respectful assets. The assets register report was signed by the accounting officer and formed part of Board of survey. | 2 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively<br><br>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:<br><br>Score 1 or else 0 | Hoima City provided the Board of Survey (BOS) report for FY 2021/2022 dated 16th September 2022 was signed on 16th August 2022 by the committee chairperson Mugisa Ahamed, with three other members: Kyomuhendo Carolyn, Ndozireho Wilfed and Ayebale Patrick. The BOS report included the following items; Cash balances and bank reconciliations; division accounts, store's inventory, follow-up on previous board of survey recommendations and a list of assets: land and buildings at headquarters and at LLGs; transport equipment; ICT equipment, office equipment; medical equipment, machinery. BOS FY 2022/2023 showed that management decisions and recommendations on action for FY 2021/2022 were on; sale of assets, fencing of health centers, engraving assets, installation of electricity in health centers, material testing laboratory be operational (pages,16-17) in BOS report of FY 2021/2022. | 1 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

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 had functional physical planning committee and all fully appointed of 6 members.

The City had the Approved Physical Development Plan: Approved by the Physical Planning Committee on 17th February 2015 and approved by Council on 25th March 2015 under Minute No.05/FC/03/2015 and approval of Action Plans under Minute No. 05/FC/03/2015.

-The Physical planner Geoffrey Muhumuza availed the following documents for FY 2022/2023:

a. Electronic Plans submission register for approval of site visit building plans.

b. Annual work-plan for FY 2022/2023, compiled under the Natural Resources Department.

c. Approval register for plans was online.

c. Appointments letter dated 30th July 2021 had a list for all the 6 members.

**d. The LG did not submit four sets of minutes for FY 2022/2023 to MLHUD.**

**The Physical planner instead provided Minutes for FY 2021/2022 and were as follows:**

Set 1 - Meeting of 13th July 2020.

Set 2 - Meeting of 15th July 2020.

Set 3 - Meeting of 14th August 2020.

Set 4 - Meeting of 4th January 2021.

Set 5- Meeting of 8th February 2021.

The City LG did not submit any set of Minutes to MOLHUD FY 2022/2023.

|    |   |   |  |   |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 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 did not provide evidence on desk appraisal for projects in the budget FY 2022/2023 during days of assessment, 16th -17th November 2023.</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 did not conduct field appraisal for projects FY 2022/2023 as there was no evidence provided on the days of assessment, 16th -17th November 2023.</p> | 0 |

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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:

Score 1 or else score 0.

Evidence showed that project profiles with costing were developed by HODs from different departments and desk appraisal and field appraisal report dated 20th September 2023. The presentation was developed from the City DP III (pages, 104-116), Annual Work plan under TPC meeting dated minute no. 5/TPC/September/2023, showed, projects listed below were derived from the AWP 2023/2024 (pages, 26, 29, 20).

These projects are under the following programme areas

#### **Agro-Industrialization**

1. Completion of a modern slaughter house at Bulera cell

Human capital Development (Health)

2. Wall fencing of Kihuukya HC IV 47,670,000 Sector development Grant

#### **Human capital Development (Education)**

3. Latrine construction at Bujwahya primary school @ 39,387,500,000/- Education sector development grant

4. Latrine construction at Bwikta Quran P/S 39,387,500.00 /- Education sector development grant

Integrated Transport System and Services

5. Upgrading of roads

6. Drainage construction

The project profiles adhere to the formats of the LG Planning guideline

0

12

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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:

Score 2 or else score 0

There was no evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for USMID Projects for current FY listed in the Hoima City Procurement plan for FY 2023/2024

Additional works for roads under USMID.at a cost of 20,526,544,564UGX

Consultancy services under USMID at a cost of 1,500,000,000UGX

|    |  |   |  |   |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan<br><br>Score 1 or else score 0             | There was evidence that all infrastructure projects for current FY to be implemented using DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan<br><br>The assessor was given and he reviewed the approved procurement plan submitted to Executive Director PPDA under cover of a letter dated 11th September 2023. The letter is signed by the Town Clerk. The eight page document included all infrastructure projects scheduled for implementation this Financial Year  | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution<br><br>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0 | <p>There was evidence all infrastructure implemented in previous F/Y where approved by the contracts committee. The evidence is as follows. USMID</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upgrading of USMID roads of Mandela road, Sir. Tito Winy road, Circular road, Persy road, Government road, Tank Hill road, Bikunyu road. This project with procurement reference HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS/CL-7/20-21/00001 was awarded to M/S China Railway 18th Bureau Group Co. Ltd through contracts committee minute 11/HC/CC/07/21 during their sitting of 3rd September 2021. The contract sum is UGX. 30, 414, 652, 348.00 The award was displayed on 3rd September 2022 and the display was removed on 17th September 2022</li> </ul> <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 - stance lined latrines at Bulemwa P/S - This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Wemba Logistics Ltd through contracts committee minute CR/HCC/156/2 during their sitting of 2nd December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 29, 338, 374.00 The award was displayed on 14th December 2022 and the display was removed on 28th December 2022</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/00001 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders &amp; Engineers Ltd through contracts committee minute 23/HC/CC/12/12/22 during their sitting of 14th December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 116, 000, 058.00. The award was displayed on 14th December 2022 and the display was removed on 28th December 2022</li> </ul> <p>Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd during the contracts' committee minute 33/HCC/25/04/22 that sat on 19th April 2023. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 000, 000.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022</li> </ul> | 1 |



- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was awarded to M/S Agemas Lord Co. Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023 The contract sum is UGX. 20, 515, 114.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022

- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0005 was awarded to M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 892, 439.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022

- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Aliku Builders Stone Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023. The contract sum is UGX. 25, 737, 499.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022

13

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

c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:

Score 1 or else 0

There was no evidence that Hoima City Council established Project Implementation Team (PIT) for education construction projects as per sector guidelines. Though there was evidence that Council officers conducted project supervision, it would appear it was done so in an adhoc manner.  
  
The assessor was not shown any evidence that a PIT had been appointed.

0

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

d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented under the following three headings DDEG, Health and Education followed standard technical designs.

The following projects were sampled per heading as below.

#### DDEG

- Protection of spring wells at 5 sites at UGX. 25,453,500.00
- Installation and Repair of faulty street solar lights at UGX. 29,850,500

#### Education

- Construction of 5 – stance lined latrines with shower at UGX. 25,632,451.00 at Kibwona P/S
- Construction of 2 classroom block with office and store at Kirasa P/S at UGX. 87,545,580.00
- Construction of 2 classroom block with office and store at Kamurasi P/S at UGX. 101,137,631.00

#### Health

- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines at Nyakitibwa HC III at a cost of UGX. 14,685,000.00
- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines at Katasengwa HC III at a cost of UGX. 14,693,702.00
- Construction of staff House at Katasengwa HC III at UGX. 148,821,654.00

Field visits were conducted to these facilities on 7th November 2023 to have physical checks if the projects complied with the standard technical designs. The field visits were conducted with the relevant drawings in hand.

During the field visits, measurements were undertaken and visual observations were made to verify compliance with technical designs.

At these sampled projects, it was indeed concluded that the projects were fully compliant with the technical designs provided either by the engineering department or by central government agencies like MOES headquarters and MOH headquarters and from Ministry of Water.

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

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

There is adequate evidence that Hoima City has provided supervision by key relevant technical officers for infrastructure projects and inspected works prior to certification of payments. The evidence is as follows:

The assessor was shown files for each of the selected project. Each file contained progress reports, monthly site meetings, site monitoring reports, contract drawings, contract implementation plans for each contract and many other documents like appointment letters for the project managers signed by the Town Clerk. For example Mugano Felix was appointed project manager for the project Construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Buhanika HC III with a letter dated 10th May 2023

Looking through monthly progress reports it was evidence that technical staff members were in attendance. The example is minutes of the first meeting for Renovation of Staff quarters at Buhanika HC III during which all key technical staff attended. This is so in all the files that the assessor sampled and looked at.

All the field monitoring reports sampled had records of attendance of technical team members.

Many final and interim payment certificates were sampled and in all cases these certificates were endorsed by multiple members of the technical team and did so timely and there was evidence that supervision took place prior to certification. For the contract Construction of 5 stance Lined VIP at Buhanika HC III, the contractor M/S Karki Builders and Engineering Ltd submitted a request for payment under cover of their letter dated 8th June 2023. On 15th June 2023, the Town Clerk had fully certified the request for payment.

For each payment request, the City Engineer always prepares a "measurement sheet" that corresponds to the volume of executed work presented for payment. To prepare this "measurement sheet" the engineer must physically inspect the works.

The Environment Officer and Community Development Officer always prepare a separate environment and social certificate. The assessor was shown copies of these certificates.

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence the Hoima City Council verified works (certify) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract.</p> <p>Files of several projects were sampled and the following evidence was found as examples of timely initiation and certification of payments.</p> <p>For the construction of the 5 stance lined VIP latrine M/S Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd requested for payment through their letter signed by their Director Kwesiga Robert dated 8th June 2023. On 15th June 2023, the TC signed off the payment request ready for payment</p> <p>For the renovation of health staff quarters at Buhanika HC III M/S Sidney Concepts Ltd requested for payment through their letter signed by their Director Baguma Sydney James dated 12th June 2023. On 14th June 2023, the TC signed off the payment request ready for payment</p> <p>For the renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III M/S Aliku Builders Stone Ltd requested for payment through their letter signed by their Director Norman Aliguma Mugenyi dated 6th June 2023. On 14th June 2023, the TC signed off the payment request ready for payment</p> <p>On receipt of Interim Payment requests, the City engineer prepares measurement sheet following site inspection/supervision. This measurement sheet is endorsed by all key heads of departments and is a key part of payment certification. The assessor was shown these measurement sheets.</p> <p>In addition, the Environment Officer and Community Development Officer always prepare a separate “environment and social certificate” that are attached to the certificates. The assessor saw copies of these certificates.</p> <p>This is sufficient evidence that Hoima City Council verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames as per contract.</p> |
|---|---|--|

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

There was evidence that the Hoima City Council kept complete procurement files for each contract as required by PPDA Act.

The following three contract files were reviewed for their completeness as required by PPDA law.

- Upgrading of USMID roads of Mandela road, Sir. Tito Winy road, Circular road, Persy road, Government road, Tank Hill road, Bikunyu road. This project with procurement reference HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS/CL-7/20-21/00001 was awarded to M/S China Railway 18th Bureau Group Co. Ltd through contracts committee minute 11/HC/CC/07/21 during their sitting of 3rd September 2021. The contract sum is UGX. 30, 414, 652, 348.00

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/00001 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders & Engineers Ltd through contracts committee minute 23/HC/CC/12/12/22 during their sitting of 14th December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 116, 000, 058.00

- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/00005 was awarded to M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 892, 439.00

Other information on the files were the following:

LGPP form 1 with Engineers' estimate, Newspaper extract for the call for bids, Bidding forms and Instructions to bidders, LGPP form 2 Request for approval of procurement method, Request for approval bidding documents, Evaluation Reports, Minutes of contract award, Payment receipt and many other documents.

## Environment and Social Safeguards

|    |   |  |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>                      | <p>There was no Evidence that Holma City had 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.</p> <p>The officer in charge was unavailable by the time of assessment</p> | 0 |
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>The LG had no specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action.</p> <p>The officer in charge was unavailable by the time of assessment.</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>The City had not publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. This publication was not seen at the Hoima City notice boards by the time of assessment.</p>   | 0 |

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0

The evidence provided indicated environment, social and climate change interventions were integrated into, LG DP III, page, 26 where a comprehensive situation analysis was given and later integration was made in the City Development Plan (pages, 38, 40, 45). Through Promote sustainable land and environmental management practices, the City is contributing to the Natural Resources, Environment, Climate Change, Land and Water Management programme.

Sampled projects were:

1. Natural resources, UGX. 62,500,000 for implementation of environment/climate change related interventions.

2. Environment and Natural Resources Management sub programme UGX 27,800,000 was budgeted (LG PD III, page, 36)

3. Land Management UGX 14,500,000 (LG DP III, page, 36).

4. Natural resources department: Desilting of river banks UGX. 3,320,000 (LG DP III, page, 63).

Interventions were:

1. Conserve and restore urban natural resources.

2. Making manure from bio-degradable waste also briquette.

3. Integrated physical and development planning processes.

4. Promotion of the use of indigenous knowledge to protect/conservate the environment and reverse or prepare for the adverse consequences of climatic change as well.

5. Concerning water for both production and human consumption the plan to concentrate on rain water harvesting.

|    |  |   |  |   |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management<br><br>score 1 or else 0  | Evidence provided showed Hoima City disseminated to Budget Call Circular and the DDEG guidelines to HoD and the LLGs. These guidelines were disseminated as per the dissemination report of 1st March 2023.<br><br>Objectives of the meeting;<br><br>1. To disseminate 2nd budget call circular and budget guidelines for FY 2022/2023<br><br>2. To disseminate enhanced DDEG guidelines, roads guidelines, guidelines for health, education, production and marketing, social development, the Unconditional Grant and PDM guidelines<br><br>3. To guide both the HLG and division staff to generate harmonized and linked budgets to the respective programs<br><br>With Expected outputs<br><br>• Both the HLG and division staff to produce workplans/budgets adhering to the guidelines | 1 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | (For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):<br><br>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:<br><br>score 3 or else score 0 | There was evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for USMID infrastructure projects other than Health, Education, Water and Irrigation example;<br><br>Rehabilitation of Perse-Commercial road(0.45km)Government road extension(0.46km),circular road(1.0km).Bikunya(0,25km),Tayali crown eka road(0.6km)Tank hill road(o.2km),Sir Tito Mandela Kasasa road(1.3km) (Ref No: HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS /CL-7/2020-2021/00001)Ongoing project<br><br>In the BOQ Item (25.01) Stone pitching, stonework and protection against erosion costed 1,790,594,543UGX for commercial road(0.45km)   | 3 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.<br><br>Score 3 or else score 0   | There was no evidence in the LG to show projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change for the previous FY by the time of assessment   | 0 |



|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>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: | The LG had no proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.) without any encumbrances for the previous FY by the time of assessment for USMID projects.  | 0 |
|    |  | Score 1 or else score 0  |   |   |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>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:  | <p>There was evidence that City Environmental officer(Kyamanywa Ronald) and PCDO (Hope Susan) conducted support supervision and monitoring for health, and education Monthly reports were done. Examples include;</p> <p>Monthly Report for compliance on Construction of 5 stance lined latrine with washrooms. Monitoring report dated 14/4/2023, 11/5/2023 and 21/6/2023 signed by PCDO and City Environment officer.</p> <p>Monthly Report for renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III for May and 22/6/2023. Monitoring report signed by PCDO and City Environment officer.</p> <p>Monthly Report for Construction of 5 stance lined latrine with bathroom at Buhanika HC III for June and 21/7/2023. Monitoring report signed by PCDO and City Environment officer.</p> <p>Compliance issues included; debris on site like bricks removed, ramps installed and lightening arrestor installed for classroom block.</p> | 1 |
|    |  | Score 1 or else score 0  |   |   |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.<br><br>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: | <p>There was evidence that LG had E&amp;S compliance Certification forms completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO. examples include;</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere PS. Environmental and social certification Cert No 001. signed on 14/3/2023 by City Environment officer and PCDO</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Bulemwa PS. Environmental and social certification Cert No 001.signed on 10/5/2023 by City Environment officer and PCDO</p> <p>Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III. Environmental and social certification Cert No 001.signed on 12/6/2023 by City Environment officer and PCDO. Certification was based on implemented safeguards in the ESMP</p>   | 1 |
|    |  | Score 1 or else score 0  |   |   |

## Financial management

|    |   |  |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 16 | LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations<br><br>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:<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0 | The City monthly bank reconciliations were to-date at time of the assessment on 16th November 2023.<br><br>The bank reconciliations were as at 31st October 2023.<br><br>The 3 sampled banks reconciled were as follows;<br><br>1. Hoima YLP Recovery A/C,- DFCU, Bank. Bank, a/c. no. 01133658768775, -UGX. 0<br><br>2. Hoima City-General Fund a/c, DFCU Bank, a/c. 01133658768845, UGX. 2,447,275.<br><br>3. Hoima City-UWEP Recovery a/c - DFCU Bank, a/c. 01133658768748, UGX. 9,203,060. | 2 |
| 17 | LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90<br><br>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.<br><br>Score 2 or else score 0                       | Evidence showed the City produced all the four quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2022/2023. They were provided by Senior Internal Auditor Kaahwa Andrew.<br><br>Preparation dates were as follows:<br><br>Q 1- 10/11/2022<br><br>Q 2 -24/02/2023<br><br>Q 3- 02/06/2023<br><br>Q 4 -26/07/2023   | 2 |

|    |  |   |  |          |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>Evidence showed the City provided information on all the four quarterly reports to the Council and the City Mayor and the Chairperson LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The status of submission dates to Council, City Mayor and Chairperson LG PAC for the four quarterly internal audit reports were as below:</p> <p>Q 1- report of 11th November 2022, submitted and acknowledged by Council and City Mayor and the Chairperson LG PAC on 11th November 2022.</p> <p>Q 2- report of 24th February 2023, submitted and acknowledged by Council and City Mayor and the Chairperson LG PAC on 28th February 2023.</p> <p>Q 3- report of 2nd June 2023, submitted and acknowledged by Council and City Mayor and the Chairperson LG PAC on 12th June 2023.</p> <p>Q 4- report of 26th June, submitted and acknowledged Council and City Mayor and the Chairperson LG PAC by on 28th August 2023.</p> <p>The City provided all the four quarterly reports (Q 1, Q 2, 3 and Q 4) internal audit reports for implementation on internal audit findings and follow-up on audit queries.</p> | <b>1</b> |
|----|--|---|--|----------|

|    |  |  |  |          |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 17 | <p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There were no reports provided to the assessor by Clerk to Council Solomon Businge (0782324088) as he was not available on the two days of assessment, 16th-17th November 2023.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|----|--|--|--|----------|

**Local Revenues**

|    |   |   |  |          |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 18 | <p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>Actual Revenue collected in FY 2022/23 was UGX. 1,446,124,813 against the planned of UGX. 2,134,232,000 The difference between actual and planned was UGX. 688,107,187 (Final accounts, FY 2022/2023, page, 15). This was 32 % not within the range of 10%.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|----|---|---|--|----------|

|    |  |  |   |          |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 19 | <p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul> | <p>The actual OSR for the FY 2022/23 UGX. 1,446,124,813 and FY 2021/2022 was UGX. 1,446,124,813 (Final accounts 2022/2023, page, 15). There was a decrease of UGX.304, 060,111. This was a decrease of 17.4%, not within 10% range.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|----|--|--|---|----------|

|    |  |  |   |          |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 20 | <p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p> | <p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the City remitted the mandatory LLG share of the local revenue FY 2022/2023. The total revenue realized during the year was, UGX. 1,446,124,813 (Final accounts, page, 36), out of which, UGX.734, 827,156 as City Headquarters share and balance of UGX. 711,297,657 to Divisions.</p> <p>During the year, the City disbursed the entire UGX. 711,297,657 (100 %+ ) to Divisions.</p> <p>1. East, UGX. 559,463,741.</p> <p>2. West, UGX. 151,833,916.</p> <p>Total, UGX. 711,297,657.</p> | <b>2</b> |
|----|--|--|---|----------|

**Transparency and Accountability**

|    |  |   |  |          |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence the procurement plan and the amounts of awarded contracts are published.</p> <p>All the files reviewed had dates and periods of display. Some of these displays could still be seen on notice board. Dates of display for the selected projects are as follows:</p> <p>USMID</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upgrading of USMID roads of Mandela road, Sir. Tito Winy road, Circular road, Persy road, Government road, Tank Hill road, Bikunyu road. This project with procurement reference HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS/CL-7/20-21/00001 was awarded to M/S China Railway 18th Bureau Group Co. Ltd through contracts committee minute 11/HC/CC/07/21 during their sitting of 3rd September 2021. The contract sum is UGX. 30, 414, 652, 348.00 The award was displayed on 3rd September 2022 and the display was removed on 17th September 2022</li> </ul> <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 – stance lined latrines at</li> </ul> | <b>2</b> |
|----|--|---|--|----------|

Bulemwa P/S – This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Wemba Logistics Ltd through contracts committee minute CR/HCC/156/2 during their sitting of 2nd December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 29, 338, 374.00 The award was displayed on 14th December 2022 and the display was removed on 28th December 2022

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/00001 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders & Engineers Ltd through contracts committee minute 23/HC/CC/12/12/22 during their sitting of 14th December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 116, 000, 058.00. The award was displayed on 14th December 2022 and the display was removed on 28th December 2022

#### Health

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd during the contracts' committee minute 33/HCC/25/04/22 that sat on 19th April 2023. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 000, 000.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022

- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was awarded to M/S Agemas Lord Co. Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023 The contract sum is UGX. 20, 515, 114.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022

- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0005 was awarded to M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 892, 439.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022

- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Aliku Builders Stone Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023. The contract sum is UGX. 25, 737, 499.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>   | <p>The LG ranked 6th with a score of 40%, (6th position as this was an assessment of Cities out of 22) FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>Scores in percentage by sector were:</p> <p>Sector Score</p> <p>Education 53</p> <p>Health 26</p> <p>Dissemination of performance assessment results and implication report as evidenced under TPC minutes of 20th September 2023 under Min 4/TPC/September/2023.</p>   | 2 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>Evidence showed Hoima City, during the previous FY 2022/2023, organized a Public Debate (Baraza) it was held on 8th December 2022 at Hoima Public Library (Public Debate report to Tc of 13th December 2022 by the City Community Development Officer)</p> <p><b>The objective of the report was;</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To inform stakeholders on service delivery</li> <li>2. To gather challenges are facing in accessing services</li> </ol> <p>Information given to stakeholders included</p> <p><b>Health -</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The various services offered in the six health facilities of government at the 2 PNFP health facilities</li> <li>2. It was highlighted that HIV/AIDS prevalence was at 6.6%</li> <li>3. Latrine coverage was at 60.8%</li> </ol> <p><b>On Roads-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. road network was 632km within the planning area of 2285qrkm</li> <li>2. around 11km of road will be tarmacked under the USMID programme</li> </ol> | 1 |

|    |  |   |  |          |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>   | <p>The LG publicly avail information on, tax rates, collection procedures, and procedures for appeal as per evidence of provided by the Principal Finance Officer dated 26th June 2023. The tax rates and procedures were on: wholesalers, agency representatives, financial institutions businesses, professional and consultancy business, health and medical business, education institution businesses, security, investment and guard business, garage and workshops, hotels, lodges / guest houses, recreation and entertainment business centers. The rates were also seen on the noticeboard and from filed copies by the assessor on 16th and 17th November 2023.</p> | <b>1</b> |
| 22 | <p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>                     | <p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>No information was available on fraud and corruption status, as the Clerk to Council, Solomon Businge was not available on the two days of assessment, 16th-17th November 2023.</p>   | <b>0</b> |

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

| <b>No.</b>                                       | <b>Summary of requirements</b>  | <b>Definition of compliance</b>  | <b>Compliance justification</b>   | <b>Score</b> |
|--|---|--|---|--------------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |   |  |   |              |
| 1  | <p>Learning Outcomes:<br/>The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>               | <p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>  | <p>PLE 2020: Div. 1 - 646; Div. 2 - 1558; Div. 3 - 496; [Total 2700]. Total candidates: 3243 - 60 Absentees = 3183. Giving a pass rate of 84.8%.</p> <p>PLE 2022: Div. 1 - 887; Div. 2 - 1537; Div. 3 - 429; [Total 2853]. Total Candidates: 3438 - 71 Absentees = 3367. Giving a pass rate of 84.7%. NB. District figures were not tallying with figures provided by UNEB. So, I used UNEB figures.</p> <p>There was a decline of 0.1% points.</p> <p>Source: District and UNEB PLE results for 2020 and 2022.</p> | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | <p>Learning Outcomes:<br/>The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>               | <p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>  | <p>UCE 2020: Div. 1 - 382; Div. 2 - 521; Div. 3 - 528; [Total 1431]. Total candidates: 2312 - 28 Absentees = 2284. Giving a pass rate of 62.7%.</p> <p>UCE 2022: Div. 1 - 609; Div. 2 - 581; Div. 3 - 583; [Total 1773]. Total Candidates: 2590 - 28 Absentees = 2562. Giving a pass rate of 69.2%.</p> <p>There was an improvement of 6.5% points.</p> <p>Source: District and UNEB UCE results for 2020 and 2022.</p>   | <b>3</b>     |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p> | <p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5%, score 1</li> <li>• No Improvement, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p> | <p>The average Education LLG performance for 2022 was 2.5/10 [25%] and for 2023 was 3.5/10 [35%] which indicated an increase in performance of 10% points which attracts a score of 2.</p>  | <b>2</b>     |



|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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>According to vouchers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No. 3750642 dated 19/07/2023 of UGX. 20,435,878/= to Munda Holdings Ltd. in respect of renovation of 2-classroom block and store at Busiisi P/S.</li> <li>2. No. 6430572 dated 19/07/2023 of UGX. 25,071,680/= to Exquisite Business Solutions and Development Consult Ltd. in respect of 3-seater desks to Bulebere P/S [36], St. Bernadetta's P/S [30], Karongo P/S [12], Bulemwa P/S [12], and Parajwoki P/S [10].</li> <li>3. No. 5853526 dated 19/07/2023 of UGX. 9,149,657/= to Wemba Logistics Company Ltd. in respect of construction of a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Bulemwa P/S.</li> </ol> <p>The education development grant, was spent on eligible activities as per sector guidelines.</p>  | 2 |
| 3 | <p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>The City Education Officer- Kusiima Johson Bayingana, City Engineer-Kiiza Boniface, MLG-CDO-Hope Susan and Environment Officer- Kyamanywa Ronald certified works on Education construction projects in FY 2022/2023 before the MLG made payments to the contractors.</p> <p><b>The projects were as follows;</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of 5 stance lined VIP latrine at Bulemwa PS by Wemba Logistics Company Limited. Procurement Number. HC604/WRKS/022-023/00002. Requisition for funds on 12/06/2023. Certified works on 15/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6441207, UGX. 7,216,338.</li> <li>2. Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere PS by Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd. Procurement Number. HC604/WKS/2022-2023/00001. Requisition for funds on 13/06/2023. Certified works on 16/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6438551, UGX. 6,124,815.</li> <li>3. Renovation of 2 classroom block plus office &amp; store at Busiisi P/S by Munda Holdings Limited. Procurement number. HC860/WRKS/2021-2022/00009. Requisition for funds on 02/02/2023. Certified works on 02/02/2023 and paid on 20/02/2023 by EFT. 3750642, UGX. 20,435,878.</li> </ol> | 2 |

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 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   | There is evidence that the variations in contract price for sampled education projects are all within the threshold of +/- 20%. The following education projects were sampled.  | 2 |
|   | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 - stance lined latrines at Bulemwa P/S - The Engineer's estimate was as per PP form 1 dated 25th July 2022 was UGX. 32,646,000.00 while the contract sum was UGX. 29,338,374.00 giving an absolute variance of 3,307,626.00 and percentage variance of 10.13%</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S - Engineer's estimate as per PP form 1 was UGX. 119, 848, 000.00 while the contract sum was UGX. 116,000,058.00 giving an absolute variance of 3,847,942.00 and percentage variance of -3.2%</li> </ul> |   |
| 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   | There was no seed school.   | 2 |
|   | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>                              |   |   |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines  | The information obtained from the HRM office revealed that the staff ceiling for primary schools in Hoima City was 340 out of which 304 were filled which is 89% which is a score of 2.   | 2 |
|   | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul> |   |   |

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul> | <p>Basing on the district schools consolidated assets register 2023 dated 19/07/2023 [updated] for 33 UPE and 05 USE schools, all schools [100%] had the basic requirements and minimum standards as per DES guidelines.</p> | 3 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>                                      | <p>According to the consolidated staff list July 2023 dated 15/07/2023 and the staff lists found in the primary schools [Karongo, St. Bernadetta's, Duhaga Girls' - all in West Division] I sampled and visited, had tallying number and names of teachers. For example, Nyombi Beatrice Amara, Kato Johnson Kisembo, Volet Birungi, and others [at Karongo P/S]; Sr. Komuhangi Jacinta, Nabankema Immaculate, Musana Richard, and others [at St. Bernadetta's]; Ayebare Moses, Harriet Monday, Kyomugisha Blossom, and others [at Duhaga Girls [P/S] were physically present at the schools.</p> | 2 |
| 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>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul> | <p>The district consolidated assets register 2023 was tallying with assets registers I found in primary schools [Karongo, St. Bernadetta's, Duhaga Girls'] I sampled and visited. The infrastructure and equipment [buildings, tables, chairs, desks, clocks, computers, among others] in registers were in existence at the schools.</p>   | 2 |

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul> | <p>Termly reports are submitted by schools duly signed by headteachers and chairmen SMCs. For example, Busiisi P/S had reports submitted on 25/11/2022, 05/05/2023, 12/08/2023; Duhaga Boys' P/S submitted on 20/12/2022, 05/05/2023, 25/08/2023; Bujwahya P/S submitted on 25/11/2022, 05/05/2023, 25/08/2023; for Term 3/2022, Term 1/2023, and Term 3/2023 respectively. All the 33 [100%] had submitted their reports with the required content though using the format within the guidelines.</p> | 4 |
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 50% score: 4</li> <li>• Between 30- 49% score: 2</li> <li>• Below 30% score 0</li> </ul>  | <p>The schools developed SIPs and 26/33 [78.8%] UPE schools had submitted their SIPs to CEO's office. The same SIPs were in place and displayed in the primary schools [Karongo, St. Bernadetta's, Duhaga Girls'] I sampled and visited.</p>   | 4 |
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 - 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>  | <p>Basing on the Approved Budget Estimates FY 2022/2023, PBS data, and letter of submission by CTC to PS/MoES dated 24/10/2022 and received on 31/10/2022, the city had communicated the enrolment figures for the 33 UPE and 05 USE schools</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>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>Basing on the Approved Budget Estimates FY 2023/2024 and the PBS data the city budgeted for 304 teachers - 7 teachers and a headteacher per school at UGX. 2,377,074,000/=.</p>   | 4 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>  | <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>   |  |   |
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,<br/><br/>Score 3 else score: 0</p>  | <p>While the primary schools [Karongo (09 teachers), St Bernadetta's (27 teachers), Duhaga Girls (09 teachers)] I sampled and visited had the threshold number of 08 teachers each including the headteacher, a number of schools according to the district consolidated staff list were below the minimum requirement of 8 teachers. For example, Bujwahya P/S [06], Nyarugabu P/S [06], Drucila Memorial P/S [06], Kabaale P/S [07], Kitemba P/S [07], Budaka P/S [06], Kiduuma P/S [07], etc [13 schools]. The city did not rationalize the teachers to meet the staffing norms.</p>  | 0 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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,<br/><br/>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>  | <p>The city consolidated staff list July 2023 dated 15/07/2023 had been displayed on the notice board. The same names and number of teachers in the city staff list were the same as those I found displayed on notice boards in the primary schools [Karongo, St. Bernadetta's, Duhaga Girls] I sampled and visited. For example, Nyombi Beatrice Amara, Kato Johnson Kitembo, Volet Birungi, and others [at Karongo P/S]; Sr. Komuhangi Jacinta, Nabankema Immaculate, Musana Richard, and others [at St. Bernadetta's]; Ayebare Moses, Harriet Monday, Kyomugisha Blossom, and others [at Duhaga Girls [P/S] were appearing in the lists displayed.</p> | 1 |
|   | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</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.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The assessor accessed files of 10 primary school head teachers and found out that all of them were appraised late (beyond 31st December 2022)

1. Isoke Kiirya Patrick (Hoima Mixed Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023
2. Kaijukya Sawa (Head Teacher Butebera Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023
3. Karungi Basemera Harriet (Head Teacher Hoima Public Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023
4. Kyalisiima Jane (Head Teacher Kyakapeya Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023
5. Kabajulizi Beatrice (Head Teacher Mparo Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023
6. Kaahwa Ismail (Bwikya Quran Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023
7. Kyalimpa Flavia (Head Teacher Kabaale Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023
8. Kamuli Diana (Head Teacher Buhanika Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023
9. Mbabazi Norah Noureen (Head Teacher Drucilla Memorial Primary School) was appraised on 16th January 2023
10. Byabasaija Mary (Head Teacher Kigarama Primary School) was appraised on 6th January 2023

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

Performance reports for all secondary school head teachers for the previous school year were not availed to the assessor.

|   |  |   |   |          |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p> | <p>Appraisal reports for all Education department staff for the previous FY were not availed to the assessor.</p> | <b>0</b> |
|---|--|---|---|----------|

|   |  |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p> | <p>The training plan for the department 2022/2023 dated 19/02/2022 was in place with training needs such as volley training, training headteachers and SMC members, MDD TOT workshop, etc.</p> | <b>2</b> |
|---|--|--|--|----------|

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

|   |   |   |  |          |
|---|---|---|--|----------|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>According to the Approved Budget Estimates FY 2023/2023, PBS data, enrolment figures provided by MoES, and the letter to PS/MoES dated 23/10/2022 and received on 31/10/2022 there was evidence of communicating corrections/revisions of school lists and their enrolment.</p> | <b>2</b> |
|---|---|---|--|----------|

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 9   | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>  | <p>Basing on the Approved Budget Estimates FY 2022/2023, the inspection and monitoring function had been allocated UGX. 14,050,000/= which was spent on fuel, lubricants and oils, stationary, and allowances. So, the activities on which money was spent, were in tandem with the sector guidelines.</p>   | 2 |
| <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> |   |   |  |   |
| 9   | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>   | <p>A review of PBS timestamps from MoFPED of LG warrant submissions for school capitation grants revealed that the LG in FY 2022/203, warranted more than 5 working days (i.e, Q 3, Q 4) after cash limits for the LG were uploaded in the PBS by MoFPED.</p>  | 0 |
| <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> |   |   | <p>Evidence</p> <p>Q 3 - FY 2022/2023-Cash lint uploaded on 29th December 2022 and LG warranted on 5th January 2023, <b>after 7 working days.</b></p> <p>Q 4 FY 2022/2023-Cash lint uploaded on 6th April 2023 and LG warranted on 17th April 2023 2023, <b>after 11 days.</b></p> <p>Q 1 Q 4 FY 2023/2024-Cash lint uploaded on 17th July 2023 and LG warranted on 18th July 2023, <b>after 1 working day</b></p> <p>LG did not warrant within 5 days (Q 3 and Q 4) after cash limits were uploaded in the PBS.</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>The city release circulars dated 09/08/2022, 18/01/2023, and 20/07/2023 were in place and vouchers for schools were raised for the schools: Karongo P/S [e.g. 959248, dated 23/01/2023]; St. Bernadetta's P/S [e.g. 3669388, dated 18/07/2023]; Duhaga Girls' P/S [e.g. 5302636, dated 18/07/2023] I sampled and visited. The releases had been displayed at the notice boards of both the district and schools.</p>  | 2 |
| <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> |   |   |  |   |



|    |  |  |   |          |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring<br><br><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.<br><br>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0   | Inspection Plan 2022/2023 dated 25/07/2022 was in place and departmental meeting minutes equally served as inspection meeting minutes due to the skeleton staff of four [04] in the department. Minutes of meetings held on 02/12/2022, 06/06/2023, etc. discussed issues of focus for the inspection - attendance of both learners and teachers, staffing positions, absenteeism in schools, planning for lessons, follow-up of recommendations made previously, and others.   | <b>2</b> |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring<br><br><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:<br><br>• If 100% score: 2<br><br>• Between 80 - 99% score 1<br><br>• Below 80%: score 0   | Term 3/2022 inspection report had 26/33 [78.8%] UPE schools monitored, Term 1/2023 report had 24/33 [72.7%] UPE schools inspected, and Term 2/2023 report had 29/33 [80.5%] UPE schools inspected. On average, 80.5% [26 UPE schools] were inspected.   | <b>1</b> |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring<br><br><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,<br><br>Score: 2 or else, score: 0   | School inspection reports were discussed in departmental meetings of the four [04] officers in the Education Department. Issues found in schools - absenteeism of teachers and learners, inadequate staff in schools, recommendations to schools, inadequate planning, etc. were discussed. Equally in the primary schools [Karongo, St. Bernadetta's, Duhaga Girls'] I sampled and visited, I found similar issues raised in the inspection reports inspectors left behind in Inspection Books each school possesses | <b>2</b> |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring<br><br><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | 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 | Term 3/2022 Inspection Report dated 15/10/2022 was received by DES on 01/01/2023, Term 1/2023 Inspection Report dated 05/06/2023 was received on 13/04/2023, and Term 2/2023 dated 28/08/2023 was received by DES on 29/09/2023.  | <b>2</b> |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring<br><br><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | 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              | There was no evidence provided that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports during the FY 2022/2023. The Clerk to Council Solom Businge was not available to provide the information for the two days of assessment (16th-17th November 2023)  | <b>0</b> |

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 11 | Mobilization of parents to attract learners<br><br><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i> | Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,<br><br><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i> | There was no evidence provided as an effort to mobilize school communities to attract and retain learners in schools. | 0 |
|----|--|--|---|---|

### Investment Management

|    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments<br><br><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i> | a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards,<br><i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>   | Basing on the consolidated assets register 2023 dated 19/07/2023 for 33 UPE and 05 USE schools and the assets registers found in primary schools [Karongo, St. Bernadetta's, Duhaga Girls'] I sampled and visited, the two assets registers [district and schools] were tallying and the infrastructure and equipment [ classrooms, latrines, desks, textbooks, hoes, among others] were in place.                          | 2 |
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments<br><br><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i> | 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> | There was no evidence provided which showed the LG conducted desk appraisal for all sector projects during the two days of assessment (16th-17th November 2023). The Planner Francis Musiime did not provide desk appraisal reports from the Education sector because, there were not there. The Education department did not have any desk appraisal reports on investment projects on the said dates above of assessment. | 0 |
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments<br><br><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i> | c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i>   | There was no evidence provided which showed the LG conducted field appraisal for all sector projects during the two days of assessment (16th-17th November 2023).The Planner Francis Musiime did not provide desk appraisal reports from the Education sector because, there were not there. The Education department did not have any desk appraisal reports on investment projects on the said dates above of assessment. | 0 |

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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*

There was evidence that the education department has budgeted and ensured that the planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan

The assessor was given and he reviewed the approved procurement plans for two financial years F/Y 2022-23 & F/Y 2023-24. The Town Clerk submitted the consolidated annual procurement plans for Hoima City Council for these two years to Executive Director PPDA. The one for F/Y 2022-23 (four page document) was submitted under cover of a letter dated 16th May 2023 while the one for F/Y 2023-2024 (eight page document) was submitted under cover of a letter dated 11th September 2023.

All planned education sector infrastructure projects for these financial years were included in these documents.

Some of the projects included for F/Y 2022-23 are the following:

- Construction of 5 – stance lined latrines at Bulemwa P/S – This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Wemba Logistics Ltd through contracts committee minute CR/HCC/156/2 during their sitting of 2nd December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 29, 338, 374.00
- Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/00001 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders & Engineers Ltd through contracts committee minute23/HC/CC/12/12/22 during their sitting of 14th December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 116, 000, 058.00.

|    |  |  |   |          |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence that the school infrastructure projects were approved by the contracts committee and cleared by Solicitor General before commencement of construction.</p> <p>Relevant files were reviewed and the following examples can be quoted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 – stance lined latrines at Bulemwa P/S Located in Hoima West Division – This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Wemba Logistics Ltd through contracts committee minute CR/HCC/156/2 during their sitting of 2nd December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 29, 338, 374.00 The award was displayed on 14th December 2022 and the display was removed on 28th December 2022</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S Located in hoima East Division - This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/00001 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders &amp; Engineers Ltd through contracts committee minute 23/HC/CC/12/12/22 during their sitting of 14th December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 116, 000, 058.00. The award was displayed on 14th December 2022 and the display was removed on 28th December 2022</li> </ul> | <b>1</b> |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>                               | <p>There was no evidence that Hoima City Council established Project Implementation Team (PIT) for education construction projects as per sector guidelines. Though there was evidence that Council officers conducted project supervision, it would appear it was done so in an adhoc manner.</p> <p>The assessor was not shown any evidence that a PIT had been appointed.</p>  | <b>0</b> |

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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

*Score: 1, else, score: 0*

There was evidence that construction of school infrastructure followed standard technical designs

Two school infrastructure projects were sampled. Relevant designs for these facilities were made available during the site visits.

- Construction of 5 – stance lined latrines at Bulemwa P/S Located in Hoima West Division

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S Located in Hoima East Division

Field visits were conducted to these schools on 17th November 2023 to have physical checks if the projects complied with the standard technical designs.

During the field visits, measurements were undertaken and visual observations were made to verify compliance with technical designs.

At these sampled projects, it was indeed concluded that the projects were fully compliant with the technical designs provided by MOES headquarters.

Some of the technical checks include the following:

Measurements were made of room sizes, size of openings (door sizes, window sizes), 75 mm thick window sills were checked particularly the provision moisture control measures, Chalkboard size and the chalk rail detail and all other details like construction of aprons, timber sizes as specified in the drawings, window and door schedules and all other details as provided on the drawings.

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY  
*score: 1, else score: 0*

There was evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous Financial Year.

Files of the following projects were sampled per sector and scrutinized for information.

For education the following two project files were scrutinized

- Construction of 5 – stance lined latrines at Bulemwa P/S at a cost of UGX. 29, 338, 374.00

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S at a cost of UGX. 116, 000, 058.00

For health the following four project files

1

were looked at in detail

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III at a cost of UGX. 44, 000, 000.00
- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III at a cost of UGX.20, 515, 114.00
- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III at a cost of UGX. 44, 892, 439.00
- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III at a cost of UGX. 25, 737, 499.00

For USMID the following file was looked at.

- Upgrading of USMID roads of Mandela road, Sir. Tito Winy road, Circular road, Persy road, Government road, Tank Hill road, Bikunyu road executed by China Railway 18th group at a cost of UGX.30, 414, 652, 348.00

There was no seed school. Though most of the projects were relatively small with very short completion periods, all projects held regular site meetings. Construction of classroom block, the staff house renovation and upgrading of USMID roads had project implementation periods running several months and held regular monthly meetings.

On all the files sampled, among other documents, the following reports could be seen:

Minutes of site meetings indicating attendance of district heads of Departments.

Monthly progress reports prepared by project managers and distributed to all heads of departments.

Field monitoring reports made by technical officers to inform District management.

Regular reports prepared by Supervisor of works (SOW) as the project supervisor. In some cases these reports were consolidated into monthly reports by the Supervisor of Works (SOW).

On the file for the project, Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere - Minutes four site meetings could be seen including the fourth site meeting that took place on 6th June 2023. In attendance were Hoima City Council heads of Departments

On the file for the project, Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III - Minutes of three site meetings were seen including the meeting held on 12th May 2023 in attendance were Hoima City Council heads of Departments

All the other files had minutes of monthly

meetings including the USMID file that had the most number of monthly meetings.

1

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

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  
*score: 1, else score: 0*

There is evidence that during critical stages of construction of infrastructure projects joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers & CDOs were conducted.

Though there was no evidence that Hoima City Council formally established Project Implementation Teams (PIT) for each sector (Education, Health & DDEG activities), there was evidence that key technical staff of Hoima City Council conducted joint monthly technical supervision.

From the Municipal Engineers' files it could be seen that all the projects conducted regular monthly site meetings more so USMID. In these meetings, the minutes indicated active participation of all heads Departments of Hoima City Council.

Monthly progress reports seen indicated attendance from members.

All the field monitoring reports sampled had records of attendance of all Heads of Departments.

Many final and interim payment certificates were sampled and in all cases these certificates were endorsed by all relevant Heads of Departments. As for the Environment Officer and Community Development Officer the two always prepare a separate "environment and social certificate" that are attached to the certificates. The assessor saw copies of these certificates.

On receipt of Interim Payment requests, the City engineer prepares measurement sheet following site inspection/supervision. This measurement sheet is endorsed by all key heads of departments and is a key part of payment certification. The assessor was shown these measurement sheets.

This is sufficient evidence that there was participation of engineers, environment officers, CDOs at different stages of construction

Examples of the meetings are the following:

1. Fourth site meeting for construction of 2-classroom block at Butebere on 6th June 2023. In attendance were many staff including the following, Kiiza Boneventure Ag. City Engineer, Kyamanywa Ronald Environment officer, Alice Ayesiga Coomunity Officer, Asiiimwe Alex Planner, Bigirwa Fred Head teacher and eleven

other officials as a total of 16 officials attended that meeting

2. First site meeting for the renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika health centre III that took place on 12th may 2023.

In attendance were 12 officials including the following, Kiiza Boneventure Ag. City engineer, Kyamanywa Ronald Environment Officer, Baguma James Director, Mugano Felix Ag. CHO, Ayebare Patrice Stastician, and seven other officials

3. Meeting for the construction of 5-stance lined VIP latrine and bathrooms at Buhanika health centre III that took place on 12th June 2023.

In attendance were Akugizibwe Peter Foremen, Mugano Felix Ag. CHO, Kymanywa Ronald Environment Officer, Kiiza Boneventure City Engineer, Musiime Francis SE, and seven other officials



13

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*

The sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors were made within specified timeframes within the contract.

#### **Evidence**

Payment terms as per contract 30 days after a request for payment / invoice by the contractor.

The sample payments were as follows;

1. Construction of 5 stance lined VIP latrine at Bulemwa PS by Wemba Logistics Company Limited. Procurement Number. HC604/WRKS/022-023/00002. Requisition for funds on 12/06/2023. Certified works on 15/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6441207, UGX. 7,216,338. **Payment made in 16 days which was within the timeframe of 30 days.**

2. Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere PS by Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd. Procurement Number. HC604/WKS/2022-2023/00001. Requisition for funds on 13/06/2023. Certified works on 16/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6438551, UGX. 6,124,815. **Payment made in 15 days which was within the timeframe of 30 days.**

3. Renovation of 2 classroom block plus office & store at Busiisi P/S by Munda Holdings Limited. Procurement number. HC860/WRKS/2021-2022/00009. Requisition for funds on 02/02/2023. Certified works on 02/02/2023 and paid on 20/02/2023 by EFT. 3750642, UGX. 20,435,878. **Payment made in 18 days which was within the timeframe of 30 days.**

**The contractors were paid within the within specified timeframes within the contract.**

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, *score: 1, else, score: 0*

There was no evidence that the Hoima City Education department submitted procurement plans timely by 30th April as required by the guidelines. The documents that the assessor saw were dated in July.

0

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law *score 1 or else score 0*

There was evidence that the Hoima City Council kept complete procurement files for each of the school infrastructure projects.

There is no Seed School within Hoima City. The only two education files were reviewed for completeness and the following was found:

- Construction of 5 – stance lined latrines at Bulemwa P/S – This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Wemba Logistics Ltd through contracts committee minute CR/HCC/156/2 during their sitting of 2nd December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 29, 338, 374.00 The award was displayed on 14th December 2022 and the display was removed on 28th December 2022

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere P/S This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/00001 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders & Engineers Ltd through contracts committee minute 23/HC/CC/12/12/22 during their sitting of 14th December 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 116, 000, 058.00. The award was displayed on 14th December 2022 and the display was removed on 28th December 2022

Apart from the above information on each project file many other details are on the files as follows:

LGPP form 1 with Engineers' estimate, Newspaper extract for the call for bids, Bidding forms and Instructions to bidders, LGPP form 2 Request for approval of procurement method, Request for approval bidding documents, Evaluation Reports, Minutes of contract award, Payment receipt and many other documents.

The above is sufficient evidence that the files being kept by are complete and in line with requirements of PPDA

## Environment and Social Safeguards

|    |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>  | <p>The City had no grievances recorded, investigated, responded to and redress reported under Education</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>There were no environment guidelines from the Environment Officer to schools to guide environment safeguards. The guidelines were missing at both the education office and in the primary schools [Karongo, St. Bernadetta's, Duhaga Girls'] I sampled and visited.</p>   | 0 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>  | <p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>  | <p>There was evidence in the LG to show costed ESMP safeguard requirements incorporated in the BoQs for the following education projects;</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere Primary School. (Ref No HC604/WRKS/22-23/00001). ESMP costed 3,004,500 UGX. In the BOQ under general Item H-Unique features include site restoration, planting grass to full maturity. costed 1,602,000UGX,</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Bulemwa PS (Ref No HC604/WRKS/22-23/00002) ESMP costed 1,807,500 UGX. In the BOQ item 5.11 environmental concerns (prepare and plant trees, cart away debris etc. costed 100,000UGX,</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, score: 1, else score:0</p>  | <p>There was no evidence availed by city to show proof of land ownership for Education/school construction projects implemented in the previous year at the time of assessment.</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 evidence that the LG had consistent monitoring and engagement of education projects throughout the contract period by CCDO(Hope Susan) and City Environment Officer(Kyamanywa Ronald) . There were also monthly reports for supervision of the education projects</p> <p>Monthly Report for compliance on Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere PS. Monitoring report dated 14/4/2023, 11/5/2023, 21/6/2023 signed by CCDO and City Environment officer.</p> <p>Monthly Report for compliance on Construction of 5 stance Latrine at Bulemwa PS. Monitoring report dated 14/4/2023, 11/5/2023 signed by CCDO and City Environment officer.</p> <p>Corrective measures were done according to the monthly reports example; debris cleared; trees planted as seen during site visit at Bulemwa PS</p> | 2 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>   | <p>There was evidence that LG had E&amp;S Contractor payment certificates and compliance Certification forms completed and signed by City Environmental Officer(Kyamanywa Ronald) and CCDO(Hope Susan) prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates. examples include;</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere PS. payment certificate No 3. Amount paid was 8,575,781UGX. signed by CCDO and City Environment officer on 16/6/2023. Environmental certification was done by CCDO and City environment officer on 14/3/2023</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Bulemwa PS. Cert No 2 amount due was 7,676,955UGX.Signed by City Environment officer and CCDO. Environmental certification was done by CCDO and City environment officer on 10/5/2023</p>                               | 1 |

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

| No.  | Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance   | Compliance justification  | Score |
|--|---|--|---|-------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |   |  |   |       |
| 1  | <p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>                         | <p>The LG Health department registered a decrease in population delivering at health facilities by 2.4 % between FY 2021/2022 to 2022/2023. Delivery data was obtained for the FY 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 for all HC IIIs in the LG (Buhamika HC III, Karongo HC III and Kihwkya HC III). Total deliveries for the FY 2021/2022(Old) was 1080 and FY 2022/2023(New) was 1054. Percentage change was calculated using <math>(\text{New}-\text{Old})/\text{Old} \times 100 = (1054-1080)/1054 \times 100 = -2.4\%</math>.</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"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>                             | <p>The status of the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment was as below:</p> <p>East Division</p> <p>2022 score = No information</p> <p>2023 score = 3/10</p> <p>West Division</p> <p>2022 score = No information</p> <p>2023 score = 0</p> <p>There was no information provided for East and West FY 2021/2022. There was no information availed for West Division FY 2022/2023.</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>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul> | <p>This indicator is not applicable, All LGs to score 0</p>   | 0     |

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

Evidence provided indicated Hoima City budgeted and spent all the health development grant for FY 2022/2023 on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines.

The City budgeted for Health Sector Development Grant, UGX.156, 992,032 (ABPR, page, 17).

The expenditure were on the following eligible activities:

1. Construction of 2 stance VIP latrine at Buhanika HC III, UGX.19, 999,467.
2. Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Buhanika HC III, UGX.42, 861,930.
3. Renovation of kitchen at Buhanika HC III, UGX.24, 915,347.
4. Renovation of health staff quarters at Buhanika HC III, UGX.44, 982,439.
5. Retention for fencing Kirongo HC III, UGX.3, 099,070.
6. Construction of placenta pit at Buhanika HC III, UGX.13, 374,179.
7. Monitoring and Supervision of capital projects, UGX.7.849.600.

**Total, UGX. 156,992,032.**

Health Development grant was used on eligible activities

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

The City HO , City Engineer, Senior Environment Officer and City CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors and suppliers.

The payments made were as follows;

1 . Construction of 2 stance VIP latrine at Buhanika HCIII by Angemas Lord Company Ltd. Procurement Number. HC604/WRKS/2022-2023/00004. Requisition for funds on 12/06/2023 . Certified works on 13/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6441124, UGX. 18,799,499.

2. Renovation of kitchen at Buhanika HCIII by Aliku Builders Stone Ltd. Procurement Number. HC604/WKS/021-022/00006. Requisition for funds on 05/06/2023. Certified works on 13/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6438667, UGX. 23,420,426.

3. Renovation of health staff quarters at Buhanika HCIII by Sidney Concepts Limited. Procurement Number. HC604/WRKS/2022-2023/00005. Requisition for funds on 12/06/2023. Certified works on 13/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6441180, UGX. 42,198,893.

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

There was evidence that the variations in contract price for sampled health projects are within the threshold of +/-20%

The health projects sampled were:

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III – Engineer’s estimate as per PP form 1 dated 14th March 2023 was UGX. 48 million while the contract sum was UGX. 44 million giving an absolute variance of UGX. 4 million. Giving a percentage variance of 8.33%
- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III – Engineer’s estimate as per PP form 1 dated 14th March 2023 was UGX. 22 million while the contract sum was 20, 515, 114.00 giving an absolute variance of 1,484,886.00 Giving a percentage variance of 6.758
- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III – Engineer’s estimate as per PP form 1 was UGX. 50 million while the contract sum was 44, 892, 439.00 giving an absolute variance of 5, 107, 561.00. Giving a percentage variance of 10.2%
- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III – Engineer’s estimate as per PP form 1 dated 19th April 2023 was UGX. 28 million while the contract sum was 25, 737, 499.00 giving an absolute variance of 2, 262, 501.00 at UGX. Giving a percentage variance of 8.08%



|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 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        | There was evidence that health sector investment projects implemented in the previous financial year were completed as per work plan by end of financial year.  | 2 |
|   | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>• less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul> | <p>The health projects sampled were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Karki Builders Ltd at the contract sum was UGX. 44 million</li> <li>• Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Agemas Lord Co Ltd at the contract sum was 20, 515, 114.00</li> <li>• Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd at the contract sum was 44, 892, 439.00</li> <li>• Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Aliku Builders &amp; Stone Ltd at the contract sum was 25, 737, 499.00</li> </ul> |   |
|   |  |   | <p>Reviewing relevant documents (works contracts for each project, annual budget performance reports, actual progress reports on project files, practical completion certificates) and conducting actual field visit to the above four projects on 17th November 2023, it was evident that the projects were completed as per work plan.</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  | Hoima City had 3 HCIIIs namely Karongo, Buhanika and Kihukya) with a total of 87 established staff positions out of which 27 were filled which is 31% hence a score of 0  | 0 |
|   | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 90% score 2</li> <li>• If 75% - 90%: score 1</li> <li>• Below 75 %: score 0</li> </ul>      |   |   |

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.

- If 100 % score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MOH facility infrastructure designs

The health projects sampled were:

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Karki Builders Ltd at the contract sum was UGX. 44 million
- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Agemas Lord Co Ltd at the contract sum was 20, 515, 114.00
- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd at the contract sum was 44, 892, 439.00
- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Aliku Builders & Stone Ltd at the contract sum was 25, 737, 499.00

First, the standard technical designs provided by MOH were reviewed. Field visits were then conducted to these sites on 17th November 2023.

The purpose of the field visit is to have physical checks of the newly constructed structures by taking measurements and by conducting visual inspection and establish compliance with MOH standard technical designs.

During the field visits, measurements were undertaken and visual observations were made to verify compliance with technical designs.

At these sampled projects, it was indeed concluded that the projects were fully compliant with the technical designs provided by MOH headquarters.

## Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>                       | <p>2 out of the 3 sampled facilities had health workers in place as indicated in the staff list provided by the CHOs office for the FY 2023/2024. The assessment team compared the staff list obtained from the CHOs office for the FY 2023/2024 with what was available at the sampled facilities (Buhanika HC III, Kihukya HC III and Karongo HC III) facilities and noted the following;</p> <p><b>Buhanika HC III:</b> The deployment list provided by the CHOs office had 10 health workers. However, Kugonza Susan -Enrolled Midwife was still maintained on this list and yet she was deployed at the City Health Office. The HF list had 10 health staff, however Kugonza Susan -Enrolled Midwife was missing on the list and replaced by Basimera Ritah- Enrolled Nurse</p> <p><b>Kihukya HC III:</b> The deployment list provided by the CHOs office had 5 health workers. On verification ALL the health workers were in place as indicated in the staff list.</p> <p><b>Karongo HC III:</b> The deployment list provided by the CHOs office had 11 health workers. On verification ALL the health workers were in place as indicated in the staff list, with Kasigwa Simon -Health Assistant on annual leave</p> | 0 |
| 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>No facility was upgraded in the last FY 2022/2023</p>   | 2 |

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul> | <p>There annual work plan and budgets for the sampled health facilities (Buhamika HC III, Karongo HC III and Kihwkya HC III) conformed to the prescribed formats in the planning guidelines and were submitted by March 31st of the previous FY 2022/2023</p> <p><b>Buhamika HC III:</b> The workplan and budget was prepared by Muhereza Oswald (Health Facility In charge) on 19th March 2023 and submitted to the CHOs on 21st March 2023</p> <p><b>Karongo HC III:</b> The workplan and budget was prepared by Kyomuhendo Gerald (Health Facility In charge) on 10th March 2023 and submitted to the CHOs on 14th March 2023</p> <p><b>Kihwkya HC III:</b> The workplan and budget was prepared by Amanyire Aberi (Health Facility) In charge on 31st March 2023 and submitted to the CHOs on the same date</p> | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that the sampled health facility Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY 2022/2023 conformed to the Budget and Grant Guidelines and were submitted timely ie 15th July of the current FY 2023/2024.</p> <p><b>Buhamika HC III:</b> The budget performance report was prepared by Muhereza Oswald (Health Facility In charge) on 13th July 2023 and submitted to the CHOs on the same date</p> <p><b>Karongo HC III:</b> The budget performance report was prepared by Kyomuhendo Gerald (Health Facility In charge) on 13th July 2023 and submitted to the CHOs on the same date</p> <p><b>Kihwkya HC III:</b> The budget performance report was prepared by Amanyire Aberi (Health Facility In charge) on 10th July 2023 and submitted to the CHOs on the same date</p> | 2 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that the sampled health facility improvement plans for the current FY (2023/2024) incorporated performance issues identified in DHMT monitoring and assessment reports.

**Karongo HC III:** Quarter 2 supervision visit conducted from 19th -21st Dec 2022 noted that there were regular stock outs of essential medicines and supplies at the facility as a result of late requisition. A recommendation was made for the HF in charge to request for essential medicines timely. This issue was incorporated in the HF PIP with a key emphasis on timely requisition drugs and essential medical supplies, and the HF In charge was responsible for this activity. (HF PIP prepared by Kyomuhendo Gerald (Health Facility In charge), dated 6th October 2023

**Buhanika HC III:** Q3 supervision visits conducted from 29th -31st March 2023 noted that there were no 24-hour maternity services at the health facility in addition to lack of essential medicines and supplies. There was a recommendation for the In charge to lobby for the handover of the staff houses to accommodate critical maternity staff. This issue was incorporated in the PIP. As an activity, the HF In charge was to follow up with the CHOs office to have the handover of the new staff house at Buhanika HC III effected so that the critical maternity staff could be accommodated to provide the 24-hour maternity services. (HF PIP prepared by Muhereza Oswald (Health Facility In charge) dated 6th October 2023)

**Kihwkyia HC III:** Q2 support supervision visits conducted on 19th - 21st Dec 2022 noted that, stock cards for vaccines were not being updated regularly. It was recommended that the In charge should update the cards and also assign a staff to take on that responsibility. This was incorporated in the PIP. As an activity in the plan, the in charge was to assign two staff to monitor and maintain the fridges (HF PIP prepared by Amanyire Aberi (Health Facility In charge), dated 3rd October 2023

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

- score 2 or else score 0

The sampled HFs (Buhamika HC III, Karongo HC III and Kihwkya HC III) did not submit 100% their monthly (12) and quarterly (4) reports for the FY 2022/2023 timely i.e. 7 days following the end of each month and quarter. Karongo HC III submitted the Q1 report on 8th October 2022, Buhamika HC III equally submitted the Q1 report on 11th Oct 2022 and Q3 on 11th April 2023. Kihwkya HC III submitted the May 2023 report on 10th June 2023. The details are summarized below;

Month Karongo HC III Buhamika HC III Kihwkya HC III

June 2023 5/7/2023 5/7/2023 7/7/2023

May 2023 6/6/2023 6/6/2023 10/6/2023

Api 2023 7/5/2023 3/5/2023 5/5/2023

Marc 2023 4/4/2023 5/4/2023 6/4/2023

Feb 2023 6/3/2023 4/3/2023 7/3/2023

Jan 2023 6/2/2023 6/2/2023 6/2/2023

Dec 2022 6/1/2022 5/1/2023 4/1/2023

Nov 2022 6/12/2022 5/12/2022 5/12/2022

Oct 2022 6/11/2022 2/11/2022 3/11/2022

Sep 2022 7/10/2022 4/10/2022 7/10/2022

Aug 2022 6/9/2022 5/9/2022 6/9/2022

Jul 2022 6/8/2022 3/8/2022 5/8/2022

Quarter Karongo HC III Buhamika HC III Kihwkya HC III

Q1 8/10/2022 11/10/2022 No ART services

Q2 6/1/2022 6/1/2022 No ART services

Q3 7/4/2023 11/4/2023 No ART services

Q4 7/7/2023 5/7/2023 Missing

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 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 is not applicable, All LGs to score 0</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 is not applicable, All LGs to score 0</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 did not avail evidence to show the City HO's office timely FY 2022/2023 compiled and submitted the quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports for consolidation for the two days of assessment (16th -17th November 2023).</p> | 0 |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG health department developed performance improvement plan for the lowest performing health facilities. Key performance issues addressed in the plan included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Redistribution of stocks from highly stocked facilities to low stocked facilities</li> <li>- Conducting CMEs on waste segregation and infection prevention and control at health facilities</li> </ul> <p>The PIP was prepared by Mugano Felix Fortunate- Ag. City Health Officer on 10th July 2022 and approved by the City Town Cleark on the same date.</p>  | 1 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>   | <p>There was evidence that the LG implemented Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drug stocks were redistributed to lower level facilities was implemented. Copies of the requisition and issue voucher were provided as evidence for drugs redistributed from Bacayaya HC II to Karongo HC III, issue voucher date 26th July 2022, Redistribution of drugs from Bacayaya HC II to Kitoole HC III(Issue voucher No 2579324, dated 3/1/2023)</li> <li>- Mentorship was conducted in health facilities on continuous quality improvement, including waste segregation. The activity was conducted in 5 health facilities (Azur HC IV- PNFP, Bujumbura HC III, Buhanika HC III, Karango HC III and Kihukya HC III)- Report prepared Nakato Aisha- Quality Improvement Focal Person, dated 7th April 2023</li> <li>- Mentorship was conducted on Infection Prevention and Control in 6 health facilities (Buhanika HC III, Karango HC III, Kihukya HC III, Bacayaya HC II, Hoima Police HC III and Kabalega HC II)- Report prepared Nakato Aisha- IPC Focal Person, dated 6th April 2023</li> </ul> <p>-</p> | 1 |

## 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). | a) Evidence that the LG has:<br>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0   | The City-Health department did not budget for health workers as per guidelines. We reviewed the City approved performance contract and wage analysis and noted that the department budgeted for 40(47.6%) of the health workforce with a wage of Ugx 977,997,000 (City Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24 Page 23). The health facility list obtained from the City Health office indicated that, the City health department had a total of 6 health facilities (2 HC IIIs and 2 HC IIs), with an approved staff structure of 84 health workers. | 0 |
| Maximum 9 points on this performance measure |  |  |   |   |
| 7  | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required). | a) Evidence that the LG has:<br>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 | There was no evidence that the LG health department deploy health workers as per guidelines/staffing levels and norms in the FY 2023/2024(i.e. at least all the HFs to have 75% of the staff required. Karongo HC III had 11 out of 19(57.9%), Buhanika HC III had 10 out of 19(52.6%) and Kihukya HC III had 5 out of 19(26.3%)  | 0 |
| Maximum 9 points on this performance measure |  |  |   |   |
| 7  | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required). | b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0  | Health workers were working in facilities where they were deployed in 2 out of the 3 sampled facilities. The assessment team reviewed the deployment list provided by the CHOs office and HF list obtained at the sampled facilities (Buhanika HC III, Kihukya HC III and Karongo HC III) and noted the following;  | 0 |
| Maximum 9 points on this performance measure |  |  |   |   |
|  |  |  | <b>Buhanika HC III:</b> The deployment list provided by the CHOs office had 10 health workers. However, Kugonza Susan -Enrolled Midwife was still maintained on this list and yet she was deployed at the City Health Office. The HF list had 10 health staff, however Kugonza Susan -Enrolled Midwife was missing on the list and replaced by Basimera Ritah- Enrolled Nurse   |   |
|  |  |  | <b>Kihukya HC III:</b> The deployment list provided by the CHOs office had 5 health workers. On verification ALL the health workers were working where they were deployed.  |   |
|  |  |  | <b>Karongo HC III:</b> The deployment list provided by the CHOs office had 11 health workers. On verification ALL the health workers were working where they were deployed, with Kasigwa Simon -Health Assistant on annual leave  |   |
|  |  |  | Since one facility didnot meet the requirements of the indicator, the LG scores 0   |   |

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

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 list of health workers deployed in the sampled facilities (Karongo HC III, Buhanika HC III and Kihukya HC III) were displayed on the health facilities notice boards

**Buhanika HC III** had a list of 11 health staff displayed (List prepared by Mugano Felix Fortunate- Principal Health Officer/Ag. City Health Officer, dated 03 July 2023)

**Kihukya HC III** had a list of 5 health staff displayed (List prepared by Mugano Felix Fortunate- Principal Health Officer/Ag. City Health Officer, dated 03 July 2023)

**Karongo HC III** had a list of 11 health staff displayed (List prepared by Mugano Felix Fortunate- Principal Health Officer/Ag. City Health Officer, dated 03 July 2023)

2

8

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

The assessor reviewed personal files of 6 health in-charges and found out that 4 out of 6 were appraised late in the previous FY as listed below:

1. Birungi Stellah (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 3rd July 2023

2. Bateba Miria (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 3rd July 2023

3. Katwesigye Doreen) (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 3rd July 2023

4. Muhereza Edward Oswald (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 3rd July 2023

5. Kyomuhendo Geval (Senior Medical Clinical Officer) was appraised on 26th June 2023

6. Amanyire Aberi (Medical Clinical Officer) was appraised on 30th June 2023

0

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. | ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0 | The assessor reviewed personal files for a sample of 10 health workers and found out that all of them were appraised late in the previous FY as listed below:  | 0 |
|   | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure  |   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Birungi Jolly (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 12th July 2023</li> <li>2. Baguma Ephraim (Nursing Assistant) was appraised on 1st August 2023</li> <li>3. Nantume Pennylope (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 12th July 2023</li> <li>4. Kiiza Annet (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 12th July 2023</li> <li>5. Sapili Geoffrey (Askari) was appraised on 1st August 2023</li> <li>6. Hiiza Hannah Bizige (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 5th July 2023</li> <li>7. Kugonza Susan (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 1st July 2023</li> <li>8. Buzibye Samuel (Laboratory Assistant) was appraised on 20th July 2023</li> <li>9. Mbolekere Simon (Porter) was appraised on 12th July 2023</li> <li>10. Atuhura Johnson (Enrolled Nurse) was appraised on 12th July 2023</li> </ol> |   |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers. | iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0   | No evidence was provided to show that the City Medical Officer took any corrective actions based on the appraisal reports  | 0 |
|   | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure  |   |  |   |

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG health department implemented training activities in the last FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>A training on active case finding was organized by Ministry of Health from 12th – 14th Dec 2022 for 10 health workers. The objective of the training was to provide technical knowledge on TB, screening, diagnoses, management, prevention, contact tracing and capture and sharing of the Active Case Finding (ACF) tool kit (Report prepared by Amanyire Aberi-City TB and Leprosy Supervisor, dated 19th Dec 2022</p> <p>A training was conducted on the New Revised HIV guidelines with funding from Baylor Uganda. This was a 15-day training attended by 29 participants from Hoima Police HC II, Karango HC III and Buhanika HC III. (Report prepared by Kugonza Susan- Maternal and Child Health Focal Person, Dated 14th June 2023)</p> <p>A training on the introduction of new vaccines in routine immunization was conducted at Glory Submit Hotel Hoima. The main goal of the training was to transfer knowledge and skills on how to provide quality immunization services (Report prepared by Kugonza Susan- Maternal and Child Health Focal Person, Dated 3rd November 2022)</p> | 1 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence to show that the LG health department documented training activities in the training/CPD database. Staff training logs were provided for trainings in cold chain management held from 11th – 12th July 2023 for 9 health workers, sponsored by Baylor Uganda, Infection Prevention and Control training held on 18th May 2023 for 8 health workers with funding from Baylor and Covid 19 psychosocial support training for 10 health workers sponsored by Ministry of health.</p> | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

**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 Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing in a letter to the PS MoH (Letter dated 28th September 2023). The letter was written within the required timeline i.e. 30th Sep 2023</p> | 2 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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.

The LG PHC budget for FY 2022/2023 was UGX. 174,593,000 (ABPR, page, 88) and allocated, UGX. 59,274,000 (ABPR, page, 88) for monitoring and service delivery and District health services. This was 34% not within 15% maximum.

0

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The LG did not warrant and transfer to health facilities all quarters (Q 1- Q 4) in accordance to the requirements within 5 working days in FY 2022/2023.

Q 1- FY 2022/2023, warranted on 03/08/2022 and transferred 05/09/2022, **after 32 working days.**

Q 2- FY 2022/2023, warranted on 10/10/2022 and transferred 19/10/2022, **after 9 working days.**

Q 3 - FY 2022/2023, warranted on 05/01/2023 and transferred 27/01/2023, **after 22 working days.**

Q 4 - FY 2022/2023, warranted on 17/04/2023 and transferred 03/05/2023, **after 16 working days.**

The LG did not transfer within 5 working days after warranting for all the 4 quarters (Q 1 - Q 4) FY 2022/2023.

0

|    |  |   |  |   |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 9  | <p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>The LG did not invoice and communicate PHC NWR Grant transfers (Q 3, Q 4) for FY 2022/2023 to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter.</p>                                    | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>  |   | <p>Q 1- FY 2022/2023, released funds on 05/08/2022, invoiced and communicated on 09/08/2022, <b>after 4 working days which was within the 5 working days.</b></p>  |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Q 2- FY 2022/2023, released funds on 12/10/2022, invoiced and communicated on 14/10/2022, <b>after 2 working days, which was within the 5 working days.</b></p>   |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Q 3 - FY 2022/2023, released funds on 12/01/2023, invoiced and communicated on 20/01/2023, <b>after 8 working days, which was beyond the 5 working days.</b></p>  |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Q 4 - FY 2022/2023, released funds on 19/04/2023, invoiced and communicated on 25/04/2023, <b>after 6 working days, which was beyond the 5 working days.</b></p>  |   |
| 9  | <p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG did not publicize the quarterly financial releases in Q 3 and Q 4 to health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED FY 2022/2023.</p>                        | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>  |   | <p>Q 1 was publicized on 9th August 2022 <b>which was 4 days</b> after the release of the expenditure limits from MoFPED on 5th August 2022.</p>   |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Q 2 was displayed on 12th October 2022 <b>which was on the same day</b> after the release of the expenditure limits from MoFPED on 12th October 2022.</p>   |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Q 3 was displayed on 20th January 2023 <b>which was 8 days after</b> the release of the expenditure limits from the MoFPED on 12th January 2023.</p>  |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Q 4 was displayed on 25th May 2023 <b>which was 6 days from</b> the release of the expenditure limits from MoFPED on 19th April 2023.</p>   |   |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p>  | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>  | <p>There was no evidence that the health department implemented actions recommended by the CHMT quarterly performance review meetings of the previous FY. Meeting minutes for the quarterly review meetings were reviewed;</p> | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>  |   | <p>Q1: The meeting was held on 30th September 2022, attended by 27 participants. Key recommendations made under Min 07/2022/23 included;</p>   |   |

- Set up of surveillance Focal Person positions at all health facilities with a key role of submitting weekly reports

- The health facilities to update vaccine control book timely whenever new stocks are received or taken for easy accountability

Q2: The meeting was held on 27th December 2022, attended by 30 participants. Key recommendations made under Min 13/2022/23 included;

- The IPC Focal Person and In charge at Karongo HC III to conduct IPC mentorship

- The In charge of Bacayaya HC II and DHO'S Clinic HC II to development quarterly workplans

- The In charge of Azur HC IV to prepare and display data analysis graphs

Q3: The meeting was held on 30th March 2023. It was attended by 29 participants. Key recommendations made under Min 22/2022/23 included

- The City Health Officer was tasked with the responsibility of following up gratuity for the Late Isingoma Joseph-former porter at Karongo HC III

- The health facilities to update vaccine control book timely whenever new stocks are received or taken for easy accountability

- Biostatistician to provide health facilities with updated target population.

Q4: The meeting was held on 30th June 2023. It was attended by 30 participants. Key recommendations made under Min 30/2022/23 included;

- The health facility In charge of Police HC III to liaise with the MCH/EPI focal person to have vaccine stocks provided

- The health facilities to update vaccine control book timely whenever new stocks are received or taken for easy accountability

No evidence in terms of reports were provided on the status of implementation of these recommendations by the City Health Office

|    |   |  |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 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 quarterly performance review meetings involved all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, CHMTs and key LG departments. The assessment team reviewed attendance for the quarterly review meeting and noted the following;</p> <p>Q1: The meeting was held on 30th September 2022, attended by 27 participants, including health facility in charges, City Health Team, Principle Educator Officer, Infectious Diseases Institute, Marie Stopes and Meeting Point Hoima.</p> <p>Q2: The meeting was held on 27th December 2022, attended by 30 participants, including, HF in charges, member of the City Health Management Team (CHMT), Implementing partners (Baylor Uganda, Infectious Diseases Institute, Meeting Point, Marie Stopes, Rundown Syndrome Awareness Centre) and Key departments including Planning Unit and Education.</p> <p>Q3: The meeting was held on 30th March 2023. It was attended by 29 participants including, HF in charges, member of the City Health Management Team (CHMT), Implementing partners (Baylor Uganda, Infectious Diseases Institute, Meeting Point, Marie Stopes, Rundown Syndrome Awareness Centre, Jhpigo) and Key departments including Engineering.</p> <p>Q4: The meeting was held on 30th June 2023. It was attended by 30 participants including the HF in charges, member of the City Health Management Team (CHMT) and Implementing partners (Infectious Diseases Institute, Marie Stopes, Jhpigo, Reproductive Health Uganda) and Key departments including Education</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>The City does not have a HC IV and General Hospital</p>   | 1 |



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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

- If not applicable, provide the score

The City does not have a HSD. However, there was evidence that the City carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY 2022/2023

Q1: Technical support supervision activities were conducted from 20th – 29th Sep 2023. A total of 10 HF's were supervised during this quarter (Report prepared by Mugano Felix Fortunate-Principal Health Inspector, dated 3rd October 2022)

Q2: Supervision activities were conducted from 19th to 22nd December 2022. A total of 10 health facilities were supervised this quarter (Report prepared by Mugano Felix Fortunate-Principal Health Inspector, dated 27th December 2022)

Q3: Supervision activities were conducted from 29th – 31st March 2023. All the 10 health facilities were visited this quarter (Report prepared by Mugano Felix Fortunate-Principal Health Inspector, dated 3rd April 2023)

Q4: Supervision activities were conducted from 27th – 30th June 2023 for 10 health facilities. (Report prepared by Mugano Felix Fortunate-Principal Health Inspector, dated 31st June 2023)

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and implementation of those were followed during the FY 2022/2023.

**Buhanika HC III:** The support supervision visit conducted on 30th September 2022 by the Leadership and Governance mentor recommended that the In charge should assign a focal person to continually update the temperature monitoring chat. This recommendation was implemented. Nyamaizi Leticia-Enrolled Midwife was assigned this role.

**Kihukya HC III:** The support supervision visit conducted on 4th April 2023 recommended that Continuous Quality Improvement Projects should be reflected on file. This was implemented. The facility developed a project to increase the percentage of children under 5 assessed on malnutrition in the out-patient department. The project was started on 1st June 2023 and will run up 31st Dec 2023.

The supervision visit conducted on 30th June 2023 recommended that the In charge should display graphs/charts on the HF notice board to show the utilization of immunization services. This recommendation was implemented. Graphs on BCG, DPT1, DPT3, measles, in addition to ANC attendance were displayed on the HF notice board

**Karongo HC III:** The support supervision visit conducted on 29th Sep 2022 recommended that the In charge should organize the drug store and update the vaccine control book regularly. This recommendation was implemented. Vaccine and Injection Materials Control Book-HMIS 017d, opened on 1st July 2023 was reviewed and it was updated for all the antigens being used at the facility on 17th Nov 2023- Hep B with balance of 230 doses, DPT with a balance of 120 doses, BCG =240, and IPV a balance of 204

|    |   |   |  |          |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>   | <p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG provided support to health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies.</p> <p>Q2: Eight government facilities and 2 PNFPs were supervised during this quarter. All health facilities had stock cards requisition and issues vouchers and dispensing logs in place. However, some facilities lacked shelves for medicine storage (Bachayaya, DHO's, Hoima Police and Kihuukya health centers) (Report prepared by Oswald Edward Muhereza-Medicines Mananagamenet Supervisor, dated 30th December 2022)</p> <p>Q3: Eight government facilities and 2 PNFPs were supervised during this quarter. One store one stock card policy was being implemented in all the health facilities supervised. Equally all health facilities were using the recommended medicine accountability tools. However, most facilities lacked essential medicines. (Report prepared by Oswald Edward Muhereza-Medicines Mananagamenet Supervisor, dated 31st March 2023)</p> <p>Q4: Eight government health facilities and 2 PNFP in hoima city were supervised in Q4 FY 2022/2023. All the health facilities were noted to be using the recommended medicines accountability tools in addition to having someone in charge of stores (Report prepared by Oswald Edward Muhereza-Medicines Mananagamenet Supervisor, dated 30th June 2023)</p> | <b>1</b> |
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>                | <p>The City Health Office budget was UGX. 59,274,000. The total amount allocated to health promotion and prevention activities was UGX. 11,658,000 (ABPR-page, 107). This was a proportion of 20%, not within the minimum of 30%.</p>  | <b>0</b> |

11

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DHT implemented health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in the FY 2022/2023

Social mobilization for mass polio vaccination campaign was implemented. Activities which were executed included; 2 Radio talk shows on Radio Hoima 88.6 FM, advocacy meeting with NGOs and religious and cultural leaders held on 2nd and 3rd November 2022. The meeting involved 18 members from NGOs, Religious and cultural leaders. (Report prepared by Kyomuhendo Gerald-Ag. City Health Educator, dated 1st December 2022)

One Radio talk show was conducted to mobilize communities for the 3rd round of accelerated Covid 19 catch up vaccination. The talk show was conducted on 1st July 2022 on Radio Hoima. Monthly "keep Hoima City Clean" campaign was equally conducted. It was conducted on 2nd to July 2022, 6th August 2022 and 3rd September 2022. Inspection of public, commercial and domestic premise was equally done. (Environmental Health Performance Report for Q1 2022/2023- Prepared by Ndozireho Wilfred-Health Inspector, dated 5th October 2022)

Supervision of VHTs were done in Bacayaya, DHOs Clinic, Karongo, Buhanika, Kihukya and Kyakapeya health centers. 53 food handlers working in maize and rice mills in Kiryatete industrial area and Kinubi were referred for medical examination (Environmental health sector performance report Q2(Prepared by Ndozireho Wilfred-Health Inspector, dated 4th January 2023

|    |   |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|
| 11 | <p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that follow up action was taken by the LG on health promotion and disease prevention issues during the last FY 2022/23. We reviewed the DHMT meeting minutes and progress reports and noted the following;</p> <p>The Q 2 City Health Team meeting held on 26th December 2022, under Min 12 /CHT/2022/23 recommended that The IPC Focal Person should organize mentorships at lower level facilities to improve infection prevention and control practices. This recommendation was implemented - Mentorship was conducted on Infection Prevention and Control in 6 health facilities (Buhanika HC III, Karango HC III, Kihukya HC III, Bacayaya HC II, Hoima Police HC III and Kabalega HC II)- Report prepared Nakato Aisha- IPC Focal Person, dated 6th April 2023</p> <p>The Quarter 3 City Health Team meeting held on 29th March 2023, under Min 18 /CHT/2022/23 recommended that the City Health Office should mobilize other staff, schools and parents to participate in the April 2023 child health days activities for better performance. This was implemented. Community based outreaches were conducted. Schools were mapped and clustered to specific health facilities catchment areas to easy mobilization. (Report on implementation of integrated child health days held in April 2023, prepared by Susan Kugonza-MCH-Focal Person, dated 2nd May 2023)</p> |
|----|---|--|--|

## Investment Management

|    |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG had an Assets register that details health facilities and equipment in the LG, relative to the medical equipment list and service standards. Each individual health facility had a register detailing the asset as of July 2023</p> |
|----|--|--|---|

|    |  |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were:</p> <p>(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> | <p>There was no evidence provided on desk appraisal carried by the LG on the prioritized investments in the health sector for FY 2022/2023 for the two days of assessment, 16th-17th November 2023.</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>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for:</p> <p>(i) technical feasibility;</p> <p>(ii) environment and social acceptability; and</p> <p>(iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>  | <p>There was no evidence provided the LG to indicate it conducted field Appraisal for FY 2022/2023, to check for technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability and customized designs to site conditions to the assessor for the two days, 16th-17th November 2023.</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>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>The City screened and prepared costed ESMPs and complied to risk mitigation plans for the following health projects that were located in one Health facility;</p>  | 1 |
|    | <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>  |   | <p>Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-. Screening forms prepared and were signed by City Environment officer(Mr.Kyamanywa Ronald) and CDO( Ms Hope Susan) on 22/6/2022 ESMP costed 353,200 UGX signed by City Environment officer and CDO on 22/6/2022</p>   |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Renovation of Health Staff quarters at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00005. Screening forms were prepared and signed by City Environment officer(Mr.Kyamanywa Ronald) and CDO( Ms Hope Susan on 22/6/2022. ESMP costed 2,757,000UGX signed by City Environment officer and CCDO )on 22/2022</p>                        |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Construction of 5 stance lined VIP Latrine with washrooms at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00007. Screening forms were prepared and signed by City Environment officer( Mr.Kyamanywa Ronald and CDO ( Ms Hope Susan)on 22/6/2022. ESMP costed 1,435,450UGX signed by City Environment officer and CDO on 22/6/2022</p> |   |
|    |  |   | <p>Compliance to the risk mitigation plan for projects implemented include, Debris like bricks removed, trees planted and landscaping etc.</p>  |   |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>                      | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY ) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the Health department submitted procurement plans timely by 30th April as required by the guidelines. The documents that the assessor saw were dated in June.</p>   | 0 |
|    | <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>   |   |   |   |

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the Health department submitted procurement requests' form PP1 to the PDU by first quarter of current financial year.

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III. This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was submitted through PP form 1 dated 17th March 2023 and was awarded to M/S Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd through the contracts' committee minute 33/HCC/25/04/22 that sat on 19th April 2023.

- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III. This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was submitted through PP form 1 dated 17th March 2023 and was awarded to M/S Agemas Lord Co. Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023

- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0005 was submitted through PP form 1 dated 17th March 2023 and was awarded to M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2022.

- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III. For this project, the PP form 1 was submitted by 17th March 2023



|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence health infrastructure investments were approved by the contracts committee. Clearance by the Solicitor General wasn't necessary as all contract amounts were below the threshold of UGX. 200, 000, 000.00</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd during the contracts' committee minute 33/HCC/25/04/22 that sat on 19th April 2023. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 000, 000.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022</li> <li>• Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was awarded to M/S Agemas Lord Co. Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023 The contract sum is UGX. 20, 515, 114.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022</li> <li>• Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0005 was awarded to M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 892, 439.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022</li> <li>• Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Aliku Builders Stone Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023. The contract sum is UGX. 25, 737, 499.00 The award was displayed on 19th April 2022 and the display was removed on 3rd May 2022</li> </ul> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of:<br/>(i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>  | <p>There was no evidence that Hoima City Council established Project Implementation Team (PIT) for health construction projects as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>   | 0 |

|    |  |   |   |          |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>   | <p>There was evidence that LG health infrastructure construction projects followed the approved MOH technical infrastructure designs.</p> <p>All the four projects executed were located at Buhanika HC III located in Hoima East City Division. The health projects sampled were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III</li> <li>• Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III</li> <li>• Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III</li> <li>• Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III</li> </ul> <p>Field visits were conducted to these sites on 17th November 2023 to have physical checks if the projects complied with MOH standard technical designs. Field visits where conducted with relevant drawings in hand.</p> <p>During the field visits, measurements were undertaken and visual observations were made to verify compliance with technical designs.</p> <p>At these sampled projects, it was indeed concluded that the projects were fully compliant with the technical designs provided by MOH headquarters.</p> | <b>1</b> |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>There was no project that requires Clerk of Works. All projects are too small except for USMID that was supervised by consultant.</p>  | <b>1</b> |

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility, the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

There was evidence that Hoima City Council organized and held monthly site meetings for the selected projects. In attendance were the heads of departments of Hoima City Council and members of the Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC).

All the four projects implemented were executed at Buhanika HC III located in Hoima East Division

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Karki Builders Ltd at the contract sum was UGX. 44 million
- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Agemas Lord Co Ltd at the contract sum was 20, 515, 114.00
- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd at the contract sum was 44, 892, 439.00
- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III – Executed by M/S Aliku Builders & Stone Ltd at the contract sum was 25, 737, 499.00

Looking through the files, there was evidence that monthly meetings took place at these construction sites. Minutes of these meetings were on the files. Examples of minutes include the minutes of the meeting for construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine and bathrooms at Buhanika HC III that took place on 12th May 2023. This meeting was chaired by Kiiza Boneventure and the Secretary of the meeting was Waman Jonan. In attendance were twelve other officials including Kyamanywa Ronald the environment officer and others like Mugano Felix the Ag. CHO

and the meeting that took place on 8th June 2023 for the renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III. This meeting was chaired by Kiiza Boneventure and the secretary was Waman Jonan and in attendance were city heads of departments. All the files without exception had minutes of monthly site meetings

During the field visits on 17th November 2023 there was evidence that District officials signed in the visitors' book of Buhanika HC III during meeting days.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance

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,

The City implemented four separate projects but all four projects focused on Buhanika HC III located in Hoima East City Division. The four files are for separate projects. There was evidence that Hoima City Council carried out technical supervision of works at health infrastructure projects at least monthly by relevant officers including engineers, environment officers, and community

measure

CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0

If there is no project, provide the score

development officers at critical stages of construction. The key officers featuring in the reports are the following; Kiiza Boneventure the City Engineer, Kyamanywa Ronald the City Environment Officer, Mugano Felix Ag. CHO, Atugonza Judith City Procurement Officer, Alice Ayesiga City Community Development officer

Files of the sampled projects were scrutinized for information.

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III
- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III
- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III
- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III

There is adequate evidence that Hoima City has provided supervision by key relevant technical officers for infrastructure projects and inspected works prior to certification of payments. The evidence is as follows:

The assessor was shown files for each of the selected project. Each file contained progress reports, monthly site meetings like the ones for construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine with bathrooms at Buhanika HC III that took place on 12th May 2023 and 8th June 2023, site monitoring reports dated 20th April 2023 and 3rd June 2023 signed by District heads of departments, contract drawings, contract implementation plans for each contract and many other documents like appointment letters for the project managers signed by the Town Clerk. For example Mugano Felix was appointed project manager for the project Construction of 5 stance lined latrine at Buhanika HC III with a letter dated 10th May 2023

Looking through monthly progress reports it was evidence that technical staff members were in attendance. The example is minutes of the first meeting for Renovation of Staff quarters at Buhanika HC III dated 3rd April 2023 during which all key technical staff attended. The meeting was chaired by Kiiza Boneventure and the secretary for the meeting was Waman Janan. This is so in all the files that the assessor sampled and looked at.

All the field monitoring reports sampled had records of attendance of technical team members as listed listed here. Kiiza Boneventure the City Engineer, Kyamanywa Ronald the City Environment Officer, Mugano Felix Ag. CHO, Atugonza Judith City Procurement Officer, and Alice Ayesiga City Community Development officer.

Many final and interim payment certificates were sampled and in all cases these

certificates were endorsed by multiple members of the technical team and did so timely and there was evidence that supervision took place prior to certification. For the contract Construction of 5 stance Lined VIP at Buhanika HC III, the contractor M/S Karki Builders and Engineering Ltd submitted a request for payment under cover of their letter dated 8th June 2023. On 15th June 2023, the Town Clerk had fully certified the request for payment.

For each payment request, the City Engineer (Kiiza Boneventure) prepares a "measurement sheet" that corresponds to the volume of executed work presented for payment. To prepare this "measurement sheet" the engineer physically inspect the works.

The Environment Officer and Community Development Officer always prepare a separate "environment and social certificate". The assessor was shown copies of these certificates. These certificates are attached to the payment request.

13

Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  
  
Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Evidence provided by the City showed City HO, City Engineer, and City-CDO, Senior Environment Officer verified works and initiated payments of contractors but contractors were not paid within the timeframe of 10 working days.

The sample of payments were;

1 . Construction of 2 stance VIP latrine at Buhanika HCIII by Angemas Lord Company Ltd. Procurement Number. HC604/WRKS/2022-2023/00004. Requisition for funds on 12/06/2023. Certified works on 13/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6441124, UGX. 18,799,499. **Paid after 16 days, not within 14 days**

2. Renovation of kitchen at Buhanika HCIII by Aliku Builders Stone Ltd. Procurement Number. HC604/WKS/021-022/00006. Requisition for funds on 05/06/2023. Certified works on 13/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6438667, UGX. 23,420,426. **Paid after 23 days, not within 14 days.**

3. Renovation of health staff quarters at Buhanika HCIII by Sidney Concepts Limited. Procurement Number. HC604/WRKS/2022-2023/00005. Requisition for funds on 12/06/2023. Certified works on 13/06/2023 and paid on 28/06/2023 by EFT. 6441180, UGX. 42,198,893. **Paid after 16 days, not within 14 days.**

From the 3 samples above, the payments to the contractors were not within the 14 days.

0

13

Procurement, contract

j. Evidence that the LG

There was evidence that the Hoima City

1

management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines  
Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Council kept complete procurement files for health infrastructure projects.

Four files were sampled and checked for completeness. All four separate projects implemented during the year focused on Buhanika HC III which is located in Hoima East City Division. Key information on these files were the following:

The files indicated that the Head of PDU Atugonza Judith (she serves as the Secretary of the contracts committee) presented before the contracts committee members evaluation reports for the following procurements and the evaluation reports were approved and awarded as below.

- Construction of 5 stance lined latrines at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was awarded to M/S Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd during the contracts' committee minute 33/HCC/25/04/22 that sat on 19th April 2023. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 000, 000.00

- Construction of 2 stance lined latrines with urinal at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0004 was awarded to M/S Agemas Lord Co. Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023 The contract sum is UGX. 20, 515, 114.00

- Renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/0005 was awarded to M/S Sydney Concepts Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2022. The contract sum is UGX. 44, 892, 439.00

- Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III This project with procurement reference HC604/WRKS/2022-23/002 was awarded to M/S Aliku Builders Stone Ltd through contracts committee minute 33/HC/CC/25/04/22 during their sitting of 19th April 2023. The contract sum is UGX. 25, 737, 499.00

Apart from the above information on each project file many other details are on the files as follows:

LGPP form 1 with Engineers' estimate, Newspaper extract for the call for bids, Bidding forms and Instructions to bidders, LGPP form 2 Request for approval of procurement method, Request for approval bidding documents, Evaluation Reports, Minutes of contract award, Payment receipt and many other documents. Like payment certificates, progress reports, completion certificates and so on.

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 14 | Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework<br><br>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   | The city had no grievances recorded, investigated, responded to and redress reported under Health.  | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery<br><br>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 guidelines on medical waste management were issued to health centers eg Buhanika HC III located in Eastern division<br><br>There was Dissemination of medical waste guidelines ie approaches to healthcare waste management and health sub-programme grants budget and implementation dated 15/9/2022 signed by PHO/Ag CHO(Mugano Felix Fortunate ) | 2 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery<br><br>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 | There was evidence that in Buhanika Health Center III located in eastern division had an open pit for burning of medical waste as seen during site visit. The site was fenced and with proper signage, however, there was no incinerator  | 2 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery<br><br>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 seen that the City conducted training(s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management   | 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 the LG had costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY example;</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance lined VIP Latrine with washrooms at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00007. In the BOQ item 5.14 under Environmental concerns there was provision for Planting of trees and grass and loose areas at 230,000UGX. ESMP costed 1,435,450UGX for waste bins, signed by City Environment officer (Mr.Kyamanywa Ronald) and CCDO(Ms Hope Susan) on 22/6/2023</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 | There was no evidence seen showing the city had proof of land ownership for health construction projects implemented for previous FY .  | 0 |
|    | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure  |   |   |   |
| 16 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments | 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 evidence of consistent monitoring and engagement throughout the contract period by CCDO (Hope Susan) and City Environment Officer (Kyamanywa Ronald ) and monthly reports for health projects examples include;</p> <p>Monthly Report for renovation of staff quarters at Buhanika HC III ,eastern division for 19/5/2023 and 22/6/2023. Monitoring report signed by PCDO and City Environment officer.</p> <p>Monthly Report for Construction of 5 stance lined latrine with bathroom at Buhanika HC III,eastern division for 21/6/3023 and 21/7/2023. Monitoring report signed by CCDO and City Environment officer.</p> <p>Compliance issues included; During site visit in Buhanika HC III, trees were planted with grass to control soil erosion. There was an open burning pit that was fenced with signages</p> | 2 |
|    | 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 evidence accessed in the City for payment certificates signed off by the City Environment Officer(Kyamanywa Ronald) and CCDO(Hope Susan) .Most of the health projects were centered at Buhanika HC III,Eastern division Example:

Renovation of 5 stance latrine with washrooms at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00007.Payment certificate No 1 amount due 42,861,930UGX signed by the CCDO and City environment officer on 15/6/2023

Renovation of Health Staff quarters at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00005. Payment certificate No 1 amount due 43,770,089UGX. signed by the CCDO and City environment officer on 15/6/2023

Construction of 2 stance lined VIP at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00004. Payment certificate No 1 amount due 19,999,487. signed by the CCDO and City environment officer on 14/6/2023

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

| No.  | Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance   | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|-------|
| <b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b> |   |  |                          |       |
| 1  | <p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>  | Not Applicable.          | 0     |
| 1  | <p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul> | Not Applicable.          | 0     |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>                     | <p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>   | Not Applicable.          | 0     |
| 2  | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>                     | <p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 1</li> <li>o If below 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>                      | Not Applicable.          | 0     |

|   |  |   |                 |   |
|---|--|---|-----------------|---|
| 2 | N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment<br><br>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<br><br>o If within +/-20% score 2<br>o If not score 0   | Not Applicable. | 0 |
| 2 | N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment<br><br>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.<br><br>o If 100% projects completed: score 2<br>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1<br>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0   | Not Applicable. | 0 |
| 3 | New_Achievement of Standards:<br><br>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards<br><br><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>         | a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning<br><br>o If there is an increase: score 2<br>o If no increase: score 0.   | Not Applicable. | 0 |
| 3 | New_Achievement of Standards:<br><br>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards<br><br><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).<br><br>o If increase is more than 1% score 2<br>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1<br>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<br><br><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<br><br><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<br><br><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<br><br><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<br><br><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<br><br><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 to cities | 0 |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|---|

|   |  |  |                           |   |
|---|--|--|---------------------------|---|
| 6 | Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff<br><br><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i> | b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2   | Not applicable to cities  | 0 |
| 7 | Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.<br><br><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>  | a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3  | Not applicable to cities. | 0 |
| 7 | Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.<br><br><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>  | b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3 | Not Applicable.           | 0 |

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

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

|    |   |  |                        |   |
|----|---|--|------------------------|---|
| 8  | <p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>  | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | 0 |
| 9  | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>   | <p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4</li> <li>• If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0</li> </ul> | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | 0 |
| 9  | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>   | <p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>   | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | 0 |
| 9  | <p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>   | <p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>   | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>   | <p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If funds were allocated score 3</li> <li>• If not score 0</li> </ul>   | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | 0 |

|    |  |   |                 |   |
|----|--|---|-----------------|---|
| 10 | Mobilization for WSS is conducted<br><br><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<br><br><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:<br><br>Score 4 or else 0 | Not Applicable. | 0 |
|----|---|---|-----------------|---|

|    |   |  |                 |   |
|----|---|--|-----------------|---|
| 11 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively<br><br><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> | Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:<br><br>Score 4 or else score 0. | Not Applicable. | 0 |
|----|---|--|-----------------|---|

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

|    |   |   |                 |   |
|----|---|---|-----------------|---|
| 11 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively<br><br><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> | d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2 | Not Applicable. | 0 |
|----|---|---|-----------------|---|

|    |   |  |                 |   |
|----|---|--|-----------------|---|
| 11 | Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively<br><br><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>   | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | <p><b>0</b></p> |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p> | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | <p><b>0</b></p> |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>                           | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | <p><b>0</b></p> |
| 12 | <p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p> | <p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>                         | <p>Not Applicable.</p> | <p><b>0</b></p> |



|    |  |  |                 |   |
|----|--|--|-----------------|---|
| 12 | Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements<br><br><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> | e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2   | Not Applicable. | 0 |
| 12 | Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements<br><br><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<br><br>o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2<br>o If not score 0 | Not Applicable. | 0 |
| 12 | Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements<br><br><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:<br><br>Score 2, If not score 0   | Not Applicable. | 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<br><br><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:<br><br>Score 3, If not score 0 | Not Applicable. | 0 |
| 14 | Safeguards for service delivery<br><br><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:<br><br>Score 3, If not score 0   | Not Applicable. | 0 |

|    |   |  |                 |          |
|----|---|--|-----------------|----------|
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments<br><br><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. | <b>0</b> |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments<br><br><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:<br><br>Score 3, If not score 0                 | Not Applicable. | <b>0</b> |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments<br><br><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:<br><br>Score 2, If not score 0 | Not Applicable. | <b>0</b> |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments<br><br><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:<br><br>Score 2, If not score 0  | Not Applicable. | <b>0</b> |

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

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

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0  | Not applicable   | 0 |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 6 | Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0   | Not applicable   | 0 |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines<br><br>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<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul> | Not applicable   | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards<br><br>Maximum score 6  | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>  | Hoima City had not recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure. The Approved structure of the production Unit in each City Division provides for 5 established positions (a total of 10 for the 2 Divisions). None of the position was filled during the time of the assessment (0%) which is a score of 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards<br><br>Maximum score 6  | b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>   | Not applicable   | 0 |

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

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

|   |   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 5 | Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information<br><br>Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0 | The City Divisions had no extension workers | <b>0</b> |
|---|---|---|---|----------|

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

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

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

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

|   |   |  |  |          |
|---|---|--|--|----------|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | d) Evidence that the LG has:<br>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence that the LG had developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest-performing LLGs. | <b>0</b> |
|   | Maximum score 6   |  |  |          |

|   |   |  |  |          |
|---|---|--|--|----------|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence that the LG had implemented a Performance Improvement Plan for lowest-performing LLGs. | <b>0</b> |
|   | Maximum score 6   |  |  |          |

**Human Resource Management and Development**

|   |   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines | a) Evidence that the LG has:<br>i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0 | There were no extension workers in the divisions. | <b>0</b> |
|   | Maximum score 6   |   |   |          |

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 6 | ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0   | There were no extension workers in the divisions   | 0 |
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0   | There were no extension workers in the divisions   | 0 |
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines<br><br>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  | There were no extension workers in the Divisions hence no deployment list to display on noticeboards | 0 |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers<br><br>Maximum score 4   | a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:<br><br>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 | There were no extension workers to be appraised  | 0 |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers<br><br>Maximum score 4   | a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;<br><br>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0  | No evidence of any corrective actions since there were no appraisals.                                | 0 |

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers<br><br>Maximum score 4 | b) Evidence that:<br><br>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence that training activities were conducted in accordance with the training plans at the district level. | 0 |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers<br><br>Maximum score 4 | ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0  | There was no evidence that training activities were documented in the training database.                                   | 0 |

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

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



|    |   |   |                |   |
|----|---|---|----------------|---|
| 9  | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>  | Not applicable | 0 |
| 9  | <p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p> | <p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>  | Not applicable | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>  | <p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> </ul> <p>Less than 70% score 0</p> | Not applicable | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>  | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>  | Not applicable | 0 |

|                              |   |   |                |   |
|------------------------------|---|---|----------------|---|
| 10                           | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 8         | 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 | Not applicable | 0 |
| 10                           | Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 8         | d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0   | Not applicable | 0 |
| 11                           | Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.<br><br>Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0   | Not applicable | 0 |
| 11                           | Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.<br><br>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 | 0 |
| <b>Investment Management</b> |   |   |                |   |
| 12                           | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines<br><br>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 | 0 |

|    |  |  |                          |   |
|----|--|--|--------------------------|---|
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines<br><br>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           | 0 |
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines<br><br>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  | Not applicable           | 0 |
| 12 | Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 8 | d) For DDEG financed projects:<br><br>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 | Not applicable to cities | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 18   | 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.   | Not applicable           | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 18   | b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0   | Not applicable           | 0 |

|    |   |   |                |   |
|----|---|---|----------------|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution:<br>The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 18 | c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0   | Not applicable | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution:<br>The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 18 | d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0  | Not applicable | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution:<br>The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 18 | e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0   | Not applicable | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution:<br>The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 18 | f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0  | Not applicable | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution:<br>The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 18 | g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0 | Not applicable | 0 |

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

### **Environment and Social Safeguards**

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

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

**Environment and Social Requirements**

|    |  |   |                |   |
|----|--|---|----------------|---|
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br>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.<br><br>score 2 or else 0   | Not applicable | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments<br>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.<br><br>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<br>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<br>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<br>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**

| <b>No.</b>                                       | <b>Summary of requirements</b>  | <b>Definition of compliance</b>   | <b>Compliance justification</b>  | <b>Score</b> |
|--|---|---|--|--------------|
| <b>Human Resource Management and Development</b> |   |   |  |              |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0               | The position of City Chief Finance Officer was vacant. Kambubi N Annet who was appointed on promotion as Principal Treasurer under DSC minute no. 198/2011 (ii) under Hoima Municipal Council was acting in the position. Performance appraisal report for the Principal Treasurer (Kambubi N Annet) for the previous FY was not provided        | 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. | b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0                               | The position of City Planner was vacant. Musiime Francis who was redesignated as Senior Economist under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (xi) was assigned duties of City Planner in a letter dated 8th November 2022. Performance appraisal report for the Acting City Planner (Musiime Franceis) for the previous FY was not provided | 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                          | The position of City Engineer was vacant. Kiiza Boneventure who was redesignated as Senior Civil Engineer under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (xxxvii) was acting. Performance appraisal report for the Acting City Engineer (Kiiza Boneventure) for the previous FY was not provided  | 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. | d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The position of City Natural Resources Officer was vacant and there was no evidence of secondment from Central Government  | 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. | e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0         | The position of City Production Officer was vacant. Kajuma Swaleh Ashraf who was retained in service as Agriculture Officer under City Service Commission Minute no. 4/2022 (xx) was acting in the position. The Acting City Production Officer (Kajuma Swaleh Ashraf) was appraised on 2nd August 2023  | 0            |



|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0          | The position of City Community Development Officer was substantively filled. Hope Susan was appointed on promotion as City Community Development Officer under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (xxv).   | 3 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0      | The position of City Commercial Officer was vacant. Ayesiga Alice who was retained in service as a Commercial Officer under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (xviii) was acting. Performance appraisal report for the Acting City Commercial Officer (Ayesiga Alice) for the previous FY was not provided.   | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.       | The position of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled. Atugonza Judith was appointed on promotion as Senior Procurement Officer under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (xxii).   | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0 | The position of procurement Officer was vacant and there was no evidence of secondment from Central Government.   | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0                              | The position of Principal Human Resource Officer was substantively filled. Akuha Evelyn was retained in service as Principal Human Resource Officer under City Service Commission Minute no. 4/2022 (xvi). Performance appraisal report for the Principal Human Resource Officer for the previous FY was not provided | 2 |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0                        | The position of Senior Environment Officer was vacant and there was no evidence of secondment from Central Government   | 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. | k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0    | The position of Senior City Physical Planner was substantively filled. Muhumuza Geoffrey was retained in service as Senior City Physical Planner under City Service Commission minute no 4/2022 (xvi).  | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0                                 | The position of Senior Accountant was substantively filled. Isingoma Robert was redesignated from Senior Accountant to Senior Revenue Officer under City Service Commission Minute no. 4/2022 (xxxv).   | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0 | The position of Principal Internal Auditor was vacant. Kaahwa Andrew who was appointed on promotion as Senior Internal Auditor under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (xxvii) was heading acting. Performance appraisal report for the Acting Principal Internal Auditor (Kaahwa Andrew) for the previous FY was not provided  | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0    | The position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary City Service Commission) was vacant. Asimwe Milton who was retained in service as Principal Assistant Town Clerk under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (v) was assigned duties to act as Secretary City Service Commission in a letter dated 31st July 2023. Performance appraisal report for acting Principal Human Resource Officer - Secretary to City Service Commission (Asimwe Milton) for the previous FY was not provided | 0 |

|   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG | 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). | Hoima City had not substantively appointed Town Clerks for the two City Divisions. The incumbents were both in acting capacity  | 5 |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG | b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.  | Hoima City had substantively recruited Community Development Officers for the two City Divisions:<br><br>1. Nafuna Susan Wandega was appointed as Community Development Officer on attainment of higher qualifications under District Service Commission minute no. 58/2017 (iv) under then then Hoima Municipality in a letter from the Town Clerk dated 14/3/2017<br><br>2. Businge Gerald was appointed as Community Development Officer on attainment of higher qualifications under District Service Commission minute no. 58/2017 (iv) under then then Hoima Municipality in a letter from the Town Clerk dated 14/3/2017 | 5 |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG | c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.  | 1. Mogga Ibrahim Hassan was appointed on attainment of higher qualification as Senior Accountant under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (xxxii) in a letter from the Town Clerk dated 8/11/2022<br><br>2. Abesiga N Rachael was appointed on promotion as Senior Revenue Officer under City Service Commission Minute no. 4/2022 (xxiv) in a letter from the Town Clerk dated 8/11/2022  | 5 |

**Environment and Social Requirements**

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 3 | Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY. | If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:<br><br>a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0 | Hoima City released 100% of funds allocated to Natural Resources Department. The amount allocated for FY 2022/2023 was UGX. 13,556,720 and released UGX. 13,556,720 (Final accounts, FY 2022/2023, page, 15) | 2 |
|   | Maximum score is 4  |   |  |   |

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 3 | Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.   | If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:   | Hoima City released 100% of funds allocated for Community Based Services. The amount allocated for FY 2022/2023 was UGX.70,154,800 and released UGX. 70,154,800 (Final accounts, FY 2022/2023, page, 15)   | 2 |
|   | Maximum score is 4  | b. Community Based Services department.   |  |   |
|   |   | score 2 or else 0.  |  |   |
| 4 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works. | a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,  | There was evidence that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all USMID Projects and ESMPs including child protection plans developed prior to commencement of civil works. These were some of the project(s);   | 4 |
|   | Maximum score is 12   | score 4 or else 0   | Rehabilitation of Perse-Commercial road(0.45km)Government road extension(0.46km),circular road(1.0km).Bikunya(0,25km),Tayali crown eka road(0.6km)Tank hill road(o.2km),Sir Tito Mandela Kasasa road(1.3km) (Ref No: HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS /CL-7/2020-2021/00001)Ongoing project. Contractor M/s China railway 18th Bureau Group Co Ltd. Contract Value 30,414,652,348 UGX. Screening and ESMPs prepared by MOLHUD |   |
| 4 | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works. | b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), | There was evidence that the LG carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs/ESMPS) prior to commencement of civil works for project(s) implemented using the USMID. ESIA was done for USMID Roads.   | 4 |
|   | Maximum score is 12   |   | ESIA for proposed reconstruction of 18.8km tarmac roads in Hoima city council under the USMID-AF-October 2020.prepared by Pan Arab Consulting Engineers in JV with AWE Environmental Engineers   |   |
|   |   | score 4 or 0  | A request for approval(cr-ADM/38/172/01) of the ESIA addressed to NEMA by Permanent secretary MOLHUD dated 16/10/2020  |   |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 the LG costed ESMPs for all project(s) implemented using the USMID example;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Perse-Commercial road(0.45km)Government road extension(0.46km),circular road(1.0km).Bikunya(0,25km),Tayali crown eka road(0.6km)Tank hill road(o.2km),Sir Tito Mandela Kasasa road(1.3km) (Ref No: HMC/USMID-AF/WRKS /CL-7/2020-2021/00001).</p> <p>The ESMP was included in the ESIA and costed 281,300,000UGX for monitoring and Evaluation costs. Table 9-5 page 227</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>Evidence showed the LG had an un-qualified audit opinion for FY 2022/2023.</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>Hoima City provided information to PS/ST on the status of the implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General's findings for FY 2021/2022. The submission dated 27th February 2023, signed by the Town Clerk Ahimbisibwe Innocent was received by the PS/ST on 27th February 2023. The submissions were also received by the Accountant General and Internal Auditor General on 27th February 2023. The report contained actions taken on 16 recommendations against all findings (pages, 1 - 10). The report was signed by the Town Clerk Ahimbisibwe Innocent. The submission was made within the February end deadline.</p> | 10 |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 7 | Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY<br>Maximum Score 4  | If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,<br><br>score 4 or else 0.   | The City LG submitted the Annual Performance Contract for FY 2023/2024, signed by the Accounting Officer Town Clerk Ahimbisibwe Innocent on 24th July 2023 and acknowledged by PS/ST on 24th July 2023. This was before the deadline of 31st August.  | 4 |
| 8 | Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year<br><br>maximum score 4 or else 0                        | If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,<br><br>score 4 or else 0.                               | The City submitted the Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/23, signed by the Accounting Officer Ahimisibwe Innocent on 23rd August 2023. This was within the deadline of 31st August.   | 4 |
| 9 | Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year<br><br>Maximum score is 4 | If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,<br><br>score 4 or else 0. | The City submitted Quarterly Performance Reports, for all the four quarters for FY 2022/23. They were signed by the Accounting Officer Ahimisibwe Innocent and final Q 4 was on 23rd August 2023.<br><br>Submission dates were as follows:<br>Quarter 1 - 23/08/2023<br>Quarter 2 - 24/02/2023<br>Quarter 3 - 19/06/2023<br>Quarter 4 - 23/08/2023<br><br>All the reports were submitted within the mandatory August 31 deadline. | 4 |

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

| <b>No.</b>                                       | <b>Summary of requirements</b>  | <b>Definition of compliance</b>   | <b>Compliance justification</b>  | <b>Score</b> |
|--|---|---|--|--------------|
| <b>Human Resource Management and Development</b> |   |   |  |              |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.<br><br><i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0 | The position of City Education Officer was vacant. Kusiima Johnson who was appointed on promotion as Senior Inspector of Schools under DSC minute no. 029/2016 (ii) was assigned duties to act as the City Education Officer in a letter dated 20th June 2023  | <b>0</b>     |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.<br><br><i>The Maximum Score of 70</i> | b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.   | Hoima City had 2 substantively appointed Inspectors of Schools<br><br>1. Kusiima Johnson was appointed on promotion as Senior Inspector of Schools under DSC minute no. 029/2016 (ii) was assigned duties to act as the City Education Officer in a letter dated 20th June 2023<br><br>2. Kinimi Charles was retained in service as Inspector of Schools under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (x) | <b>40</b>    |

**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>If the LG carried out:<br/>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>   | <p>There were Environmental and Social and Climate Change Screening Forms for Education projects for the previous FY. examples include;</p>   | 15 |
| <p>The Maximum score is 30</p> | <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere Primary School. (Ref No HC604/WRKS/22-23/00001). Contract Amount 116,000,058 UGX, Contractor M/S Karki Builders and Engineers. Screening forms were signed by the City Environment officer and CCDO on 22/6/2022. ESMP costed 3,004,500 UGX</p> | <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Bulemwa PS (Ref No HC604/WRKS/22-23/00002) Contract Amount 29,338,374 UGX. Contractor M/S Wemba Logistics. Screening forms were signed by the City Environment officer and CCDO on 21/6/2022.</p> |   |    |
| 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>If the LG carried out:<br/>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>   | <p>There was evidence that LG carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs/ESMPs) for the following projects; Basing on screening results ESMP were required as a safeguard document;</p> | 15 |
| <p>The Maximum score is 30</p> | <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Butebere Primary School. (Ref No HC604/WRKS/22-23/00001). ESMPs costed at 3,004,500 UGX and were signed by the City Environment officer and CCDO on 22/6/2022</p>  | <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Bulemwa PS (Ref No HC604/WRKS/22-23/00002). ESMPs costed at 1,807,500 UGX and were signed by the City Environment officer and CCDO on 22/6/2022</p>   |   |    |



**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

| <b>No.</b>                                       | <b>Summary of requirements</b>   | <b>Definition of compliance</b>  | <b>Compliance justification</b> | <b>Score</b> |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Human Resource Management and Development</b> |  |  |                                 |              |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><br><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.<br><br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><br><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.<br><br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><br><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.<br><br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><br><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.<br><br><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i><br><br><i>Maximum score is 70</i> | e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.   |                                 |              |

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>  |  |   |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p> | <p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>                                |  |   |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>   | <p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p> | <p>The position of City Health Officer was vacant. Mugaro Felix Fortunate who was substantively appointed as Principal Health Officer under City Service Commission minute no. 4/2022 (xxviii) was assigned duties to act as City Health Officer in a letter dated 8th November 2022</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>   | <p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>                                    | <p>The position of Principal Health Inspector was vacant and there was no evidence of secondment from Central Government</p>   | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>   | <p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>  | <p>The position of Senior Health Educator was vacant and there was no evidence of secondment from Central Government. Kyomuhendo Gerald (Senior Clinical Officer) was assigned duties to act in a letter dated 8th November 2022</p>   | 0 |

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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 the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening Forms for Health projects for the previous FY. examples include;

Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00006. Contractor M/S Aliku builders stone Ltd. Contract amount 25,737,499 UGX. Screening forms were signed by City Environment officer and P CCDO on 22/6/2022

Renovation of Health Staff quarters at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00005. Contractor M/S Sidney Concepts Ltd. Contract amount 44,892,439 UGX. Screening forms were signed by City Environment officer and CCDO on 22/6/2022

Construction of 5 stance lined VIP Latrine with washrooms at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00007. Contract amount 44,000,000 UGX. Screening forms were signed by City Environment officer and CCDO on 22/6/2022

Construction of 2 stance lined VIP Latrine at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00004. Contractor M/S Agemas lord Co Ltd Contract amount 20,515,114 UGX. Screening forms were signed by City Environment officer and P CCDO on 22/6/2022

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.

There was evidence that the LG carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs/ESMPs) for the following projects; basing on screening results ESMP were required as a safeguard documents for health projects for the previous year, these include;

Renovation of Kitchen at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00006. ESMPs costed at 353,200UGX undertaken and were signed by the City Environment officer and CCDO on 22/6/2022

Renovation of Health Staff quarters at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00005. ESMPs undertaken and were signed by the City Environment officer and CCDO on 22/6/2022

Construction of 5 stance lined VIP Latrine with washrooms at Buhanika HC III (Ref No: HC604/WRKS/22-23/00007. ESMPs costed at 2,757,000UGX undertaken and were signed by the City Environment officer and CCDO on 22/6/2022

**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

*Maximum score is 70*

If the LG has recruited;  
a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer

*score 70 or else 0.*

The indicator is not applicable to Cities

**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.

*Maximum score is 30*

If the LG:  
Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.

Hoima city is not covered under Microscale irrigation

**0**

**Water & Environment Minimum Conditions**

| No.  | Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance   | Compliance justification  | Score    |
|--|---|--|---|----------|
| <b>Human Resource Management and Development</b> |   |  |   |          |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Maximum score is 70</i>  | a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.   | The indicator is not applicable to Cities.  | <b>0</b> |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Maximum score is 70</i>  | b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.   | The indicator is not applicable to Cities   | <b>0</b> |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Maximum score is 70</i>  | c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The indicator is not applicable to Cities</li> </ul> | <b>0</b> |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Maximum score is 70</i>  | d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.  | The indicator is not applicable to Cities   | <b>0</b> |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Maximum score is 70</i>  | e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.  | The indicator is not applicable to Cities   | <b>0</b> |
| 1  | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.<br><i>Maximum score is 70</i>  | f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.   | The indicator is not applicable to Cities   | <b>0</b> |
| <b>Environment and Social Requirements</b>       |   |  |   |          |
| 2  | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects | If the LG:<br>a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0. | Not Applicable.   | <b>0</b> |
| 2  | Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects | b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.   | Not Applicable.   | <b>0</b> |

2

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

Not Applicable. **0**