



LGMSD 2022/23

Jinja city

(Vote Code: 854)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	87%
Education Minimum Conditions	70%
Health Minimum Conditions	70%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	84%
Educational Performance Measures	93%
Health Performance Measures	88%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>There was only one ongoing USMID funded projects that was the roadwork's rehabilitation for Clive and Clerk roads(1.891km), Bell Avenue East & West (1.466km), completion of Busoga Avenue (0.75km) ,traffic signalling (2No.) and drainage works (1.782km) ,however, the road was functional and being utilised</p>	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By more than 5%, score 3 1 to 5% increase, score 2 If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The City scored 72% in 2022 and 82% in 2023 LLG performance assessment which presented a performance increase of 11% according to the Final results for comparison of LLG scores - 2022 & 2023.</p>	3
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 If 80-99%: Score 2 If below 80%: 0 	<p>By the end of the financial year 2022/2023, according to the June monthly report, the project of (the rehabilitation of Clive and clark road 1.89km, Bell avenue east and west 1.466km, completion of Busoga avenue 0.782km and drainage works 1.782km) was 100% completed.</p>	3
3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The City set out and implemented eligible investments as per the USMID grant guidelines The rehabilitation of Clive and Clark road 1.89km, Bell avenue east and west 1.466km, completion of Busoga avenue 0.782km and drainage works 1.782km at Ugx 16,536,240,976.</p>	2

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence to show variations in contract prices and the engineers estimate as indicated. Rehabilitation for Clive and Clark roads (1.891km), Bell Avenue East & West (1.466km), completion of Busoga Avenue (0.75km) ,traffic signalling (2No.) and drainage works (1.782km Contract sum = Ugx 16,536,240,976 Engineers estimate = Ugx 17,150,922,070 % variations = -3.5%.	2
---	--	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	The positions filled for LLG were accurate. A sample of 1 Division (Southern) was visited where by it was required to have 99 staff according to the structure dated 26th July, 2022. It was then confirmed that information on the positions filled was accurate as indicated below, 1.Kasowole Joy was working as Deputy Division Town Clerk which position was provided for on the approved staff structure; 2.Baliraine Christopher was the Senior Assistant Town Clerk which position was provided for in the approved staff structure; 3. Nyende Michael Kakaire was the Senior Assistant Accountant which position was provided for in the approved staff structure;	2
---	--	--	---	---

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG: • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0	According to the ABPR for FY 2022/2023 report submitted on 28th/7/2023, the City's civil works executed in 2022/2023 were; the rehabilitation of Clive and Clark road 1.89km, Bell avenue east and west 1.466km, completion of Busoga avenue 0.782km and drainage works 1.782km. The assessment visited the investments on 19th/12/2023 and found them in place.	2
---	--	--	--	---

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise; If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs score 4 or else 0	The two Divisions obtained the scores below in the LGs Performance Assessment and the LLG IVA which were within the -/+ 10 performance range hence the assessment was credible	4									
			<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>DLG</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>IVA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Southern</td> <td style="text-align: center;">81</td> <td style="text-align: center;">89</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Northern</td> <td style="text-align: center;">93</td> <td style="text-align: center;">96</td> </tr> </table>		<u>DLG</u>	<u>IVA</u>	Southern	81	89	Northern	93	96	
	<u>DLG</u>	<u>IVA</u>											
Southern	81	89											
Northern	93	96											
		NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.											

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	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. Score: 2 or else score 0	The City did not prepare performance improvement plans the lowest performing LLGs.	0
---	---	--	--	---

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	The City did not prepare performance improvement plans the lowest performing LLGs.	0
---	---	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	The City consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for FY 2024/25 on 29th/9/2023. Receipt by MoPS, MoFPED and MoLG was on 29th/9/2023.	2
---	--	---	---	---

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>There was evidence that Jinja City conducted staff tracking and analysis of attendance on a quarterly basis. This was obtained from the staff attendance analysis for FY 2022/23 (submitted to MoPS on 7th July, 2023).</p>	2
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Accordingly, Mugalya Simon (Porter) worked for 14 days in April and was absent for 3 days without approval in the analysis. Likewise, Ereemye David, (Ag. City Engineer) worked for 9 days in April, 2023, Nampendo Charles, (City Physical Planner) only worked for 6 days, Wampande Aisha, (Principal Human Resource Officer) worked for 11 days, was absent for 5 days without approval in the analysis.</p>	
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence showed that the 8 HoDs were all appraised by the City Town Clerk however, 3 of them were appraised past the set timelines of 30th June with more details stated here under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Kaffi Ronald Elijah, (City Finance Officer) was appraised on 30/06/2023 2.Nabihamba Ernest (City Natural Resources Officer) was appraised on 3/07/2023 3.Dr. Banonya Stephen, (Senior Planner) was appraised on 6/7/2023; 4.Eng. Nyangweso Marie Gorretti (Ag. City Health Officer) was appraised on 30/6/2023. 5.Kayongo Christine, (City Planner) was appraised on 30/6/2023; 6. Muzusa Geoffrey, (City Community Development Officer) was appraised on 1/7/2023. 7. Ereemye David, the Ag. City Engineer was appraised on 6/7/2023; 8.Kubwooyo Rogers, Ag. City Commercial Officer was appraised on 30/6/2023; 9. Kasuku Aron, (Ag. City Production Officer) was appraised on 27/6/2023. 10. Nampendho Charles, (City Physical Planner) was appraised on 30/06/2023; 	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 Jinja City Council implemented administrative rewards and sanctions. Reference was taken from the Minutes of Rewards and Sanctions Committee held on 24th October, 2022 in the council Chambers.</p> <p>Under Min JCRSC/003/2023, the committee undertook the hearing of 8 disciplinary cases including;</p> <p>Ms. Tilirayo Sarah, (Education Assistant) who fought on the school premises at the same time was not attending duties regularly. In recommendation, the committee agreed to forward her to the service commission for termination of her service.</p> <p>Similarly, under Min JCRSC/005/2023, the committee heard the case of Ntuuyo Suman, an Askari who was reported for absenteeism. Ntuuyo Suman in his defence said that he was injured and used to report to his immediate supervisor. He further said he had not missed a day of work since his recovery.</p> <p>In observation, the committee observed that the staff did what was required however his immediate supervisor was quick to report the case without due diligence. In conclusion, the staff had no case to answer.</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Jinja City had established a Consultative Committee of 5 members however, the membership was less than the expected of at least 8 members.</p>	0

Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:

Score 1.

Evidence availed revealed that Jinja City recruited 119 staff according to a list presented dated 26/06/2023. Also observed was that (100%) of the staff had accessed the salary payroll within a period of two months including:

1. Kafifi Ronald, City Finance Officer, assumed duty on 15/3/2023 and accessed in the same month of March 2023.

2. Nabihamba Ernset Moses, City Natural Resources Officer, assumed duty on 15/3/2023 and accessed in the same month of March 2023;

3. Nabwonso Janet, Principal Procurement Officer, assumed duty on 15/3/2023 and accessed in the same month of March 2023;

4. Nnume Yasin Abubaker, Principal Accountant, assumed duty on 27/3/2023 and accessed in and accessed in the same month of March 2023;

5. Tamubula Olivia, (SCDO) assumed duty on 27/3/2023 and accessed in and accessed in the same month of March 2023;

6. Awor Josephine, Principal Health Officer (MCH), assumed duty on 27/3/2023 and accessed in and accessed in the same month of March 2023;

7. Kalume Saidi, Senior Health Educator, assumed duty on 27/3/2023 and accessed in and accessed in the same month of March 2023;

8. Kakaire Victoria, Principal Environmental Officer, assumed duty on 27/3/2023 and accessed in and accessed in the same month of March 2023;

9. Muzusa Geoffrey, City Community Development Officer, assumed duty on 15/3/23 and accessed in the same month of March 2023;

10. Charles Wansagi, (Town Agent), assumed duty on 27/3/2023 and accessed in and accessed in the same month of March 2023.

Pension Payroll management

Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0

a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:

Score 1.

It was evident that less than 100% of the staff that retired within FY 2022/23 for Jinja City had accessed pension payroll in a period of not more than two months as indicated below;

1.Kakaire Ronald, (Teacher), retired 11/10/2022 and accessed payroll in January, 2023.

2.Naigaga Priscilla (Internal Auditor), retired on 09/9/2022 and accessed pension payroll in November, 2022.

3.Mwondha Perezi (Teacher), retired on 07/3/2023 and accessed pension payroll in April, 2023.

4.Okanya Jessica (Deputy Headteacher), retired on 15/10/2022 and accessed pension payroll in November, 2022;

5. Nagaya Jabel, (Tutor), retired on 29/8/2022 and accessed pension payroll in May, 2023

6.Nakato Ruth, (Education Assistant), retired on 2/9/2022 and accessed pension payroll in November, 2022;

7. Namuba Clementina, (Askari), retired on 18/12/2022 and accessed pension payroll in January, 2023;

8.Angida Grace, (Personal Secretary, retired on 26/8/2022 and accessed pension payroll in September, 2022;

9. Mirembe Suzan, (Education Assistant), retired on 22/7/2022 and accessed pension payroll in June, 2022;

10. Musembya Muzamiru, (Teacher), retired on 29/7/2022 and accessed pension payroll in September, 2022.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10

N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:

Score 2 or else score 0

The City during the previous FY received a total of Ugx 387,942,585 which was all sent to the two Divisions because the Centre was using the USMID funds.

During the FY 2022/2023 DDEG transfers to the Divisions were done in two instalments;

In 2nd Qrt. on 15th/11/2022 for Ugx 129,314,196 and in 3rd Qrt. on 6th/2/2023 of Ugx.258,628,389

2

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	The City Council did timely warranting (within 5 working days) from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED. In 2nd Qrt the date of receipt of release was 23/10/2022 while warranting date was 25/10/2022 (2 days). In 3rd Qrt the date of receipt of release was 23th/1/2023 while the warranting date was 30/1/2023 (5 days).	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	In FY 2022/2023 the City Council did not do timely invoicing of DDEG to Divisions from the date of funds release. In 2nd Qrt. the date of funds release was 21/10/2022 while invoicing date was 15/11/2022 (17 days). In 3rd Qrt. the date of funds release was 18/1/2023 while invoicing date was 6/2/2023 (16 days).	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	During FY 2022/2023 the City mentored the Divisions on a quarterly basis. Reports were produced and forwarded to the City Town Clerk as follows: 1st Qrt report was produced on 15/9/2022, 2nd Qrt report on 24/11/2022, 3rd Qrt on 4/2/2023 and 4th Qrt report on 15th/4/2023. Some of the key areas handled were i. The development of the planning and budgeting cycle. ii. Local revenue generation, mobilisation and management at various levels. iii. Equipping officers with adequate knowledge on how to prepare activity performance reports. iv. Monitoring activities under DDEG guidelines.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council carried out monitoring visits three times in FY 2022/2023 and reports were produced, presented to TPC for discussion. First visit was conducted between 13th and 14th July 2022. The report was discussed by TPC on 21/9/2022 under Min. TPC/21/2022/23. Second visit was conducted between 7th and 18th December 2022 and the report discussed on 30/3/2023 under Min. TPC/58/2022/2023.</p> <p>Third visit was carried out between 1st and 2nd June, 2023 and discussed on 30/6/2023 under Min. TPC/82/2022/2023.</p> <p>Some of the recommendations made by TPC included but not limited to: 1. Quicken construction process of USMID Batch II projects since a 7% was too low. 2. City Physical Planner should speed up the process of titling Council properties to ensure safety. 3. Along Busoga Avenue, traffic signing and humps should be provided t control over speeding.</p>	2
----	---	--	---	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The City Council which was on IFMS maintained an asset register for Furniture and Fittings, Buildings, Machinery, Medical Equipment, Transport Equipment, Office Equipment, etc. Each category with own details, for example details for furniture are: Description, Asset category, Cost, Control centre, Section, Department, Physical location, Date placed in service, Tag No., Serial No., Type, Condition, Date of purchase, User, Heritage lease</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>A board of survey report for FY 2021/2022 was compiled and submitted to the City Town Clerk on 8/8/2022. In the report there were recommendations made e.g. on page 49 were unserviceable items recommended for disposal. In a letter dated 16/8/2023, the City Town Clerk was reminding the Government valuer to value the items. For this matter, the process was still ongoing by this assessment date.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>A nine member Physical Planning Committee was appointed on 5/2/2020 was functional. During the FY 2022/2023, the committee met five times as follows: 15/9/2022, 22/9/2022, 13/2/2023, 15/2/2023 and 4/4/2023. Minutes of all meetings were produced and submitted to Senior Physical Planner, Jinja Ministry Zonal Officer, MoLHUD through letter Ref. 1204 dated 29/6/2023 and received the same day by stamping.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to a report dated 15th/04/2022, the Desks appraisal exercise was conducted by the City officials for all the DDEG and USMID projects in the budget conference of 2022/2023. In the forms used in the exercise the officers committed themselves by marking “yes” to indicate that the projects were derived from the City Development Plan (DDP III) on page 94 to 97 for USMID/DDEG.</p> <p>The DDEG projects were eligible according to the investment menu captured on pages 7 and 8 of the funding guidelines. The project was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The rehabilitation of Clive and clark road 1.89km, Bell avenue east and west 1.466km, completion of Busoga avenue 0.782km and drainage works 1.782km. 	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A project Field appraisal exercise and a report was produced for example the reviewed forms indicated that the screening form for rehabilitation of Clive and clark road 1.89km, Bell avenue east and west 1.466km, completion of Busoga avenue 0.782km and drainage works 1.782km located in Jinja City prepared by the Natural resource officer and City CDO on 15th/04/2022. In the forms and subsequent report, officers pronounced themselves positively in regard to technical feasibility and environmental and social acceptability as indicated in sections A and B.</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Project profiles with costings for FY 2022/2023 were developed; a report was compiled and forwarded to the City Town Clerk on 30/6/2023. Examples of the projects were: 1. Construction of sanitary facilities in selected Primary Schools in the City at Ugx.134, 725,910. 2. Completion of USMID roads batch 2 in Northern Division at shs.16,536,240,976. 3. Completion of Masese Seed Secondary School at shs.6,000,000,000.</p> <p>The profiles were presented to the TPC for discussion in their meeting held on 30/5/2023 under Min. TPC/77/2022/23. Members called for timely execution of planned projects and called for quality assurance to achieve value for money.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no USMID project for the FY2023/2024 because the USMID funding had temporarily been suspended</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a procurement plan incorporating DDEG infrastructure projects for the divisions as shown below;</p> <p>Periodic maintenance of roads in Southern division (Road materials for roads like Nsajja, Kataliakawe, Magwa close, Naika, Kulazikulabe and Kisira at Ugx 225,000,000</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for approval of extension of contract period for rehabilitation of Bell Avenue East and West road (1.466km), completion of Busoga avenue (0.75km), traffic signalling (2No.) and drainage works (1.783m) by the contracts committee under Min. JC-CC 047/2023 on the 13th December 2023.</p> <p>Periodic maintenance of roads in Southern division (Road materials for roads like Nsajja, Kataliakawe, Magwa close, Naika, Kulazikulabe and Kisira</p>	1

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 evidence of an appointment by the City Town Clerk on the 20th January 2023 all health projects as shown below. Dr. Banonya Stephen as the project manager Eng. Nyende Ramathan as the contract manager Mr. Musuza Geoffrey as CDO Mr . Nabihamba Ernest as the Environment Officer Ms. Kagoya Annet as Labour officer Mr. Kaliro Geofrey as Clerk of works	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	The works (Rehabilitation of Clive and Clerk roads (1.891km), Bell Avenue East and West (1.466km) , completion of Busoga Avenue (0.75km) , Traffic signalling (2No.) and drainage work (1.782km) were implemented as per specifications for instance some of the implemented works were installed culverts of sizes 600mm, 900mm and the precast road kerbs, for the side drainages.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence to show for supervision of works as indicated; A progress report for the month of June 2023 showed works were at 33.37% progress. A monthly report for February 2023 with 13.4% physical progress and this indicated works had been delayed. A site meeting held on 25th May 2023 attended by the City Council Committee, consultancy firm and the contractor team.	2

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for payments made for the road works implemented in the financial year 2022/2023.</p> <p>The contractor raised a claim for payment on 25th November 2022 and the voucher 3662044 effected an amount of Ugx 500,337,000 on the 6th February 2023 for a certificate endorsed on the 10th January 2023.</p> <p>The second payment request was raised on 8th June 2023 by the contractor and the voucher 6411136 effected an amount of Ugx 1,801,725,299 on the 26th May 2023 for a certificate endorsed still on the same date.</p> <p>The last payment was made on 27th June 2023 under voucher 641136 for an amount of Ugx 1,476,310,864 .The request was raised on the 14th June 2023 and the certificate endorsed on the same date by the project manager, City natural resource officer, City Community Development Officer, treasurer and the PIA.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a complete procurement file for the USMID project.</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Clive and Clerk roads (1.891km), Bell Avenue East and West (1.466km) , completion of Busoga Avenue (0.75km) , Traffic signalling (2No.) and drainage work (1.782km).</p> <p>Procurement ref no . JC854/USMID/wrks/21-22/00057 . The contract was signed on 2nd March 2022 with M/s. Zhongmei Engineering Group Ltd, The evaluation report approved by the contracts committee was on the 12th January 2022 and the contract was awarded under Min. JC-CC 071 / 2022 (a).</p>	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of designating Ms. Mugala Martha- Principal CDO as the grievance Focal person. Through a letter dated 12th/07/2021 signed by the Ag. Town Clerk, the MC designated her as the grievance handling officer. The Ag. Town Clerk further appointed the GRC member on 12th/07/2021 and the members were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Kwagala Hellen - Ag. Deputy Town Clerk - chairperson GRC 2.Mugala Martha- Principal CDO/ secretary GRC 3.Kagere Ibrahim -Ag. labour officer Were Isaiah - MEO 4. Dr. Zzimbe Richard 5.Mukwaya David Kyakulga - Lands management officer 	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had a centralised log of grievance which was opened on 1st/07/2022 for the FY 2022/23 which was under review and where the grievances were recorded for further action by the GRC</p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was display of the GRM/framework titled "Jinja city complaints and grievance handling process" and had the contact of the grievance focal person displayed at Notice boards at the City main administration block entrance</p>	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that environment, social and climate change had been integrated into the LGDP, Annual work plans and budgets as shown below;</p> <p>Work plan for 2022/23 LG planned for under program: Natural resources, environment, climate change</p> <p>sub-program: environment and natural resources.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support monitoring, distribution and planting of seedlings 2.Environmental impact assessment for capital projects 3.sensitization of communities on natural management through seminars, workshops and trainings <p>From the Approved Budget 2022/23 under Natural resources and environment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.workshops, seminars and travel inland - UGX. 23,228,000 2.ESIAs for capital projects - UGX. 50,000,000 <p>From DP III pages 75-79</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Increase of forest cover from 15% to 35% 2.Restore the natural and degraded wetlands and increase wetland cover from 15% to 35% 3.Develop wetland management plans to support gazetting and demarcating of existing wetlands 4.Under take sensitization campaigns on permitted levels of pollution emission <p>promote rural and urban plantation development and tree planting</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the TPC meeting held on 19th/04/2023 under minute TPC 70/2022/2023 presentation of DDEG grants guidelines for 2023/24 by the City Planner (Kayongo Christine) and minutes were prepared on 30th/05/2023 and in attendance were the Town Clerks from the divisions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Kyangwa Mercy - Ag. town clerk Northern division <p>Kasowole Joy - Deputy Town Clerk Southern Division.</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	The LG had project financed by USMID other than health, education, water and irrigation in the FY2022/23 such as; Costed ESMP of UGX. 770,300,000 under bill No. 1: preliminaries and general item 17.00 environmental protections and waste disposal items 17.01 to 17.14 environmental protection and waste disposal. Item 18.00: occupational health and safety, HIV/AIDs gender, STD prevention for the rehabilitation of Clive road, Clerk road, Bell avenue, completion of Busoga avenue and drainage works. M/S. Zhongmei Engineering group Ltd. JC854/USMID/WRKS/21-22/00057.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	There was no project with additional costs for addressing impacts resulting from climate change at the LG in the FY2022/23.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	Not applicable for the rehabilitation works of Clive road, Clerk road, Bell avenue, completion of Busoga avenue and drainage works public road project implemented.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the Natural resources officer and City CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of the project under USMID funding as shown below; Monitoring reports for the rehabilitation works of Clive road, Clerk road, Bell avenue, completion of Busoga avenue and drainage works with recommendations such as; provide workers with PPE, sensitization of workers about HIV/AIDs, installation of signage at the site and re-vegetate the bare ground prepared by the city CDO and Natural resources officer on 12th/01/2023, 27th/02/2023, 20th/03/2023, 18th/04/2023 and 29th/06/2023	1

15 Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.
Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:
Score 1 or else score 0

There was signed E&S compliance certificates and payment record for the project under USMID by Natural resources officer Officer and City CDO as shown below;

E&S certificate issued for the rehabilitation works of Clive road, Clerk road, Bell avenue, completion of Busoga avenue and drainage works, the City CDO and Natural resources officer certified works on 10th/01/2023 and payment was made on 6th/02/2023. The Contractor M/s Zhongmei Engineering Group Ltd for Project JC854/USMID/WRKS/21-22/00057.

E&S certificate issued for the rehabilitation works of Clive road, Clerk road, Bell avenue, completion of Busoga avenue and drainage works, the city CDO and Natural resources officer certified works on 26th/06/2023 and payment was made on 27th/06/2023.

M/S Zhongmei Engineering group Ltd for the project JC854/USMID/WRKS/21-22/00057.

Financial management

16 LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations
Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:
Score 2 or else score 0

The City Council with Bank Accounts in Centenary Bank made monthly bank reconciliations and were up-to date at the time of the assessment, Examples of reconciled balances were:

	30/6/2023
31/11/2023	
General Fund	Ugx 76,916,896
42,018,397	
UWEP A/c	Ugx 559,660
4,710,310	
YLP A/c	Ugx 2,697,325
7,437,975	

17 LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.
Score 2 or else score 0

For FY 2022/2023 all the four quarterly internal audit reports were produced and forwarded to City Town Clerk as follows: 1st Qrt report produced on 1st/10/2022, 2nd Qrt report on 24th/1/2023, 3rd Qrt on 20th/4/2023 and 4th Qrt. report produced on 24th/7/2023.

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>Information on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2022/2023 was generated and provided through four separate reports entitled "Responses to queries raised by the internal audit department" for each quarter. The reports were forwarded to the Secretary, PAC and copied to His Worship the Mayor as follows: 1st Qrt report produced on 27th/12/2022, 2nd Qrt report on 27th/1/2023, 3rd Qrt on 21th/6/2023 and 4th Qrt report produced on 15th/8/2023</p>	1
----	--	---	--	----------

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>All the four quarterly internal audit reports FY 2022/2023 submitted to the City Town Clerk, PAC Chairman. PAC reviewed the reports as follows: 1st Qrt report reviewed on 9th/5/2023, 2nd Qrt on 13th/6/2023, 3rd Qrt report on 15th/8/2023 and 4th Qrt. report reviewed on 17th/10/2023. However, the quality of the minutes was very poor.</p>	1
----	--	--	--	----------

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The budgeted revenue collections for FY 2022/2023 Ugx. 11,091,000,000 as noted in the approved budget for the period. The actual collection year Ugx. 5,883,291,000 as noted on page 16 of the draft financial statements for the period. This was a performance of 53% below the range of +/- 10% scorable.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	----------

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The OSR collections for FY 2021/2022 Ugx. 3,688,585,746 as noted on page 13 of the audited Final Accounts for the period.</p> <p>For FY 2022/2023 OSR collection Ugx. 5,883,291,090, an increase of Ugx. 2,194,702,344. The 59.4% increase was attributed to recovery from COVID 19 effects.</p>	2
----	--	--	---	----------

20	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	The sharable local revenue for FY 2022/2023 Ugx. 2,914,621,685 (Ugx. 5,883,291,090 less property tax Ugx. 2,968,669,405). The mandatory LLGs share of local revenue remitted to the Divisions Ugx. 1,907,498,958 i.e. 65.4% slightly over 65% set in the law.	2
----	---	---	--	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	Although the procurement plan and the awarded contracts had been removed from the Notice Board, there was evidence that at one time the publications were on there. Examples of awarded contracts are: 1. Completion of the General Ward at Bugembe HC IV awarded to Interbuild Technical Services Ltd at Ugx. 90,951,194, 2. Periodical maintenance of Mafubira-Kayunga-Idogolo-Namulesa Road awarded to M/s Muga Services Ltd at Ugx. 1,008,587,762, 3. Construction of girl's 5-stance latrines, shower and incinerator at Nakanyonyi Primary School awarded to M/sKalimuino (U) Ltd. at Ugx. 36,990,168.	2
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	In FY 2021/2022, the City Council was assessed USMID arrangements. A few pages of their report were photocopied and published on the Notice Board indicating that the City scored 37% among others as overall.	2
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	During FY 2022/2023 two barazas were held and minutes produced. The first one was held on 18th/4/2023 in the City main hall. The theme was Stakeholders engagement on piloting of electronic buses in Jinja City. The second was held on 20th/6/2023 at Masese landing site on the replanning of Masese landing site.	1
21	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	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	Information on tax rates, collection procedures and procedures were published on the City notice boards e.g. hiring of City hall Ugx. 500,000, Wholesale licenses Ugx. 112,500, Pitches in markets Ugx. 5,000 per day, etc. The collection procedures were also outlined e.g. customers to visit council with IDs for registration on the payment system, and then make payments in the bank. For appeal procedures advised to register complaints at the complaints desk.	1

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

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

During the FY 2022/2023 the City prepared and submitted two reports to The Regional Inspector of Government, Jinja on 3rd/3/2023 and 22nd/9/2023 respectively. The submissions were about the activities of Jinja City Good Governance and Anti-corruption committee. It was however stated in the report that the committee did not receive any cases relating to fraud in Jinja City during the year.

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>School Year 2020</p> <p>Total No. of Candidates registered = 1734</p> <p>Total absentees = 07</p> <p>Total that sat = 1727</p> <p>Total Grades (I, II & III) = (348+1139+157) =1644</p> <p>Pass rate = 1644×100</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1727</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">= 95.2%</p> <p>School Year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of Candidates registered = 5386</p> <p>Total absentees = 67</p> <p>Total that sat = 5319</p> <p>Total Grades (I, II & III) = (922+3486+844) = 5252</p> <p>Pass rate = 5252×100</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">5319</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">= 98.7%</p> <p>PLE pass rate increased by 3.5% (from 95.2% to 98.7%)</p>	2

1

Learning Outcomes:
The LG has improved
PLE and USE pass
rates.

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

b) The LG UCE pass rate
has improved between the
previous school year but
one and the previous year

- If improvement by more
than 5% score 3
- Between 1 and 5% score
2
- No improvement score 0

School Year 2020

Total No. of Candidates registered = 185

Total absentees = 10

Total that sat = 175

Total Grades (I, II & III) = (09+33+50) = 92

Pass rate = 92×100

175

= 52.6%

School Year 2022

Total No. of Candidates registered = 343

Total absentees = 6

Total that sat = 337

Total Grades (I, II & III) = (45+152+65) =
262

Pass rate = 262×100

337

= 77.7%

The UCE pass rate increased by 25.1%
(from 52.6% to 77.7%)

2

N23_Service Delivery
Performance: Increase
in the average score in
the education LLG
performance
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

a) Average score in the
education LLG performance
has improved between the
previous year but one and
the previous year

- By more than 5%, score 2
- Between 1 and 5%, score
1
- No Improvement, score 0

NB: If the previous average
score was 95% and above,
Score 2 for any increase.

The LLGs performance in 2022 was 55%
and in 2023 the score was 65% that gave a
variance of 10%.

This implied that there was an increase of
10% in Education performance of LLGs
according to the OPAMS ' the LLG
Performance Assessment Variance 2022 -
2023.

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

The LG utilised SFG (Ugx 103,918,004) on
eligible according to the Investment menu
in Planning and Budgeting Guidelines for
Education and Sports and the activities
were;

- The construction of a 5-stance VIP
latrine at Nakanyonyi P/S in Northern
Division at Ugx 36,990,168.

- The construction of a 5-stance VIP
latrine at Buyala P/S in Northern Division at
Ugx 36,990,168.

- Procurement, supply and delivery of 3-
seater desks for primary schools Northern
desks at Ugx 29,855,540.

All the activities were defined in the
investment menu under the sector
guidelines on pages 4 through to 5.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the Ag. CEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors as per the examples below;

- The project for the construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Nakanyonyi P/S. The contractor M/s Kalimwino Uganda Limited raised a payment claim of Ugx 23,265,824 on 31st/05/2023. The Interim Payment certificate (IPC) No. 1 of Ugx 20,988,252 was drawn and certified by the CE (City Engineer) and Ag. CEO (Acting City Education Officer) on 5th/06/2023. The Environment Officer and CDO certified the payment on 2nd/6/2023 and payment was made on 13th/11/2023 vide EFT Voucher No. 8641231.

- The project for the construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Buyala P/S. The contractor M/s Medabil Technical Services Limited raised a payment claim of Ugx 18,420,626 on 31st/07/2023. The Interim Payment certificate (IPC) No. 2 of Ugx 16,545,945 was drawn and certified by the CE, Ag. CEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified the payment on 07th/08/2023 and payment of Ugx 16,545,945 was made on 3rd/11/2023 vide EFT Voucher No. 8602496.

- The supply and delivery of 3-seater desks for Primary Schools in Northern Division. The supplier M/s Nabitende Investments Ltd made a payment request on 8th/6/2022 of Ugx 29,855,540 via invoice No. 0066. The Goods Received Note No. 9668 dated 8th/06/2022 and Delivery Note 0080 dated 8th/06/2023 and payment of Ugx 24,737,040 via Voucher 6415269 was made on 27th/6/2023.

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show variations made in contract prices and engineers estimates for the education infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Construction of a VIP latrine at Nakanyonyi Primary School.</p> <p>Contract sum =Ugx 36,990,168</p> <p>Engineers estimate =Ugx 37,112,062</p> <p>% variations = -0.33%.</p> <p>Construction of VIP latrine at St .Paul Buyala Primary School.</p> <p>Contract sum =Ugx 37,072,296</p> <p>Engineers estimate =Ugx 37,112,062</p> <p>% variations = -0.11%</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>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools)were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>According to the ABPR for FY 2022/2023, the education projects in the Work Plan for the FY under review were fully completed, fully paid and had been commissioned. The projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Nakanyonyi P/S in Northern Division at Ugx 36,990,168 ● The construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Buyala P/S in Northern Division at Ugx 36,990,168. ● Procurement, supply and delivery of 3-seater desks for primary schools Northern desks at Ugx 29,855,540. 	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>There was adherence to the prescribed MoES guidelines when recruiting teachers. The LG at least had recruited a teacher per class. At the time of the assessment, the LG had 806 teachers serving in 48 schools against the staffing norm of 878. It implied that the LG recruitment was at 91.8%</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the UPE and USE had prepared Assets registers in the past two FYs which the LG consolidated into the LG Assets registers. The FY 2021/2022 register was endorsed by the</p>	3

standards

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

- If above 70% and above score: 3
- If between 60 - 69%, score: 2
- If between 50 - 59%, score: 1
- Below 50 score: 0

Ag. CEO on 15th/07/2022 and for FY 2022/2023 was endorsed by the CEO on 11th August, 2023.

The registers presented the average stocks for the LG as indicated below;

FY 2021/2022

The review indicated the UPE schools' average stocks were;

1. Classrooms were 643
2. Latrine stances were 158
3. Desks were 11447
4. Staff houses were 74

The USE school's average stocks were;

1. Classrooms were 196
2. Latrine stances were 195
3. Desks were 3401
4. Laboratories were 29
5. Staff houses were 77

FY 2022/2023

The UPE schools' average stocks were;

1. Classrooms were 643
2. Latrine stances were 162
3. Desks were 11782
4. Staff houses were 75

The USE school's average stocks were;

1. Classrooms were 196
2. Latrine stances were 195
3. Desks were 3401
4. Laboratories were 29
5. Staff houses were 77

Total GoU that submitted X 100

Total (UPE+USE)

$(48+10) \times 100$

(58)

$= 100\%$

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

The LG accurately reported on teachers and their work stations according to the Staff deployment list endorsed by the Ag. CEO on 11th, November, 2023 that captured 806 teachers serving in 48 registered Primary Schools.

The assessment sampled three (3) of; Main street P/S (Urban), St. Spire Road (Semi urban) and Walukuba (rural) to verify the accuracy of deployment information. The pointers of verification were; the displayed teachers' list, teacher's duty rosta and the teacher's daily attendance books. When the assessment reviewed the 3 documents, the teacher's names, the staff size per school, they were all in tandem with the deployment list at the Ag. CEO's office.

The staff list that was posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office at Main street P/S indicated that the Government paid teachers were 26 which was in tandem with the Ag. CEO's deployment list.

At Spire Road P/S, the staff list posted on the walls of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU paid teachers were 25 which number tallied well with the Ag. CEO's deployment list.

While at Walukuba P/S, the staff list posted on the wall of the Headteachers' office indicated that the GoU paid teachers were 21 which number was matching with that on the Ag. CEO's deployment list

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence that all the registered primary schools had prepared Assets registers which were consolidated into the Assets registers which was endorsed by the Ag. CEO on 11th August, 2023.

The UPE schools' average stocks were;

1. Classrooms were 648
2. Latrine stances were 162
3. Desks were 11782
4. Staff houses were 75

The assessment sampled three schools (Main street, Spire Road and Walukuba) to verify the records presented by the Ag. CEO. The verification noted that the records at the Ag. CEO's and at the respective schools were the same as shown below;

The assets stocks at Main street P/S indicated; 29 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 311 desks and 04 units of staff houses which were the same figures reported in the Ag. CEO's Consolidated assets register.

At Spire Road P/S, the classrooms were 15, the latrine stances were 15, and the desks were 295 and 02 units of staff houses. The stocks were in tandem with what was reported by the Ag. CEO's consolidated assets register.

The visit at Walukuba P/S, noted 15 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 385 desks and 2 units of staff houses which stocks tallied with those in the Ag. CEO's assets stock list.

The reviewed School files indicated that the Headteachers had prepared the Annual Budget Performance Reports as guided by the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and submitted to the Ag. CEO by 30th January, 2023.

The assessment sampled 10 Primary and they had all complied with the Budgeting and Planning guidelines and they are;

1. The Headteacher of Main Street P/S, Ms. Florence Nabukwasi prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 12th /12/2022

2. The Headteacher of Walukuba P/S, Mr. Tamuzade Ziyadi prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 10th January, 2023

3. The Headteacher of Spire Road P/S, Ms. Ketra Amoding prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 15th January, 2023

4. The Headteacher of Mpumude Estate P/S, Mr. Mwoya Mike Mutove prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 11th January, 2023

5. The Headteacher of Kimasa P/S, Ms. Konso Juliet prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 17th January, 2023

6. The Headteacher of Mafubira P/S, Mr. Babagobya Ronald prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 2nd January, 2023

7. The Headteacher of Jinja Police Barracks P/S, Ms. Hellen Esaete prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 2nd January, 2023

8. The Headteacher of St. Paul Buyala P/S, Ms. Resty Musubika prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 25th January, 2023

9. The Headteacher of Kiira P/S, Ms. Margaret Kamwana Nalwumbwe prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 16th January, 2023

10. The Headteacher of Kalungami P/S, Ms. Betty Mubiru prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 14th January, 2023

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

The reviewed School files indicated that the Headteachers had prepared the annual Budget Performance Reports as guided by the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and submitted to the Ag. CEO by 30th January, 2023.

The assessment sampled 10 Primary and they had all complied with the Budgeting and Planning guidelines and they are;

1. The Headteacher of Main Street P/S, Ms. Florence Nabukwasi prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 12th /12/2022.
2. The Headteacher of Walukuba P/S, Mr. Tamuzade Ziyadi prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 10th January, 2023.
3. The Headteacher of Spire Road P/S, Ms. Ketra Amoding prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 15th January, 2023.
4. The Headteacher of Mpumude Estate P/S, Mr. Mwoya Mike Mutove prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 11th January, 2023.
5. The Headteacher of Kimasa P/S, Ms. Konso Juliet prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 17th January, 2023
6. The Headteacher of Mafubira P/S, Mr. Babagobya Ronald prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 2nd January, 2023
7. The Headteacher of Jinja Police Barracks P/S, Ms. Hellen Esaete prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 2nd January, 2023
8. The Headteacher of St. Paul Buyala P/S, Ms. Resty Musubika prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 25th January, 2023
9. The Headteacher of Kiira P/S, Ms. Margaret Kamwana Nalwumbwe prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 16th January, 2023
10. The Headteacher of Kalungami P/S, Ms. Betty Mubiru prepared the Annual performance report which was submitted to Ag. CEO on 14th January, 2023

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG supported the Schools in the preparation and implementation of the SIPs.</p> <p>During the inspection Planning meeting held on 1st/09/2022 through Min. III, the City Inspector of Schools emphasised the need to always teach the School administration on how to take action on the recommendation through developing of the SIPs.</p> <p>It was further noted that the inspection feedback reports found at the sampled schools, the Headteachers were inducted on how to make SIPs from the recommendations for example while at Walukuba East P/S on 29th/9/2022, Mr. Ngobi Samuel the Inspector discussed the inspection findings with Headteacher Mr. Tamuzade Ziyadi on how to make a SIP and the SIP found displayed on the walls of the HT office 19th/12/2023 captured the recommendations as the action points.</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"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 - 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>The assessment reviewed the OTIMS data extract for Jinja City and noted that they submitted data for 46,544 enrolment data for UPE and 21,995 data for USE on 6th/10/2022 which was 100%.</p> <p>We reviewed the Jinja City performance contract for FY 2022/23 and noted a list of 48 schools.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG collected and compiled data for all registered schools (UPE) in the City and submitted it, accordingly.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2023/2024 on page 28 of 54 indicated Ugx 6,396,459,000 as salary for the 806 Primary teachers in Jinja City.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

From the three sampled and visited Primary Schools of Main street (urban), Spire Road (semi-urban) and Walukuba (rural), it was evident that LG deployed at least a teacher per class as required by the guidelines.

The assessment noted that the names and number of teachers as displayed in the Headteachers' office were tallying with what was on the teacher's deployment list dated 11th November, 2023 at the Ag. CEO's office.

The Ag. CEO' Deployment list for School year 2023 indicated that; Main street P/S had 26, Spire Road had 25 and Walukuba had 21 including the Headteachers.

The School verification tour reviewed the teacher's daily attendance book and the posted staffs lists plus the staff duty allocation schedules, it was revealed that the numbers and names of teachers were similar with those on the deployment list at the Ag. CEO's desk for instance the Headteacher at Spire Road P/S Ms. Ketra Amoding had posted in her office and put on file a staff list dated 5th/02/2023 with 25 teachers which was in tandem with that at the Ag. CEO's lists.

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

The LG staff list signed by the Ag. CEO on 11th November, 2023 was found displayed at the Ag. CEO notice board that entailed 806 teachers serving in 48 Primary Schools and at Spire Road, Ms. Ketra Amoding the HT had posted a staff list of 25 teachers dated 5th/02/2023 on the walls of her office.

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 copy to DEO/MEO

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The findings from the 10 randomly sampled and reviewed Headteacher's files in respect of appraisal for work done during the School year 2022 indicated that the appraisals were done within the set timelines as presented below;

1. Ms. Amoding Ketrah the Headteacher of Spire Road P/S in Southern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Kitto Rajab on 30th/12/2022.

2. Ms. Florence Nabukwasi the Headteacher of Main street P/S in Southern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Kitto Rajab on 16th/12/2022.

3. Mr. Mwoya Mike Mutove the Headteacher of Mumude Estate P/S in Southern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Kyakwise Stephen on 29th/12/2022.

4. Mr. Tamuzade Ziyadi the Headteacher of Walukuba West P/S in Southern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Mutakisa Moses on 30th/12/2022.

5. Ms. Juliet Konso the Headteacher of Kimasa P/S in Northern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Okello Paul on 06th/12/2022.

6. Mr. Babagobya Ronald the Headteacher of Mafubira P/S in Northern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Nnume Edward on 08th/12/2022.

7. Ms. Hellen Esaete the Headteacher of Jinja Police Baracks P/S in Northern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Nnume Edward on 08th/12/2022...

8. Ms. Resty Musubika the Headteacher of St. Paul Buyala P/S in Northern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Kyangwa Mercy on 30th/12/2022.

9. Ms. Margaret Kamwana Nalwumbwe the Headteacher of Kiira P/S in Northern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Mukwaya Paul on 11th/12/2022.

10. Mr. Emmanuel Ngobi Ernest the Headteacher of St. John Kizinga in Northern Division was appraised by the Assistant Senior Town Clerk Nnume Edward on 12th/12/2022.

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The records pertaining to the appraisal of Secondary School Headteachers were not presented for assessment.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Education department staff were appraised against there set targets for the FY 2022/2023 as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Ag. City Education Officer, Muloopa Haruna was appraised by Choli Golooba James the Principal Education Officer on 28th/June, 2023. ● The City Inspector of Schools, Ms. Mutesi Aminah was appraised by the Ag. City Education Officer (Ag. CEO) Mr. Haruna Muloopa on 29th/June/2023 ● Ngobi Sam the Sports Officer was appraised by the Ag. CEO on 29th June, 2023 	2
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The training plan dated 30th January, 2023 signed by the Ag. City Education Officer was presented for assessment. The plan captured activities like retaining of staff about the on-line EMIS registration of learners which was to be done on 12th/04/2023.</p>	2

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The City Council did not write a correction letter to MoES, regarding the list of schools and enrolment because all the data had been captured appropriately. During the orientation it was agreed by the education assessors that if there was no error, no letter correction should be written.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The City Education department made allocations to inspection and monitoring was Ugx 60,732,000 captured in the unpagged LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2022/2023 under output 000023 programme 12 Human Capital Development. This was in line with sector guidelines (page 18 and 21 of the guidelines) which call for a minimum allocation of UGX 4,000,000 per LG.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The City made timely warranting of the school's capitation received in the last three quarters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Cash release for Q1 and Q2 was on 7th/10/2022 and warranting was on 12th/10/2022. ● The cash release for Q3 was on 5th/01/2023 and warranting was on 10th/01/2023. ● The cash release date for Q4 was 17th/04/2023 and warranting was on 20th/4/2023. 	2

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Release circulars dated 22nd/08/2022 and 22nd/10/2022 for term III, 2022; 19th/01/2023 for term I, 2023; and 08th/05/2023 for term II, 2023 were in place. Invoices for primary schools I sampled and visited as indicated below and for other terms were available. Invoices: No. 1040942 dated 04th/11/2022 worth Ugx. 1,555,858/= for Main street P/S [Term III, 2022]; No. 5877108 dated 15th/06/2023 worth Ugx. 4,112,700/= for Spire Road P/S [Term 2/2023]; and No. 3341952 dated 27th/01/2023 worth Ugx. 8,004,983/= for Walukuba West P/S [Term 1/2023] were in place. The releases had been publicized on notice boards at the City and at the sampled Schools.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <p>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>The City LG Education department inspectorate prepared termly inspection Workplans as shown below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Term III, 2022 inspection plan was prepared on 1st September, 2022. ● Term I, 2023, inspection plan was prepared on 8th/02/2023. ● Term II, 2023 inspection plan prepared on 30th/05/2023. <p>All the Inspection plans were duly signed by the City Inspector of Schools and they entailed inspections schedules with clear timelines</p> <p>Prior to inspections, the City Council held inspection planning meetings to discuss among other issues deployments of inspectors, inspection logistics. Examples of meetings held included;</p> <p>On 1st September, 2022 vide Min. IV, the meeting discussed the teaming and schedules for the inspection for the inspection which was to start on 10th/10/2022..</p> <p>On 8th/02/2023, the meeting vide Min. IV, discussed Term III, 2022 inspection findings. It was prominently noted that SNE teachers were needed in many schools.</p> <p>On 30th/05/2023 through Min. EDUC.9/2022/2023, the meeting recommended two inspections to be carried out; support inspection and routine. It was emphasised that digital inspection was applied when carrying out routine inspection.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>A review of the inspection reports for the past three Terms revealed that for every round of the termly inspection, all the 48 Government Primary schools, were inspected.</p> <p>48×100</p> <p>48</p> <p>= 100%.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>It was observed by the assessment team that inspection reports were discussed at both the school and the LG levels. The examples were presented below;</p> <p>At departmental level, review meetings for inspection findings were held for example;</p> <p>On 16th/12/2022 through Min. EDUC: 3, the department discussed the Term II, 2022 report and noted that the inspection was going to move to digital and there was a need for induction.</p> <p>On 30th/05/2023 vide Min. EDUC6/2022/2023 there was discussion of the Term III, 2023 inspection work plan. Through Min. EDUC. 8/2022/2023, it was agreed that the Inspector of Schools should sensitise Headteachers on the weak areas observed during the inspection and the need to closely supervise the weak performing schools starting from 5th June, 2023 and a schedule was worked out.</p> <p>On 30th/6/2023 through Min. Educ. 3, the meeting received and discussed the Term I, 2023 inspection findings.</p> <p>From the sampled schools it was also evident from the inspection feedback reports that the inspectors and the school administration consented to which was a sign that discussion of inspection finding and the recommendations thereafter had been agreed upon.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The inspection feedback reports duly signed by the Inspectors of Schools and the School Head teachers were found at the three sampled Schools (Main street, Spire Road and Walukuba West) were evidence of discussion and consent on the inspection and monitoring findings between the Headteacher and the inspectors for example;</p> <p>The City Inspector of Schools prepared and submitted all the inspection reports together with the monitoring reports, activity work plans and budgets to DES as shown below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Term III, 2022 report was submitted to DES on 7th/01/2023. ● Term I, 2023 report was submitted on 17th/7/2023. ● Term II, 2023 report was submitted on 16th/08/2023. 	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>The Jinja City Council Social Services Committee was responsible for the discussion of matters for education service delivery. During the FY under review, the committee discharged its duties in respect of Education service delivery as per the examples below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● On 13th/04/2023 vide Min. JCC/SSC/38/2023, the committee discussed the Education Budget estimates for FY 2023/2024 of Ugx 456,026,097. ● On 28th/11/2022 via minute JCC/SSC/28/2022 there was discussion of the inspection findings for Term II, 2022. <p>Other meetings were held on 26th/09/2022, 25th/01/2023 and 15th/08/2022,</p> <p>All minutes were well typed, duly signed and kept in bound form.</p>	2

11	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p><i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p><i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of mobilising and attracting plus retaining of learners into Schools through the community engagements;</p> <p>It was noted from the reviewed documents that City Education officers were attending PTA General meetings during which they reminded parents of their obligations in the education of their children for example on 24th/02/2023 while at Budondo P/S through minute 07/02/2023, parents were reminded to feed their children well and should not keep them at school while hungry.</p> <p>On 3rd/3/2023 through minute; 08/AGM/03/03/2023, the Ag. CEO Muloopa Haruna encouraged parents to sacrifice and keep their children in school. This was at Walukuba West P/S.</p>
----	---	---	---

Investment Management

Planning and budgeting for investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, *score: 2, else score: 0*

There was evidence of an up-to-date Assets register for all the registered primary schools. The reviewed Consolidated Assets register was endorsed by the Ag. CEO on 11th August, 2023. It captured the recently acquired assets like; 3-seater desks supplied by M/s Nabitende Investments Ltd, the 5-stance VIP latrines at Nakanyonyi and Buyala.

The UPE schools' average stocks were;

1. Classrooms were 648.
2. Latrine stances were 162.
3. Desks were 11782.
4. Staff houses were 75.

The assessment sampled three schools (Main street, Spire Road and Walukuba) to verify the records presented by the Ag. CEO. The verification noted that the records at the Ag. CEO's and at the respective schools were the same as shown below;

The assets stocks at Mainstreet P/S indicated; 29 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 311 desks and 04 units of staff houses which were the same figures reported in the Ag. CEO's Consolidated assets register.

At Spire Road P/S, the classrooms were 15, the latrine stances were 15, the desks were 295 and 02 units of staff houses. The stocks were in tandem with what was reported by the Ag. CEO's consolidated assets register.

The visit at Walukuba P/S, noted 15 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 385 desks and 2 units of staff houses which stocks tallied with those in the Ag. CEO's assets stock list.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>According to a report dated 15th/04/2022, the Desks appraisal exercise was conducted by the City officials for all the budgets in the budget conference of 2022/2023. In the forms used in the exercise the officers committed themselves by marking “yes” to indicate that the Education projects were derived from the City Development Plan (CDP III) on page 119 to 121. Also for the Education projects were eligible according to the investment menu captured on pages 4 and 5 of the Sector Planning and Budgeting guidelines. The Education projects were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Nakanyonyi in Northern Division. ● Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Buyala in Northern Division. ● The supply and delivery of 3-seater desks for Primary Schools in Northern Division 	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The City officials conducted the field appraisal for all the education projects as evidenced by a report dated 15th/04/2022. The Environment Officer and City CDO for example screened the projects (Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Nakanyonyi in Northern Division and Construction of a 5-stance VIP latrine at Buyala in Northern Division). In the report the officers in regard to the Education projects pronounced themselves that the technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and the projects were all feasible.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of an approved procurement plan dated 29th May 2023 incorporating education projects as indicated below;</p> <p>Phased construction of Buwala seed school at Buwala village at Ugx 740,948,697 on page 2.</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrines at Kakira St. Theresa , Nabirama , Kagoma hill , Ndiwansi and Busegulu primary schools @35,000,000.</p> <p>Construction of a 4 in one teachers house at Mawoito salvation Army primary school at Ugx 99,810,000 on page 1.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The sector procurement plan for education that was submitted to PDU incorporated the sampled projects on the 27th June 2022. The projects included;</p> <p>The construction of Buwala seed school was approved by the contracts committee under Min.000039/DCC/2021-2022 on 25th February 2022 and was cleared by the solicitor general on 7th October 2022.</p> <p>Construction of a staff house at Lubani primary school was awarded under Min. 00008/DCC/2022-2023 (4) on 21st November 2022.</p> <p>Construction of a staff house at Wansimba primary school was awarded under Min.00014/DCC/2022-2023(5) on 30th November 2022.</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Kigalagala primary school was awarded under Min.00021/DCC/2022-2023 on 10th February 2023.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of an appointment for project implementation members for education projects dated 4th August 2022.</p> <p>Mr. Buyinza Joseph (City Engineer) as the project manager.</p> <p>Mr. Haruna Muloopa the Ag. CEO</p> <p>Mr. Mwembe Robert as Clerk of works.</p> <p>Mr. Kyangwa Ivan as CCDO.</p> <p>Mr. Walusimbi Andrew as Senior labour officer.</p> <p>Mr. Maganda Moses as Environment officer.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The construction works at Buwala seed school adhered to the MoES standard designs and specifications that was all structures were raised as required with 200mm thick solid blocks for a walling raised up to ring beam level.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of supervision reports for construction works at Buwala seed school.</p> <p>A progress report dated 3rd February 2023 for overall progress at 5% (excavation of trenches to receive foundation trenches).</p> <p>A site meeting for Buwala seed school was held on 14th March 2023 and was attended by the CAO , Director of the contracted company , project manager , environment officer , CDO ,RDC and the site engineer.</p> <p>A site meeting for the seed school that was held on 31st January 2023 works were still at a low pace of 6%.</p> <p>Monthly Report prepared on 2nd April 2023 for overall work progress at 25%.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of a report for construction of the staff house at Lubani primary school dated 21st February 2023 and this was after an inspection by the education officer, environment officer, CCDO , CIA, PAS and the project manager.</p> <p>An inspection report for a staff house at Wansimba and Lubani primary schools prepared on the 25th April 2023 , works were conforming to the standards and specifications for instance roofing by 26-gauge iron sheets..</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence for payments made for works done for all education projects implemented in the last financial year. Construction of Buwala seed school. The requisition for an advance payment was raised on 21st October 2022 for Ugx 572,049,079 and the voucher 1831844 of Ugx 432,400,000 was effected on 4th November 2022. A second request for payment was raised on 12th April 2023 of Ugx 1,150,098,158 for 40% works done by the contractor. An interim certificate of Ugx 393,533,119 was signed by the City Engineer, Ag CEO , CAO, CCDO and Environment officer. and Principal internal auditor on 16th May 2023 and the voucher 5868173 was effected on 15th June 2023. Construction of a staff house at Lubani primary school. The requisition was raised on 25th April 2023 by the contractor and the voucher 5297507 effected a payment of Ugx 28,246,108 on the 17th May 2023 for a certificate signed on 25th April 2023 by the City Engineer, Ag. CEO, CAO , City Engineer, CCDO and Environment officer.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There was evidence of a sector plan for the FY 22-23 submitted on 27th June 2022 for the education department. This submission was untimely	0

<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of complete procurement files for the sampled education projects as indicated below.</p> <p>Construction of Buwala seed secondary school.</p> <p>Procurement ref no. MoES / UgiFT / JINJ / wrks / 2021-2022 / 00005 Lot 38. The contract was signed with M/s .Semwo Construction company Ltd on 13th October 2022, An evaluation report was approved by the contracts committee on 25th February 2022 and the contract was awarded under Min . 000039/DCC/2021-2022 on 25th February 2022.</p> <p>Construction of a teacher's staff house at Lubani primary school.</p> <p>Procurement ref no. Jinj 511 / wrks / 22-23 / 00015 .The contract was signed with M/s . Crescent General Company Ltd on 19th December 2022 , An evaluation report was approved by the contracts committee on the 10th November 2022 and the contract was awarded under Min. 00008 / DCC / 2022-2023 (4) on 21st November 2022.</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Kigalagala primary school.</p> <p>Procurement ref no. Jinj 511 /wrks / 22-23 / 00062 . The contract agreement was signed on 1st March 2023 and the evaluation report was approved by the contracts committee on 10th February 2023. The contract was then awarded under Min. 00021 / DCC / 2022-2023 on 10th February 2023.</p> <p>Construction of a teachers house at Wansimba primary school.</p> <p>Procurement ref no. Jinj 511 / wrks / 2022-2023 / 00016 . The contract agreement was signed on 19th December 2022 with M/s . Gl.TI Consult Ltd .An evaluation report was approved by the committee on 30th November 2022 and contract awarded under Min. 00014 / DCC / 2022-2023 (5) on 30th November 2022.</p>
--	--	---

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 LG had a log for recording grievances which was in place which was opened on 1st/07/2022 and during the assessment the log was reviewed, it was noted that for the FY 2022/2023 under review, there was no grievance reported arising from the implementation of projects under the education sector.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG education department in collaboration with other departments disseminated education guidelines as required by MoES.</p> <p>The CDO in the report of 4th/07/2022 sensitised head teachers on social and health safeguards when projects were taken to their schools.</p>	3
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of incorporating costed ESMPs in the BoQs and contractual documents for the projects implemented in the FY2022/23 as shown below;</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX 820,000 was incorporated into the BoQs under bill No.3 preliminaries items A&B environmental, social and health safeguard for the construction of 5-stances of lined pit latrine at Nakanyonyi primary school.</p> <p>contractor: M/s Kalimuino (U) Ltd under procurement ref. No. JC854/WRKS/22-23/00064.</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX 820,000 was incorporated into the BoQs under bill No.3 preliminaries items A&B environmental, social and health safeguard for the construction of 5-stances of lined pit latrine at St. Paul Buyala primary school.</p> <p>contractor: M/s Medabil technical services Ltd under procurement ref. No. JC854/WRKS/22-23/00063.</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 for land ownership documents for where the Education projects were implemented in the FY 2022/23.</p> <p>The city was engaging the founding entities in regards to land consent for access to land for projects implementation</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	Monitoring reports for the construction of 5-stances of lined pit latrine at St. Paul Buyala primary school and Nakanyonyi primary school prepared by the City CDO and Natural resources officer on 3rd/05/2023 and 7th/06/2023 with recommendations such as site levelling, planting of grass and trees, identifying waste collection point and hoarding of the site.	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	E&S certificate issued for the construction of 5-stances of lined pit latrine at Nakanyonyi primary school, city CDO and Natural resources officer certified on 5th/06/2023 and payment was made on 13th/11/2023. Contractor: M/s Kalimuino (U) Ltd under procurement ref. No. JC854/WRKS/22-23/00064. E&S certificate issued for the construction of 5-stances of lined pit latrine at St. Paul Buyala primary school, city CDO and Natural resources officer certified on 7th/08/2023 and payment was made on 3rd/11/2023. Contractor: M/s Medabil technical services Ltd under procurement ref. No. JC854/WRKS/22-23/00063.	1

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>The assessment sampled and calculated the annual Delivery attendance for selected Health facilities using the monthly reports (HMIS107) as indicated below;</p> <p>1.Jinja main prison HC III FY 2021/2022 Deliveries: 22 cases, FY 2022/2023 Deliveries: 64 cases increase in utilisation = 42 % increase $42/22 \times 100 = 190\%$</p> <p>2.Gaddafi HC III FY 2021/2022 Deliveries; 35 cases, FY 2022/2023 Deliveries: 60 cases increase in utilisation = 25 % increase $25/35 \times 100 = 71\%$</p> <p>3.Jinja Police HCIII FY 2021/2022 Deliveries; 31 cases, FY 2022/2023 Deliveries: 41 cases increase in utilisation = 10 % increase $10/31 \times 100 = 41\%$</p> <p>From the above information there was evidence that there was increased utilisation in health care services by more than 20%.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 	<p>The assessment team reviewed the results from LLGs assessments for 2022 was 50% and 2023 was 100%. The average score for the two years therefore was 75%.</p>	2

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p>	<p>There was no implementation of RBF activities iduring the FY under review.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 		
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>From the ABPR for FY 2022/2023 approved by City Clerk on 20th July 2023, Jinja MLG budgeted and spent (Ugx 182,907.414) all the health development grant on eligible activities as indicated below;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Completion of General ward at Walukuba HCIV at UGX 81,956,220</p>	
			<p>Completion of General ward at Bugembe HCIV at UGX 90,951,194</p>	
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the CMO, CDO, Environment officer and City Engineer certified works before payments were made as indicated in the reviewed vouchers below;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>1. Payment Voucher NO. 58503036 amount Ugx 22,567,104 for the completion of Walukuba HC IV.</p>	
			<p>The contractor raised a request for payment on 8th May 2023, an interim certificate was endorsed by the City Engineer, City Health officer, Environment officer, CDO and the City clerk on 9th May 2023 and payment was effected on the 14th June 2023.</p>	
			<p>2. Payment Voucher NO. 58503039 amount UGX 46,098,189 to M/s. Inter-build Ltd for completion of ward at Bugembe HC IV. The contractor raised a request for payment on 2nd June 2023, an interim certificate was endorsed by the City Engineer , City Health officer , Environment officer , CDO and the City Town Clerk on 5th June 2023 and payment was effected on the 14th June 2023</p>	

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for variations in the prices of the health infrastructure projects implemented last financial year.</p> <p>Completion of a maternity ward at Bugembe HC IV.</p> <p>Contract sum = Ugx 90,951,194</p> <p>Engineers estimate = Ugx 91,885,420</p> <p>% variations = -1.02%</p> <p>Completion of male ward at Walukuba HC IV.</p> <p>Contract sum = Ugx 81,956,220</p> <p>Engineers estimate = Ugx 81,213,500</p> <p>% Variations = 0.91%.</p> <p>All variations were within +/-20%.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The city did not have any upgrading health centre facilities from II to III in the last financial year.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>There was evidence to confirm that Jinja City recruited staff for the (4) HC IVs and (5) HC IIIs as per the staffing structure dated 1st July 2023.</p> <p>Hence, HCII's had a ceiling of 95 and filled were 83, HC IV had 192 and filled were 164, implying,</p> 247×100 287 $= 86.1\%$ <p>This implied that 86.1% of positions of health workers for the available HC III's and HC IV's were filled</p>	1

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>The city did not have any upgrading of Health facilities from II to III during the previous financial year.</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The staff recruitment and deployment were verified at the three facilities below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bugembe HC IV, had 47 staff in number as per staff list compared to the 49 recommended by the Ministry of Health. 2. Jinja Central HC III, had 20 staff in number as per staff list out of 19 recommended by the MoH 3. Kimaka HC III, had 20 staff in number as per staff list out 19 recommended by the MoH <p>Thus, the information about health workers filled was accurate.</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have facilities upgraded 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 & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was evidence that the budgets were prepared by 31st March. As per sampled facilities below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). Mpumudde HC IV, prepared Annual workplan and budget for FY 2023/2024 by Dr. Kisira the Facility In-charge and submitted on 30th March 2023, 2). Jinja Central HC III, prepared the Annual workplan and budget by Sendyabane Henry a senior clinical Officer the facility in-charge on 31st March 2023 3). Muwumba HC III prepared the Annual workplan and budget by Namuganza Jennifer the Senior clinical officer the facility in-charge on 13th March 2023 	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

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 :

- Score 2 or else 0

From the sampled facilities, the BPR were prepared and submitted before the deadline of 15th July.

1). Budondo HC IV, was prepared and submitted on 10th July 2023 by the Facility In Charge

2) Bugembe HC IV ,

was prepared and submitted on 13th July 2023 by the facility In-charge

3) Mpumude HC IV,

was prepared and submitted on 9th July, 2023 by the facility In-charge

Therefore, there was enough evidence that the Health facilities prepared and submitted to the CHO the annual Budget Performance reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the current FY as per the Grant guidelines.

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

The LG provided evidence of development and implementation of facility Improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports which included,

At Wakittaka HC III, the issues were; Insecurity due to absence of a perimeter fence, inadequate staff and Accommodation, understaffing, Inadequate infrastructure

While at Budondo HC IV, the issues were Understaffing and inadequate infrastructure, and at

Bugembe HC IV, Understaffing and inadequate infrastructure were reported.

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

A review of the monthly and quarterly HMIS records by the assessment team, it was confirmed that Health facilities submitted reports within 7 days following the end of each month and quarter

Wakittaka HC III

The monthly submission dates are as follows: 5th August 2022, 6th September 2022, 5th October 2023, 6th November 2022, 5th December 2022, 5th January 2023, 5th February 2023, 2nd March 2023, 4th April 2023, 4th May 2023, 5th June 2023 and 6th July 2023.

The quarterly submissions were;

Q1 on 6th October, 2022,

Q2 on 6th January 2023,

Q3 on 6th April 2023

Q4 on 6th July 2023.

Mpumudde HC IV

The monthly submission dates were as follows: 5th August 2022, 5th September 2022, 5th October 2023, 6th November 2022, 6th December 2022, 6th January 2023, 5th February 2023, 5th March 2023, 5th April 2023, 6th May 2023, 5th June 2023 and 6th July 2023. The quarterly submission dates;

Q1 on 7th October, 2022,

Q2 on 7th January 2023,

Q3 on 7th April 2023

Q4 on 7th July 2023.

Bugembe HC IV

The monthly submission dates were as follows: 7th August 2022, 7th September 2022, 7th October 2023, 5th November 2022, 7th December 2022, 4th January 2023, 4th February 2023, 7th March 2023, 6th April 2023, 5th May 2023, 7th June 2023 and 7th July 2023. The quarterly submission dates;

Q1 on 6th October, 2022,

Q2 on 5th January 2023,

Q3 on 6th April 2023

Q4 on 6th July 2023.

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</p>	<p>There was no RBF activities during the financial under review and this was attributed to a letter from the ministry of health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all LG Accounting Officers highlighting the termination of RBF Funding was availed</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>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no RBF activities during the financial under review and this was attributed to a letter from the ministry of health dated 7th December 2022 addressed to all LG Accounting Officers highlighting the termination of RBF Funding was availed.</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>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 sector compiled and submitted all quarterly BPR for the financial year under review as indicated below;</p> <p>Q1, 15th October 2022</p> <p>Q2, 20th January 2023</p> <p>Q3, 17th April 2023</p> <p>Q4, 9th July 2023</p> <p>Therefore, the LG was complaint</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>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that LG developed PIP for the weakest performing Health facilities, PIPs developed included;</p> <p>Kimaka HC III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non observance of infection control • Staff absenteeism • Poor staff supervision <p>Muwumba HC III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of PPH/PET kits for emergence • Poor staff supervision by the in-charge • Perennial absenteeism by the in-charge 	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 of implementation of PIPs for Kimaka HC III and Muwumba HC III which included;</p> <p>Mentorship training for health facility staff done on 18th February, 2023</p> <p>A warning letter dated 9th June 2023 to facility in-charges regarding absenteeism</p> <p>Regular on spot supervision by, CHO</p>	1
---	--	--	---	----------

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was proof that Jinja MLG budgeted for the department of health workers in FY 2022/2023 as evidenced by the Jinja City Annual budget Vote 605 FY 2022/2023. The department of Health was allocated UGX 6,938,425,000 for 345 health workers.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	----------

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has: ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From Jinja MLG staff audit for health department, the approved structure was 356 health staff, the filled positions were 339, therefore the percentage deployment; $339/356 \times 100$. Giving 95.2% which was above the minimum requirement of 75%.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The assessment team sampled and visited 3 health facilities namely Bugembe HC IV, Budondo HC IV and Wakittaka HC III. A review of the duty roster and staff lists at the visited facilities revealed that health workers were working at their place of deployment for instance Waiswa Samuel, (Laboratory Assistant) was found working at Bugembe HC IV as reported by the Ag. City Health Officer deployment list, Lavaluka Richard, (SCO) at Wakittaka HC III and Nakamyuka Joweriah (Assistant Nursing Officer) at Budondo HC IV..</p>	3
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to prove the publicization of the health worker's deployment list right from the department of health at the City Headquarters and at the visited health facilities (Bugembe HC IV, Budondo HC IV and Wakittaka HC III) notice boards.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:

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

All Health Facility -In-Charges were appraised on time as shown below;

1. Musomba Joshua, (Enrolled Nurse) at Kyomya HC II was appraised by Shem Mutala (SCO) on 20/6/2023;

2. Kisira Charles Muyingo, (Enrolled Nurse) at Mpumudde HC IV was appraised by Banonya Steven, (SMO) on 23/6/2023;

3. Namuganza Jenipher, (SCO) at Jinja Central HC III was appraised by Dr. Isabirye Hamuza (Medical Officer) on 29/06/2023;

4. Lavaluka Richard, (SCO) at Wakitaka HC III was appraised by Dr. Kairanga Moses (Medical Officer) on 30/06/2023;

5. Babirye Catherine, (Enrolled Nurse) at Musiima HC II was appraised by Nakamyuka Joweriah (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 7/06/2023;

6 . Babirye Miria, (Enrolled Nurse) at Lwanda HC II was appraised by Lavaluka Richard, (SCO) on 22/06/2023;

7. Nseizere Mutala Shem, (SCO) at Lukolo HC III was appraised by Dr. Muwanguzi Daniel (SMO) on 22/6/2023;

8. Kulwenza Joyce, (Enrolled Nurse) at Nawangoma HC II was appraised by Nseizere Mutala Shem, (SCO) on 26/06/2023;

9. Isabirye Hamuza, (Medical Officer) at Walukuba HC IV was appraised by Dr. Banonya Steven (SMO) on 8/06/2023;

10. Boror Tomas, (Enrolled Nurse) at Kisima HC II was appraised by Bogere Joy, (Nursing Officer) on 7/06/2023.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

All health facility workers were appraised by Health Facility -In-Charges on time as shown below;

1. Kalabano Joshua, (Enrolled Nurse) at Maseseport HC II was appraised by Konso Rebecca (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 22/6/2023;

2. Mugiire Rebecca Mbeiza, (Enrolled Nurse) at Mpumudde HC IV was appraised by Alitwala Annet, (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 31/3/2023;

3. Nabirye Ruth, (Enrolled Nurse) at Mpumudde HC IV was appraised by Mwebaze Annet (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 5/06/2023;

4 .Tumwakire Calmel, (Enrolled Midwife) at Kimaka HC III was appraised by Mwesige Charles (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 7/06/2023;

5. Mwesigye Charles, (Assistant Nursing Officer) at Kimaka HC II was appraised by Muweta Juma (SMCO) on 7/06/2023;

6. Bwizanganya Sandra, (Enrolled Nurse) at Jinja Central HC III was appraised by Katusime Merab, (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 14/06/2023;

7. Waiswa Samuel, (Laboratory Assistant) at Bugembe HC IV was appraised by Muzira Benard (SMO) on 4/6/2023;

8. Kirago Rogers, (Enrolled Nurse) at Kimaka HC III was appraised by Mwesigye Charles, (Assistant Nursing Officer) on 5/06/2023;

9.Namwebya Asia, (Enrolled Nurse) at Buwenda HC III was appraised by Lualuka Richard, (SCO) on 30/06/2023;

10. Kyankoza Denis, (Enrolled Nurse) at Kyomya HC II was appraised by Mutala Sam, (SCO) on 7/06/2023.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Evidence showed that Health Facility in-charges and other health workers were on 27/1/2023 trained in waste management using Private Public Partnership strategy in Jinja City.

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>Evidence showed that Health Facility in-charges and other health workers were on 27th/1/2023 trained in waste management using Private Public Partnership strategy in Jinja City.</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 that the LG conducted continuous professional training of Health workers as per the following reports.</p> <p>Training report on essential maternal and newborn care guidelines dated 31st May, 2023</p> <p>Training report on integrated management of newborn/childhood illnesses dated 25th August, 2022</p> <p>Training report on malaria in pregnancy guidelines dated 22nd September, 2022</p> <p>Training report on immunisation in practice dated 14th October, 2022</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 a letter written by the Town Clerk Jinja MLG to the PS ministry of Health dated 7th September 2022 mentioning Health facilities benefitting from PHC Non-wage recurrent grants namely Bugembe HC IV, Walukuba HC IV, Mpumudde HC IV, Budondo HC IV, Jinja Central prison HC III, Kimaka HC III, Wakitaka HC III, Lukolo HC III</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>According to the Annual work plan of Jinja MLG Vote 605 for FY 2022/2023, the total Budget for health department was Ugx 20,822,048</p> <p>The monitoring of health services was allocated Shillings Ugx 6,200,000</p> <p>Thus the percentage allocation was $6,200,000/20,822,048 * 100 = 29.7\%$ which was above the 15 percent minimum</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Timely warranting of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY was done as indicated below.</p> <p>Q1 cash limit date was 25th July 2022, and warranting was on 25th July, 2022, same day</p> <p>Q2 cash limit date was 7th October 2022 and warranting was 13th October, 2022, after 4 working days</p> <p>Q3 cash limit date was 5th January 2023, and warranting was on 10th January, 2023 , after 4 working days</p> <p>Q4 cash limit date was 17th April 2023 and warranting was 18th April, 2023, after 1 working day</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Invoicing and Communication for Q3 and Q4 were done beyond 5 working days as indicated below;</p> <p>Q1 cash release date was 25th July 2022, and Invoicing and communication was on 25th July 2022</p> <p>Q2 cash release date was 14th October 2022 and Invoicing and communication was 18th October 2022</p> <p>Q3 cash release date was 10th January 2023, and invoicing and communication was on 30th January 2023, after 13 working days</p> <p>Q4 cash release date was 28th April 2023 and Invoicing and communication was on 30th May 2023, after 20 working days</p> <p>There LG was not compliant on this indicator</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG publicised all the quarterly financial releases to all the health facilities as below,</p> <p>Quarter 1 cash limit date was 25th July, 2022 and publishing was done on 25th July, 2022,</p> <p>Quarter 2 cash limit date was done on 18th October, 2022, date of publicising was 18th October, 2022,</p> <p>Quarter3 cash limit date was on 30th January, 2023 and date of publishing was 30th January, 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 cash limit date was 30th May, 2023 and date of publicising was 30th May, 2023.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>No documentary evidence was availed to the assessment team for review.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>As per minutes of quarterly performance review meetings reviewed by the assessment team, all in charges and other stakeholders participated as follows;</p> <p>Q1 dated 29th September 2022; participants included all HC in-charges, City councillors, MHO, municipal mayor, plan international, MJAP, UHA</p> <p>Q2 dated 29th December 2022; participants included all HC in-charges, City councillors, MHO, municipal mayor, UHA, MJAP, MRA</p> <p>Q3 dated 28th March 2023; participants included all HC in-charges, City councillors, MHO, municipal mayor, M2M, MJAP</p> <p>Q4 dated 30th June 2023; participants included all HC in-charges, City councillors, MHO, municipal mayor, UHA,MJAP</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There were reports on the joint supervision visits conducted in the health facilities and here examples included;</p> <p>Q1 support supervision report dated 29th September 2022.</p> <p>Q2 support supervision report dated 28th December 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 3 support supervision report dated 3rd January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter 4 support supervision report dated 30th June 2023.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There were reports on the joint supervision visits conducted in the health facilities and here examples included;</p> <p>Q1 support supervision report dated 29th September 2022 and health facilities supervised included; Gaddafi HC III, Kimaka HC III, Jinja police HC III among others.</p> <p>Q2 support supervision report dated 28th December 2022 and health facilities supervised included; Jinja police HC III, Gaddafi HC III among others.</p> <p>Quarter 3 support supervision report dated 3rd January 2023 and health facilities supervised included Kimaka HC III, Jinja police HC III among others.</p> <p>Quarter 4 support supervision report dated 30th June 2023 and health facilities supervised included Jinja Police HC III, Gaddafi HC III and Kimaka HC III.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City Council provided evidence as follows;</p> <p>Q1 report dated 28th/09/2022 with recommendations such as duty schedules be developed and displayed on notice boards, all facilities to have schedules for health education, all facilities to have referral directories.</p> <p>Q2 report dated 20th /12/2022 with recommendations like Budondo and Bugembe HC IVs to improve on screening for TB/HIV, prenatal death reviews to be conducted in all health facilities.</p> <p>Q3 report dated 28th/3/2023 with recommendations like staff to adhere to professional code of conduct/practice, facilities to procure basic equipment for examinations.</p> <p>Q4 report dated 10th April 2023 with recommendations like facilities to utilise photographs for monitoring labour.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The City provided quarterly support supervision in the management of medicines and health supplies as evidenced by the Municipal quarterly support supervision report listed below;</p> <p>Q1 compiled on 15th September 2022,</p> <p>Q2 compiled on 9th December 2022,</p> <p>Q3 compiled on 12th March 2023,</p> <p>Q4 compiled on 13th June 2023.</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the approved BPR for Jinja City Council for previous FY 2022/2023;</p> <p>Total allocation to CHO's office was Ugx 20,822,048. The amount allocated for health promotion and prevention was Ugx 8,622,048 giving a percentage of 41%. Therefore, City was compliant.</p>	2

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the CHT held health promotion activities as evidenced by the reports below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report dated 6th August 2022 on community engagement with city stakeholders to increase awareness of KP/PP interventions to increase service delivery • Report dated 15th January 2023 on community engagement to increase awareness of HIV and STI prevention among the youth • Report dated 17th November 2022 on community TB screening and diagnosis management 	1
----	---	--	--	---

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>This was evidenced through;</p> <p>Follow up report on community TB screening dated 29th November 2022</p> <p>A follow up report on STIs/HIV prevention among youth dated 30th March 2023.</p> <p>A follow up report on community engagement with stakeholders on KK/PP awareness dated 30th August 2022.</p>	1
----	---	--	--	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The assets register for Jinja City department of health last updated on 5th July 2023 was reviewed by the assessment team and included the following items; 1 refrigerator, 4 laptops among others</p>	1
----	--	--	---	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>According to a report dated 15th/04/2022, the Desks appraisal exercise was conducted by the City officials for all the budgets in the budget conference of FY 2022/2023. In the forms used in the exercise the officers committed themselves by marking “yes” to indicate that the Health projects were derived from the city Development Plan (DDP III) on page 118 to 120. Also for the Health projects were eligible according to the investment menu captured on pages 5 and 6 of the Sector Planning and Budgeting guidelines. The Health sector projects were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Completion of a ward at Bugembe HC IV phase 2 ● Completion of Male ward at Walukuba HC IV and purchase of solar system 	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The City officials conducted a field appraisal for all the Health projects as evidenced by a report dated 18th/04/2022. The screening form for the completion construction of general ward at Bugembe HC IV in the Northern Division prepared on 18th/04/2022 by the Natural resources officer and the city CDO was assessed. In the report the officers in regard to the Health projects pronounced themselves that the technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and the projects were all feasible.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Screening form for the completion construction of general ward at Bugembe HC IV in the northern division prepared on 18th/04/2022 by the Natural resources officer and the City CDO and costed ESMP of Ugx 2,000,000 with identified impacts such as; vegetation clearance, accidents, and public safety and waste generation. mitigation measures identified such as; proper waste disposal, providing PPE to workers, re-grass bare surfaces, and installing signage prepared on 18th/04/2022.</p> <p>Screening form for the completion construction of general ward at Bugembe Walukuba HC IV in the southern division prepared on 18th/04/2022 by the Natural resources officer and the city CDO and costed ESMP of Ugx 2,000,000 with identified impacts such as vegetation clearance, accidents, and public safety and waste generation. mitigation measures identified such as; proper waste disposal, provide PPE to workers, re-grass bare surfaces, and install signage prepared on 18th/04/2022.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a timely submission of the health sector plan on 27th April, 2023 by Dr. Banonya Steven indicating;</p> <p>Construction of water borne at Walukuba HC IV at Ugx 35,000,000.</p> <p>Construction of a water -borne toilet at Bugembe HC IV of Ugx 35,000,000</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence for submission of a requisition form1 on the 30th August, 2023 for investments for the health department like; construction of water borne at Walukuba HC IV at Ugx 35,000,000 and construction of a water -borne toilet at Bugembe HC IV of Ugx 35,000,000.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 of the contracts committee approving health projects as shown below.</p> <p>Completion of a ward at Bugembe HC IV phase 2 was approved by the contracts committee under Min. JC-CC/028/22 (b) on 2nd December, 2022</p> <p>Completion of Male ward at Walukuba HC IV and purchase of solar system was approved under Min. JC-CC/028/22(c) on 22nd December, 2022.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence of an appointment by the City Town Clerk on the 20th January 2023 all health projects as shown below.</p> <p>Dr. Banonya Stephen as the project manager</p> <p>Eng. Nyende Ramathan as the contract manager</p> <p>Mr. Musuza Geoffrey as CDO</p> <p>Mr. Nabihamba Ernest as the environment officer</p> <p>Ms. Kagoya Annet as Labour officer</p> <p>Ms. Nabirye Lydia (Clerk of works)</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>The City did not have a health facility upgrade of HC II to HC III.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The City did not have a health facility upgrade of HC II to HC III.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0	The City didn't have any HC II to HC III upgrading facility.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0	There was evidence of a supervision report dated 16th August 2023 for the completion of the ward at Walukuba HC IV indicating 80% work progress, the report also indicated an extension of 61 days as requested by the contractor.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score	A supervision report for the maternity ward at Bugembe HC IV indicated works as complete and the structure was functional. Works done in the last phase included floor screening and tile fixing , installation of UMEME and solar system , fixing door and window frame shutters plus glazing.	

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

There was evidence to show whether payments were made within required time frames.

Completion of Walukuba HC IV.

An interim certificate was endorsed by the City Engineer, City Health officer, Environment officer, CDO and the City Town Clerk on 9th May 2023 of Ugx 22,567,104. This was effected under voucher 58503036 for an amount of Ugx 21,213,078 on the 14th June 2023. The interim certificate of Ugx 34,449,768 was signed on 15th August 2023 and was effected on the 17th August 2023 with a voucher of Ugx 32,193,408 .

The last interim certificate of Ugx 12,197,268 was endorsed on 4th September 2023 and the payment effected on 7th September 2023.

Completion of ward at Bugembe HC IV.

A requisition was raised on 2nd June 2023 of Ugx 73,558,094 by M/s. Interbuild Ltd and the certificate of Ugx 46,098,189 signed by the City natural officer, City health officer , City engineer, City community development officer and the city clerk for 56.2% of works done.

The requisition for payment was raised on 2nd August 2023 for Ugx 39,827,262 and an interim certificate was of Ugx 19,341,065 signed by the project manager, CNRO, CHO, City engineer and City clerk on 8th August 2023 for 79.8% works done, the payment was then effected on 23rd August 2023.

The requisition of Ugx 18,377,585 was raised on 28th August 2023 by the contractor and the certificate of Ugx 11,253,928 for 100% works done was signed on 30th August 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>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of complete procurement files for the health projects as shown below.</p> <p>Completion of ward at Bugembe HC IV.</p> <p>Procurement ref no. JC854/WRKS/ 22-23/00061. The contract was signed on 31st January 2023 with M/s. Interbuild Technical services Ltd, the evaluation report was approved by the contracts committee on 22nd December 2022 and the contract was awarded under Min. JC-CC028/22 (b) on 22nd December 2022.</p> <p>Completion of male ward at Walukuba HC IV.</p> <p>Procurement ref no. JC854/wrks/ 22-23/00062 on 22nd December 2022 , evaluation report was approved by the contracts committee on 22nd December 2022 and was awarded under Min . JC-CC028/22(c) on 22nd December 2022.</p>	1
----	--	---	---	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a centralised grievances log opened on 1st/07/2023 at the LG for the FY 2022/2023 under review where grievances were recorded, investigated and responded to, the log of grievances was reviewed and there was no grievance reported resulting from health projects implementation.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>From the sampled health centres such as;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wakitaka HC III 2. Bugembe HC IV 3. Budondo HC IV <p>there was evidence of medical waste guidelines titled “National guidelines for WASH in health care facilities 2022” and “Uganda national infection prevention and control guidelines 2013”</p>	2

15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0	The health facilities had functional health care waste bins and placenta pits, waste pits M/s Green Label Services Ltd was contracted by MoH with funding from USAID to collect waste, transport and safe disposal arising from voluntary male medical circumcision (VMMC) maternal New-born and child health (MNCH) and care and treatment (C&T) activities at Health Centres IVs and IIIs that generate higher volumes of waste and there was evidence of waste collection forms dated	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure		17th/02/2023, 15th/03/2023, 19th/04/2023, 17th/05/2023 and 22nd/06/2023.	
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence availed of training medical workers on medical waste management by the time of the assessment for carried out on 25th/01/2023 and in attendance were health workers as below; 1. Dr. Wakonda Najoma - Medical officer Walukaba HC IV 2. Mutyabule Fred a registered Nurse Musima HC II 3. Kyankola Denis a registered Nurse Kyomya HC II 4. Namwebya Ashia an Enrolled Nurse Buwendda HC III 5. Kisira Charles a Medical officer Mpumdde 6. Muweta Juma a SMCO Kakira HC III Musomba Joshua a Enrolled Nurse Kibibi HC II	1
	Maximum 5 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	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 were costed ESMPs for health projects for the FY 2022/2023 and were incorporated in contract documents and BoQs seen for the health investments;</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX. 1,200,000 for the completion construction of the general ward at Bugembe HCIV was incorporated into the contract documents and BoQ under Bill No. 3: external works item B environmental mitigation measures</p> <p>procurement Ref No. JC854/WRKS/22-23/00061</p> <p>Contractor: M/S Inter Build Technical Services Ltd</p> <p>A costed ESMP of UGX. 1,700,000 for the completion construction of the general ward at Walukuba HCIV was incorporated into the contract documents and BoQ under Bill No. 3: external works item B environmental mitigation measures</p> <p>procurement Ref No. JC854/WRKS/22-23/00062</p> <p>Contractor: M/S Wakanira Investments Co. Ltd</p>	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	<p>Land title for Walukuba HCIV for where there was completion works of the general ward; Freehold registration volume JJA 350 FOLIO 6 on block (Road) Menya plots 51 and 32-40 at Walukuba west measuring 1.2900 hectares issued on 27th/07/2017.</p> <p>However, there was no land documentary ownership evidence for Bugembe HC IV as there was a claim that the City was about to fully receive all the documents from the District that formerly occupied and used the the land.</p>	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.	Monitoring reports for the completion of the General ward at Bugembe HCIV conducted by the Natural resources officer and city CDO on 1st/06/2023 and 4th/08/2023 with recommendations such as removal of construction waste, site levelling and planting grass around the site.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Monitoring reports for the completion of the General ward at Walukuba HCIV conducted by the Natural resources officer and city CDO on 1st/06/2023 and 4th/08/2023 with recommendations such as removal of construction waste, site levelling and planting grass around the site.	
			There was delayed execution of works under the health sector.	
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the E&S Certificates for the implemented Health investments were fully signed by the Environment Officer and Community Development Officer prior to payment of contractors as in the examples below;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		E&S certificate issued for the completion construction of the general ward at Bugembe HC IV, Under procurement Ref No. JC854/WRKS/22-23/00061	
			Contractor: M/s. Inter Build Technical Services Ltd, the City CDO and the natural resources officer certified works for payment on 8th/08/2023 and payment was made on 23rd/08/2023. There was delayed execution of works under the health sector and late payment	
			E&S certificate issued for the completion construction of the general ward at Walukuba HC IV Under procurement Ref No. JC854/WRKS/22-23/00062. Contractor: M/S Wakanira Investments Co. Ltd, the City CDO and the Natural Resources Officer certified works for payment on 9th/05/2023 and payment was made on 14th/06/2023.	

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

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

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

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

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

Human Resource Management and Development

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

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

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines. <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If 60-79: Score 1 • If below 60 %: Score 0 	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>	Not applicable	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 95% and above of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-94% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	Not applicable	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	Not applicable	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	Not applicable	0
10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	Not applicable	0

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

Investment Management

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Environment and Social Requirements

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

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

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

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

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

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

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
	Maximum score 6			

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	Not Applicable	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable	0

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

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

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

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

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

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

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
----	--	---	----------------	----------

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

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

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

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

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0

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

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	Not applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Not applicable	0

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

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of City Finance Officer was substantively filled by Kifafi Ronald appointed on 1/03/2023 under MIN NO.008/JCSC/2023 (i).	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	The City Planner, (Kayongo Christine) was substantively appointed on 11/01/2023 under MIN NO.017/JCSC/2022 (i).	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.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	The post of city Engineer was not substantively filled and there was no evidence of a seconded staff from central government. However, Ereemye David, a substantive Principal Engineer appointed on 30th/11/2023 under Min. No. 023/JCDSC/2022(i) was assigned extra duties of City Engineer on 26th/04/2023 when he was a Senior Engineer, Civil.	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	Nabihamba Ernest was the substantively appointed City Natural Resources Officer with effect from 11/01/2023 under Min. No.008/JCDSC/2022(ii)	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.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The position of city Production Officer was not substantively filled and there was no evidence of a seconded staff from central government. However, Kasuku Aron, a substantive Senior Veterinary Officer appointed on 11/01/2023 under Min. No. 015/JCDSC/2022(i) was assigned extra duties of City Production Officer effective 3/8/2023.	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	Muzusa Geoffrey was the substantively appointed City Community Development Officer with effect from 11/01/2023 under Min. No.008/JCSC/2022 (i).	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 not substantively filled and there was no evidence of a seconded staff from central government. However, Kubwoyo Rodgers Ttembo, a substantive Principal Commercial Officer appointed on 11/01/2023 under Min. No. 02/JCDSC/2022(i) was assigned extra duties of City Commercial Officer effective 8/8/2023.	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.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	Ms. Nabwonso Janet was the substantively appointed Principal Procurement Officer with effect from 11/01/2023 under Min. No.009/JCDSC/2022(v).	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	Jinja City staff establishment structure dated 26th July, 2022 provided for a position of Senior Procurement Officer. However the position was vacant at the time of assessment.	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 by Ms. Wampande Aisha appointed on 1/03/2023 under MIN NO.008/JCSC/2023(ii).	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	Jinja City staff establishment structure dated 26th July, 2022 provided for a position of Principal Environment Officer. Ms. Kakaire Victoria (Principal Environment Officer) was appointed on 13/2.2023 under Min.No. 029/JCSC/2022 (i).	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	Jinja City staff establishment structure dated 26th July, 2022 traded off the of the Senior Land Management Officer for a position of Principal Land Management Officer. However the position of the Prncipal Land Management Officer was vacant at the time of assessment and there was no formal secondment from MoLHUD to fill the position.	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.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Accountant, (Lukalango Joseph) was substantively appointed on 18/01/2023 under MIN NO.025/JCSC/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.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The position of Principal Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Naigaga Juliet appointed on 11/01/2023 under MIN NO.023/JCSC/2022(ii).	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was substantively filled by Mr. Maali Samuel appointed on 16/04/2023 under MIN NO.117/JCSC/2023(i).	2
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	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).	Jinja City staff establishment structure dated 26/07/2022 provided for the positions of Deputy Division Town Clerks who were substantively appointed as follows: 1. Kasowole Joy, (Southern division) was appointed on 11/01/2023 under Min. No. 018/JCSC/2022 (ii). 2. Kyangwa Mercy, (Northern division) was appointed on 11/01/2023 under Min. No. 018/JCSC/2022 (iii).	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.	Jinja City staff establishment structure dated 26/07/2022 provided for the positions of Senior CDO's who were substantively appointed as follows: 1. Baligeya Angella, (Southern Division) was appointed on 18/01/2023 under Min. No. 001/JCSC/2023 (i). 2. Tamubula Olivia, (Northern Division) was appointed on 11/01/2023 under Min. No. 016/JCSC/2022 (i).	5
Maximum score is 15				
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.	Jinja City staff establishment structure dated 26/07/2022 provided for the positions of Senior Accountants and Principal Treasurers who were substantively appointed as follows: 1. Nnume Yasin Abubaker, Principal Treasurer, (Southern Division) was appointed on 18/01/2023 under Min. No. 025/JCSC/2022 (i). 2. Kasiko Penda Naaibale, Senior Accountant, (Northern Division) was appointed on 18/01/2023 under Min. No. 025/JCSC/2022 (xvi).	5
Maximum score is 15				

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: a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the City Council released 100% of the funds allocated to the Natural Resources Department in the FY 2022/2023, the amount warranted was UGX. 384,765,962 and the department received 100% of the warranted amount UGX. 384,765,962 as indicated on page 16 of the draft financial statement ended 30th/06/2023 FY 2022/23 approved by the city town clerk on 30th/08/2023.	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: b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	There was evidence that the City Council released 100% of the funds allocated to the Community Based Services Department in the FY 2022/2023, the amount warranted was UGX. 196,270,916 and the department received 100% of the warranted amount UGX. 196,270,916 as indicated on page 16 of the draft financial statement ended 30th/06/2023 FY 2022/23 approved by the City Town Clerk on 30th/08/2023.	2
Maximum score is 4				

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening form for rehabilitation of Clive and Clark road 1.89km, Bell avenue east and west 1.466km, completion of Busoga avenue 0.782km and drainage works 1.782km located in Jinja City prepared by the Natural Resource officer and City CDO on 15th/04/2022 to ascertain the magnitude of impacts and what assessment level was required. After screening was carried out, the project required an ESIA in reference to the National Environment Act No.5 2019 schedule 5 section 1 sub-section a(i)	4
	Maximum score is 12			
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),	There was an evidence of an ESIA for the proposed rehabilitation of Clive and Clark road 1.89km, Bell avenue east and west 1.466km, completion of Busoga avenue 0.782km and drainage works 1.782km located in Jinja City and was submitted to NEMA on 7th/07/2023 awaiting approval and issuance of the EIA certificate.	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 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.	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;	There was evidence availed for the rehabilitation of Clive and Clark road 1.89km, Bell avenue east and west 1.466km, completion of Busoga avenue 0.782km and drainage works 1.782km which was approved on 19th/08/2022 after review by the Client (Jinja city) and the supervising consultant (professional engineering Company PEC). Contractor: M/S Zhongmei engineering group Ltd. contract No.JC854/USMID/WRKS/21-22/00057.	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

Financial management and reporting

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;	Jinja City obtained Unqualified audit opinion in respect of its operations during the FY 2022/2023.	10
	Maximum score is 10	If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5		
		If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0		
6	Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).	If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),	The City provided information to the PS/ST of MoFPED on the status of implementation of Auditor General's findings for FY 2021/2022 through a letter Ref. CR/251/1 of 24th/2/2023 and received on 28th/2/2023 by stamping. This was before the end of February as required by PFMA.112g.	10
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.		
7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,	The Annual Performance Contract for FY 2023/2024 was submitted to MoFPED via PBS on 30th/6/2023 before August 31st. For this matter the LG was compliant.	4
	Maximum Score 4	score 4 or else 0.		
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	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,	The Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 was submitted to MoFPED on 8th/8/2023, a date before August 31st as required thus the City was compliant.	4
	maximum score 4 or else 0	score 4 or else 0.		

Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,

score 4 or else 0.

All the four quarterly budget performance reports for FY 2022/2023 were submitted to MoFPED through PBS as follows: 1st Qrt. report submitted on 26th/10/2022, 2nd Qrt. report on 31st/1/2023, 3rd Qrt. on 27th/4/2023 and 4th Qrt. The report was submitted on 8th/8/2023. Since all the four reports were in by August, 2023, the City was compliant with this requirement.

Education Minimum Conditions

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <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 the City Education Officer (CEO) was not substantively filled there was no formal secondment to fill the position. Mr. Haruna Muloopa the Ag. CEO was a substantively appointed Senior Education Officer. He was appointed on 11th/01/2023 under minute JCSC Min. No. 024/JCSC/2022 (ii) and was assigned duties of Ag. CEO by City Town Clerk Mr. Lwanga Edward on 8th/08/2023 vide letter Ref. No. CR/C/10780.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	Jinja City staff establishment structure dated 26/07/2022 provided for one position of the City Inspector of Schools The City had substantively filled the inspectorate department. Ms/ Muteesi Aminah the Senior Inspector of Schools was appointed on 8th/01/2028 as was directed by Min. No. 467/JDSC/2027	40
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) <i>The Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening form for the construction of 5-stances of lined pit latrine at Nakanyonyi Primary School in Northern division was prepared by the City CDO and the Natural Resources Officer and a costed ESMP of Ugx.2,000,000 which identified impacts such as west generation, accidents, vegetation clearance, and mitigations such as site hoarding, limit vegetation clearance, provide PPE to the workers, and first aid kit prepared by the city CDO and the natural resources officer on 4th/04/2022. Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening form for the construction of 5-stances of lined pit latrine at St. Paul Buyala Primary School in Northern Division prepared by the City CDO and the Natural Resources Officer and a costed ESMP of Ugx.2,000,000 which identified impacts such as west generation, accidents, vegetation clearance, and mitigations such as site hoarding, limit vegetation clearance, provide PPE to the workers, and first aid kit prepared by the City CDO and the Natural Resources Officer on 4th/04/2022.	15

2

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

If the LG carried out:

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

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

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

The Maximum score is 30

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

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

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
	<i>Applicable to Districts only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	<p>The position of City Health Officer was not substantively filled and there was no evidence of a seconded staff from central Government.</p> <p>However, Dr. Banonya Stephen, a substantive Senior Medical Officer appointed on 12/06/2015 under Min. No.567/JDSC/2015 was assigned extra duties of city Health Officer effective 8/8/2023.</p>	0
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	The position of Principal Health Inspector was substantively filled by Ms. Mudondo Grace who was appointed on 7th May, 2018 as was directed by CSC 220/JDSC/2018.	20
	<i>Applicable to MCs only.</i>			
	<i>Maximum score is 70</i>			

1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0</p>	<p>The position of Senior Health Educator was substantively filled by Kalume Saidi appointed on 11/01/2023 under Min. No. 022/JCSC/2022(v).</p>	20
---	--	---	---	-----------

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Screening form for the completion construction of general ward at Bugembe HC IV in the northern division prepared on 18th/04/2022 by the Natural resources officer and the city CDO and costed ESMP of Ugx 2,000,000 with identified impacts such as; vegetation clearance, accidents, and public safety and waste generation. Mitigation measures identified such as; proper waste disposal, providing PPE to workers, regrass bare surfaces and installing signage prepared on 18th/04/2022.</p> <p>Screening form for the completion construction of general ward at Bugembe Walukuba HC IV in the Southern Division prepared on 18th/04/2022 by the Natural Resources Officer and the city CDO and costed ESMP of Ugx 2,000,000 with identified impacts such as; vegetation clearance, accidents, and public safety and waste generation. Mitigation measures identified such as; proper waste disposal, provide PPE to workers, re-grass bare surfaces, and install signage prepared on 18th/04/2022.</p>	15
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was no requirement for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for the health projects, this was in reference to the National environment Act 2019 schedule 4, part 2 sections (4) sub-section (e) of which categorised them as small projects that required ESMPs after screening and had minimal impacts.</p> <p>The environmental and social measures were identified and mitigated in the ESMPs.</p>	15

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	Not applicable	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.	Not applicable	0

**Water & Environment Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Not Applicable	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Not Applicable	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	Not applicable	0

2

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

c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0. Not applicable

0