



LGMSD 2022/23

Kyotera District

(Vote Code: 621)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	48%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	70%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	80%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	59%
Educational Performance Measures	73%
Health Performance Measures	47%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	70%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	85%

**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 evidence that the infrastructure project implemented using DDEG funding was functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project:</p> <p>In the previous FY, the district planned for only one project under DDEG (Pg. 19 of the Approved Budget) which was the construction of the District Administration Block at UGX 71,035,000. This had been implemented and was 100% complete as reported on Pg. 10 of the Annual Performance Report.</p>	4

N23_Service Delivery Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

There was evidence that the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased by 9% from previous assessment.

- 1 Kyotera Town Council improved by 32% from 53% to 85%;
 - 2 Mutukula Town Council improved by 16% from 66% to 82%;
 - 3 Kalisizo Town Council improved by 11% from 70% to 81%;
 - 4 Kasaali Town Council improved by 5% from 66% to 71%;
 - 5 Kirumba Subcounty improved by 32% from 61% to 70%;
 - 6 Lwankoni Subcounty improved by 13% from 50% to 63%;
 - 7 Kasensero Town Council improved by 10% from 51% to 61%;
 - 8 Kalisizo Subcounty declined by 7% from 67% to 60%;
 - 9 Kyebe Subcounty improved by 17% 43% to 60%;
 - 10 Kabira Subcounty improved by 5% from 53% to 58%;
 - 11 Kasasa Subcounty improved by 6% from 51% to 57%;
 - 12 Nangoma Subcounty improved by 4% from 51% to 55%;
 - 13 Kakuuto Subcounty remained static at 53%; and
 - 14 Nabigasa Subcounty was static at 50%
- Average Score improved by 9% from 56% to 65%

N23_Service Delivery Performance

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.

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

There was evidence that the DDEG funded investment project implemented in the previous FY was completed as per the annual performance report of the FY.

In the previous FY, the district planned for only one project under DDEG (Pg. 19 of the Approved Budget) which was the construction of the District Administration Block at UGX 71,035,000. This had been implemented and the phase was 100% complete as reported on Pg. 10 of the Annual Performance Report.

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	<p>There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG of UGX 383,767,000 for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines as reported on Pg.4 of the Fourth Quarter Report:</p> <p>In the previous FY, the district planned for only one infrastructure project under DDEG (Pg. 19 of the Approved Budget) which was the construction of the District Administration Block at UGX 71,035,000. This had been implemented and was 100% complete as reported on Pg. 10 of the Annual Performance Report.</p> <p>The district also implemented the following:</p> <p>Investment Servicing costs, (participatory planning, site verification, and environment screening, desks and field appraisal, BoQ preparation) UGX 6,038,439;</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation of implemented projects UGX 12,000,000;</p> <p>Procurement of 2 Laptops (D/Planner and Economist/Planner) UGX 8,500,000;</p> <p>Procurement of a Desktop computer for CAO's Office UGX 3,500,000; and</p> <p>Procurement of office carpets for the office of the Vice District Chairperson and the DIA UGX 1,000,000</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	<p>There was evidence that the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on District Administration Block. The District budgeted Ugx 71,035,000 as final payment for the construction and spent Ugx 71,035,000 and hence variation was 0%.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,</p> <p>score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Three LLGs of Kyotera TC, Kasasa and Nabigasa Sub Counties were sampled to establish whether information on their filled positions was accurate.</p> <p>Kasasa SC staff list had 12 filled positions and the staff list obtained from the HR division had 10. Nabigasa SC staff list had 11 filled positions and the staff list obtained from the HR. Division had 11. Kyotera TC staff list had 19 filled positions and the staff list obtained from the HR division 19</p> <p>Information on the filled positions in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was not accurate</p>	0
4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG was in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <p>In the previous FY, the district planned for only one project under DDEG (Pg. 19 of the Approved Budget) which was the construction of the District Administration Block at UGX 71,035,000. This had been implemented and was 100% complete as reported on Pg. 10 of the Annual Performance Report.</p>	2
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise according to the data provided by OPM below:</p> <p>1 Lwankoni SC: the LG Assessors scored 63%, and IVA Scored 88%, variance of +25%, Not Credible;</p> <p>2 Kyotera TC: the LG Assessors scored 85%, and IVA Scored 87%, variance of +02%, Credible;</p> <p>3 Nabigasa SC: the LG Assessors scored 50%, and IVA Scored 56% , variance of +6% , Credible ; and</p> <p>4 Kasasa SC: the LG Assessors scored 57%, and IVA Scored 75%, variance of +18%, Not Credible</p>	0
		<p>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p>		

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.	<p>There was no evidence that the District has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>The average score was 65% and the following LLGs scored below average:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Lwankoni Subcounty 63%; 2 Kasensero Town Council 61%; 3 Kalisizo Subcounty 60%; 4 Kyebe Subcounty 60%; 5 Kabira Subcounty 58%; 6 Kasasa Subcounty 57%; 7 Nangoma Subcounty 55%; 8 Kakuuto Subcounty 53%; and 9 Nabigasa Subcounty 50% 	0
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0			
5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:	<p>There was no evidence that the District has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY (since there was no PIP developed):</p> <p>The average score was 65% and the following LLGs scored below average:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Lwankoni Subcounty 63%; 2 Kasensero Town Council 61%; 3 Kalisizo Subcounty 60%; 4 Kyebe Subcounty 60%; 5 Kabira Subcounty 58%; 6 Kasasa Subcounty 57%; 7 Nangoma Subcounty 55%; 8 Kakuuto Subcounty 53%; and 9 Nabigasa Subcounty 50% 	0
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0			

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS as per the submission letter CR/KTR/156/1 dated 29th September 2023</p>	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>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not conduct the tracking and analysis of staff attendance. Only the attendance register was presented for review. There was neither analysis nor monthly reports</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had 10 Heads of Department. They were appraised by CAO Mr. Gabriel Rogers Bwayo on the following dates;</p> <p>1. District Production Officer, Lutaaya John Mary - 30th June 2023, 2. District Health Officer, Muwanga Edward - 20th June 2023, 3. District Natural Resources Officer, Kiyingi Jamil - 30th June 2023, 4. Chief Finance Officer, Kyambadde Robert - 30th June 2023, 5. District Educations Officer, Sekyondwa Lawrence - 30th June 2023, 6. District Community Development Officer, Mukasa Deo - 30th June 2023, 7. District Commercial Officer, Kisekulo Matheus - 30th June 2023, 8. District Planner, Nakayotte Judith Marion, 30th June 2023, 9. District Engineer, Sebulime Harold Aranar - 30th June 2023 and 10. Deputy CAO, Ntutumukiza Muhammed - 30th June 2023.</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG implemented administrative rewards and sanctions as per the minutes of meetings examined. The meetings were held on;</p> <p>1. 5th April 2023, during which, staff members presented their defense against misconduct allegations and 2. 13th April 2023, during which, staff misconduct was discussed, resolved and sanctions imposed</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>Information of the establishment of the Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress was not availed for review</p>	0
8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>The LG recruited various cadres of new employees during the previous FT, as per the district recruitment list 2022/23, which was examined. They all accessed the payroll within the prescribed time period, as per the 10 names sampled on the IPPS payroll for the months of November and December 2022, January, February, March and May 2023.</p> <p>1. Mawanda Jimmy, Driver, was appointed on 1st November 2022 and accessed payroll on 1st December 2022, 2. Ntambi Moses, Human Resource Officer, was appointed on 2nd January 2023 and accessed on 2nd February 2022, 3. Musiige Augustine, Parish Chief, was appointed on 1st February 2023 and accessed payroll on 4th March 2023, 4. Nanyunja Florence, Education Assistant, was appointed on 9th February 2023 and accessed payroll on 4th March 2023, 5. Kabogoza Giburiru, Assistant Education Officer, was appointed on 1st November 2022 and accessed payroll on 1st November 2022, 6. Lubega Athenas, Medical Officer, was appointed on 1st May 2023 and accessed payroll on 6th May 2023, 7. Mwesigwa Emmanuel, Askari, was appointed on 31st January 2023 and accessed on 2nd February 2023, 8. Nakate Susan, Enrolled Midwife, was appointed on 2nd January 2023 and accessed payroll on 2nd February 2023, 9. Kakembo Dominic, Office Attendant, was appointed on 1st May 2023 and accessed payroll on 6th May 2023 and 10. Kalyango Roger, Education Assistant, was appointed on 6th February 2023 and accessed payroll on 4th March 2023</p>	1

9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1.	A number of employees retired during the previous FY, Five names were sampled on the pension payroll to establish whether the retired employees accessed the payroll within the prescribed time period, as follows; 1. Nakanwagi Benedict, Senior Medical Officer, retired on 7th April 2023 and accessed payroll on 1st May 2023, 2. Namaganda Regius Kakooza, Deputy Head Teacher, retired on 5th May 2023 and accessed payroll on 1st June 2023, 3. Namuwawu Janet, Senior Education Assistant, retired on 28th July 2022 and accessed payroll on 1st August 2022, 4. Kiwanuka Kimbugwe Godfrey, District Production Officer, retired on 31st July 2022 and accessed payroll on 1st August 2022, 5. Nampeera Margret, Education Assistant, retired on 10th June 2023 and accessed payroll on 1st July 2023	1
---	---	--	--	---

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	There was evidence that the direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: The district received the DDEG funds in Q2+Q3 and the LLG share of UGX 241,915,032 was disbursed 100% as follows: 1 Kasaali Town Council UGX 30,746,000 2 Kalisizo Town Council UGX 17,707,000 3 Mutukula Town Council UGX 3,281,029 4 Kyotera Town Council UGX 16,320,000 5 Kasensero Town Council UGX 3,281,003 6 Kirumba Subcounty UGX 23,108,000 7 Kakuuto Subcounty UGX 27,832,000 8 Kabira Subcounty UGX 27,373,000 9 Lwankoni Subcounty UGX 15,695,000 10 Kasasa Subcounty UGX 17,335,000 11 Kalisizo Subcounty UGX 17,991,000 12 Nabigasa Subcounty UGX 19,894,000 13 Kyebe Subcounty UGX 14,842,000 14 Nangoma Subcounty UGX 6,510,000 Total Disbursed UGX 241,915,032	2
----	--	--	---	---

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).</p>	<p>There was no evidence that 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:</p> <p>The district received the DDEG funds in Q2+Q3 which were warranted as follows:</p> <p>Q2 release was uploaded on 30/09/2022 and Warrant No. 878AW-2023-13 was prepared on 07/10/2022 (beyond 5 working days); and</p> <p>Q3 release was uploaded on 29/12/2022 and Warrant No. 878AW-2023-16 was prepared on 09/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days)</p>	0
		<p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>		
10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>DDEG Funds were received in only two-quarters ie Q2+Q3 of the FY; it was invoiced as follows:</p> <p>Q2 Cash Limits were received on 30/09/2022 and invoiced to LLGs on 24/10/2022 (beyond 5 working days); and</p> <p>Q3 Cash Limits were received on 29/12/2022 and invoiced to LLGs on 25/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days)</p>	0
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District supervised and mentored all LLGs in the District at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines, this was done twice in the previous FY.</p> <p>During the year, the district conducted mentorships concurrently with joint monitoring and supervision only three times</p> <p>The following reports were verified:</p> <p>Q-1 report dated 20/09/2022;</p> <p>Q-2 report dated 31/10/2022;</p> <p>Q-3 report dated 12/10/2022; and</p> <p>There was no Q-4 report.</p> <p>Mentorships were in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Local Revenue Enhancement; -LLG budget planning and quarterly reporting; -PDM 	0
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no 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>The district had only 3 monitoring reports and TPC sessions.</p> <p>-Q1 report dated 20th Sep. 2022 had been discussed by TPC on 27th Sep. 2022;</p> <p>-Q2 monitoring report of 31/10/2022 had not been discussed by TPC on 01/11/2022;</p> <p>-Q3 monitoring report of 12/10/2022 had been discussed by TPC on 15/02/2023; and</p> <p>-Q4 there was no monitoring report for Q4 or TPC meeting.</p> <p>Matters discussed included:</p> <p>-Dissemination of previous LG and LLG Assessment results;</p> <p>-Status of the new budgeting process/cycle;</p> <p>-Roll out of new UBOS Registers ; and</p> <p>-interventions and promotion of trade and development services</p>	0
----	---	---	--	----------

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that The District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual.</p> <p>The Asset Register is in place and was last updated on 04/04/2023, the details were as follows:</p> <p>1 ICT Equipment UGX 226,921,497</p> <p>2 Transport Equipment UGX 4,624,540,000</p> <p>3 Furniture & Fittings UGX 180,658,600</p> <p>4 Non-Residential Buildings UGX 6,929,264,566</p> <p>5 Office Equipment UGX 33,399,500</p> <p>6 Machinery UGX 1,059,891,872</p> <p>Total Value UGX 13,054,676,035</p>	2
----	---	---	---	----------

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:

Score 1 or else 0

There was no evidence that the District had 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.

The BoS report was issued on 31/08/2022 and it had 7 recommendations on Pg.3; however, by the time of assessment, none of them had been implemented; they include the following:

1. All scrap items listed in the current and previous reports should be boarded off to allow room for replacement. The CAO should write to the responsible departments to initiate and speed up the process of boarding off these items;
2. The stores at all health facilities should be renovated and expanded to create room for the separation of highly flammable items from human drugs, and also avoid overloading them.; and
3. The hospital generator, dental unit chairs, theatre auto plates, scan and X-ray machines should be urgently replaced.

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.

There was evidence that District had a functional physical planning committee in place which had submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD during the previous FY

-the district submitted only 4-sets to MoLHUD as follows:

-Q1 minutes dated 26th Sep. 2022 were submitted to the regional MoLHUD, Office in Masaka on 27th Sep. 2022;

-Q2 minutes dated 30th Dec. 2022 were submitted to Regional MoLHUD, Office in Masaka on the same day 30th Dec. 2022;

-Q3 minutes dated 31st Jan. 2023 were submitted to MoLHUD, Regional Office in Masaka on the same day 31st Jan. 2023; and

-Q4 minutes dated 1st Jun. 2023 were submitted to the Regional MoLHUD Office in Masaka on 2nd Jun. 2023.

The physical planning committee was fully composed of the following 16 members:

(a)The Deputy CAO; (b) the district physical planner who shall be the secretary;(c) the staff surveyor; (d)the district roads engineer; (e) the district education officer; (f) the district agricultural officer; (g) the district water engineer; (h) the district community development officer; (i)the district medical officer; (j) 5- Town Clerks of 5 urban councils; (k) the district environment officer; (l) the natural resources officer. All the 16 Appointment Letters issued by CAO on 1st Jul. 2022 were verified

The Building Plans Registration book was in place and verified. It was opened on 11th Aug. 2017 and was last updated on 31st Mar. 2023.

The district doesn't have a physical development plan yet.

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>There was evidence that the District had conducted a desk appraisal for the only DDEG project in the budget on 06/02/2022- to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from Pg.86 of the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source. The desk appraisal was conducted during the TPC of 06/02/2022.</p> <p>The only project implemented with DDEG funding that year was construction of the District H/Q</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</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>There was evidence that LG conducted field appraisal on 22/02/2022 to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY. The District Planner presented field appraisal form for verification</p> <p>The only project implemented with DDEG funding that year was construction of the District H/Q</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>There was 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 guidelines and DDEG guidelines</p> <p>The DDEG-funded project planned for 2023/24 includes the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. construction of 5 stances pit latrine at Kabira HC II at UGX 30,000,000 (Pg 35 of the Approved Budget); 2. Renovation of Minziro HC II UGX 33,175,000 (Pg 35 of the Approved Budget); 3. Beatification of the Administration Block at UGX 61,569,000 (Pg 9 of the Approved Budget); and <p>Sanitation Facility at Kikungwe P/S at UGX 30,323,000 (Pg 72 of the Approved Budget)</p> <p>These profiles had been discussed by TPC on 13/06/2023 under Agenda No. 5, Minute No. MNGMT/04/13/06/2023</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 only one DDEG project implemented by Kyotera DLG. This was Completion of the District Headquarters. The Screening was done at project inception in 2018 and there was no need for rescreening at the completion stage.</p>	2
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 no evidence of any infrastructure projects to be implemented using the DDEG for the current FY.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG.	0
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 a letter referenced CR/KTR/156/1, dated July 15, 2022, recommending the Water Officer, the District Agricultural engineer, the District Environment officer, the Senior CDO, DEO, the DHO and the District Health Inspector on all to the District funded projects for the current FY.	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 funded infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG was defects rectification on the Administration block and it followed a snag list prepared by the LG Engineer. which included: defects on the plumbing, and completion of painting works.	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 no evidence of the participation of DE/ME, environmental officer, CDO in the form of site meetings with contractors. The sampled projects were: the Construction of Nangoma HC III; and Construction of a General ward of at Kakuto HC II.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of timely payments for the various projects executed which determined that the payments were appropriately certified. The sampled payments were for: Payment for Construction of a 2 classroom block, with offices and store at Kabwoko PS, where the requisition was made on April 17, 2023, the certificate was prepared by the DE on April 24, 2023, and payment was effected June 28, 2023 under voucher no. 6440338; Payment for Installation of Micro irrigation systems for 11 farmers, where the requisition was made on June 5, 2023, the payment was certified by the Agricultural officer on June 8, 2023, and payment was effected July 17, 2023 under voucher no. 6439710; and Payment for Construction of staff house at Nyangoma HC III, where the requisition was made on June 7, 2023, the certificate was prepared by the DE on June 16, 2023, and payment was effected June 29, 2023 under voucher no. 6440129.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of complete procurement files with record as required. The sampled projects were: KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/0008 Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kikungwe PS, whose requisition was made on May 1, 2022, advert was made on October 10, 2022, evaluation was completed on October 24, 2022 and contract signed on December 20, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 47,955,724; KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00015 Completion of upgrade of Nangoma HC II to HCIII, whose requisition was made on February 1, 2022, advert was made on March 10, 2023, evaluation was completed on March 30, 2023, Solicitor General's clearance was obtained on May 3, 2023 under Letter referenced DLAS/mbr/079/2023, and contract signed on May 7, 2023 at an award price of Ug Shs 292,928,805; and KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00004 Supply and Installation of water harvesting tanks, whose requisition was made on March 20, 2022, advert was made on June 27, 2022, evaluation was completed on July 19, 2022 and contract signed on November 18, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 66,447,180.	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	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>There was 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. The situation that obtained was as follows:</p> <p>i) A Letter dated 13th September 2022 written by Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers CAO Kyotera, appointed Mr. Mukasa Deo as a member to the District Grievance Committee. But on the same day, the CAO passed a Circular announcing members of the District GRC in which Mr. Mukasa Deo was mentioned as Secretary and the CAO himself was Chairperson;</p> <p>ii) On 13th September 2022, the CAO Kyotera DLG passed a Circular announcing formation of the Kyotera District Grievance Committee in which he mentioned that he himself (CAO) was Chairperson, Mr. Mukasa Deo was Secretary, and nine other staff as members.</p>	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	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>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG had 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. A Central Grievance Log was available at the office of the Secretary to the Grievance Committee. It had only one case recorded therein. The case was recorded on 26/06/2023. It was of Katunzi Bakali, a male of 51 years from Nangoma Sub County, Nangoma LC1. The Nature of Grievance was that of an unpaid balance of UGX1,500,000/-as part of material (sand) to the Contractor of Nangoma HC III. The Feedback was that Investigations were made and confirmed by S/C GRC. The DCDO engaged the Contractor and the balance claimed by Katunzi was paid on 1/8/2023.</p> <p>The Secretary to the Grievance Committee explained that there were few cases recorded in the Grievance Log because there were GRC at Sub Counties and these handled most of the grievances presented. Only those that became complicated were escalated to the District GRC. There were fourteen GRCs at the LLGs, one at each LLG.</p>	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0		

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	True, the DLG had a website, http://www.kyotera.go.ug and had a Twitter Account: @Kyoteradistrict	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0	But there was no GRM advertised on the most convenient and easily accessible mode of publicizing – the Noticeboard. The Forms used were for the more advanced clientele whereas the most affected people who needed to know what to do were the locals who are able to access the Noticeboard more than other forms of publicizing.	
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>There was evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with:</p> <p>The following Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were derived from Pages 181-to- 184 of the DDP to be implemented across all development projects:, the interventions included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Wetland restoration; -Plan to plant 8,000 trees; - restoration of soil degradation; -waste management and recycling; and -creation of environmental public awareness <p>These had been costed on Pg.155 of the DDP for total cost projection UGX 275,000,000 for the year</p>	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management	There was no evidence that LGs had 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	0
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	score 1 or else 0		

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	No incorporation of costs into BOQs was necessary as screening was not required for the sole project under DDEG. Incorporation into BoQs was done at project inception in 2018.	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 were no such additional projects implemented on climate change.	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	The Land title for the new Administration Block was said to be under Key and Lock at the CAOs Office but somehow, they did not see it so that its details could be captured in this assessment.	0

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that Kyotera DLG Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports. Two reports, prepared by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO, were availed. They were titled: 'Environmental and Social monitoring Report for the Administration block. 'One report was dated 16 June 2023, and another with the same title was dated 15 Sept.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	The only project under DDEG- Completion of the District Headquarters - was at completion stage. The past FYs had the E&S compliance Certification forms completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim stages. The project was now only waiting for final stage payment which was due at this final stage. This payment will be effected in future after the Defects Liability period has elapsed.	1
----	--	---	--	----------

Financial management

16	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment. The last reconciliations for the month of October 2023 had been made on 03/11/2023. The following Accounts were sampled: -A/C No. 3100054176 for the District Women Enterprise A/C had been reconciled by the Accountant and Checked by the Senior Finance Officer on the same day; -A/C No. 3100048305 The District general Fund A/C had been reconciled by the Accountant and Checked by the Senior Finance Officer on the same day; and -A/C No. 3100052001 District Youth Livelihood Fund A/C had been reconciled by the Accountant and Checked by the Senior Finance Officer on the same day	2
----	---	--	--	----------

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG had produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY</p> <p>Q-I report was produced on 17th Nov. 2022;</p> <p>Q-II report was produced on 7th Apr. 2023;</p> <p>Q-III report was produced on 28th Jun. 2023; and</p> <p>Q-IV report was produced on 26th Sep. 2023</p> <p>Some of findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Un-spent balances of 2021/22 of UGX 6,834,561,942; -Un-accounted for funds amounting to UGX 750,000 by Ambrose Musasizi for developing the district website; and -Non-functional statutory bodies: the district service commission and DPAC 	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had 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>Whereas all the four reports were produced, only one (the third quarter report) had been distributed.</p> <p>Q-I report was produced on 17th Nov. 2022; and distributed to CAO, chairperson and the LG PAC on 04/01/2023;</p> <p>Q-II report was produced on 7th Apr. 2023; and distributed to CAO, chairperson and the LG PAC on 05/05/2023;</p> <p>Q-III report was produced on 28th Jun. 2023 and submitted to the District Chairman and to DPAC on 30th Aug. 2023; and</p> <p>Q-IV report was produced on 26th Sep. 2023 and distributed to CAO, chairperson and the LG PAC on 28/10/2023</p> <p>All the reports contained status of implementation of previous internal audit findings and recommendations</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>There was no 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 because DPAC was not functional for two years, that period inclusive.</p> <p>Q-I report was produced on 17th Nov. 2022; and distributed to CAO, chairperson and the LG PAC on 04/01/2023. This report had been discussed by DPAC on 30th Jun. 2023;</p> <p>Q-II report was produced on 7th Apr. 2023; and distributed to CAO, chairperson and the LG PAC on 05/05/2023. This report had been discussed by DPAC together with Q-1 report on 30th Jun. 2023;</p> <p>Q-III report was produced on 28th Jun. 2023 and submitted to the District Chairman and to DPAC on 30th Aug. 2023. This report had not been discussed by DPAC by the time of assessment; and</p> <p>Q-IV report was produced on 26th Sep. 2023 and distributed to CAO, chairperson and the LG PAC on 28/10/2023 but had not been discussed by DPAC</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the local revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is beyond +/-10%</p> <p>From Pg. 43 of the final accounts -Statement of Revenues Collected, the district planned to collect UGX 1,027,744,000.00 but actually collected only UGX 549,253,764.00 representing 53% hence shortfall of 47%.</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>There was evidence that the LG's own source revenue increased by 0.03% (less than 10%) in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Deriving from the Statement of Revenue Collected on Pg. 43 of the Financial Statements, the local revenue performance in FY 2022/23 was US\$ 549,253,764.00 having increased by US\$ 143,425.00 (0.03%) from UGX 549,110,339.00 in FY 2021/2022</p>	0

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

There was no evidence that the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY.

During the year, the district realized local revenue amounting to UGX 549,253,764.00 (Pg 43 of the Annual Financial Statements "Statement of Revenue Collected") out of which UGX 389,970,172.44 was the share for LLGs. However, only UGX 45,891,270 was disbursed to LLGs as below (shortfall of UGX 344,078,902.44)

- 1 Kasaali Town Council UGX 8,591,270
 - 2 Kalisizo Town Council UGX 5,000,000
 - 3 Mutukula Town Council UGX 3,000,000
 - 4 Kyotera Town Council UGX 4,000,000
 - 5 Kasensero Town Council UGX 1,300,000
 - 6 Kirumba Subcounty UGX 3,000,000
 - 7 Kakuuto Subcounty UGX 3,000,000
 - 8 Kabira Subcounty UGX 3,000,000
 - 9 Lwankoni Subcounty UGX 2,500,000
 - 10 Kasasa Subcounty UGX 3,000,000
 - 11 Kalisizo Subcounty UGX 2,500,000
 - 12 Nabigasa Subcounty UGX 3,000,000
 - 13 Kyebe Subcounty UGX 2,500,000
 - 14 Nangoma Subcounty UGX 1,500,000
- Total UGX 45,891,270

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

There was evidence of a Notice board at the DLG head quarters displaying procurement and other information. The sampled procurement information included: The Best evaluated bidder notices posted on August 16, 2023 for: KYOT876/WRKS/23-24/00003 Construction of a General ward at Kakuuto HC IV Phased III awarded to Kyamulibwa Carpentry workshop at UGX at 64,406,000; KYOT876/WRKS/23-24/00001 Construction of a 3-classroom block at Ndolo PS awarded to Enotu Construction at UGX at 131,749,360; and KYOT876/WRKS/23-24/00006 Supply and installation of 11 HDPE tanks awarded to Kolma Technical Company at UGX at 93,447,386.

2

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG disseminated performance assessment results and implications are published for the previous year.</p> <p>The results were pasted on the main notice board on 18/07/2023 by the District Planner.</p> <p>The district was ranked 84th nationally having improved from the 119th position in the previous year.</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no 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.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal. The copies had been placed on the Chairman's Notice Board on 26/05/2023 by the Senior Finance Officer. These had been approved by council on 30/05/2023 under Agenda No.7, Minute No.KGLG/COU/7/05/2023</p>	1

Reporting to IGG
Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

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

There was no evidence that the LG had prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which includes a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report had been presented and discussed in the council and other fora.

The district has an active file for IGG correspondence CR/KTK/D/223/4 it contained a status report prepared by the Clerk to Council on 18/05/2023 which included the case reference numbers, the parties affected, recommendations and status of implementation.

The status report had not been presented to council by the time of the assessment. Some of the outstanding investigations included the following:

MSK/08/08/2019 for the failure of PHRO to clean the payroll of ghost workers ;

MSK/13/08/2019 for forgery of academic documents by the District Cold Chain Technician; and

MSK/10/08/2019 for the failure of CAO to discipline errant officers

**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>The number of candidates that registered for PLE in 2020 was 6355</p> <p>The number of absentees was 106 so the number that sat was 6249</p> <p>The number of candidates that passed in division 1 was 1133 = 17.80%</p> <p>The number of candidates that passed in division 2 was 3457 = 54.40%</p> <p>The number of candidates that passed in division 3 was 827 = 13.00%</p> <p>The number of candidates that passed between division one and there was 5417 = 86.68%</p> <p>The number of candidates that registered for PLE in 2022 was 6041</p> <p>The number of absentees was 176 so the number that sat was 5865</p> <p>The number of candidates that passed in division 1 was 1561 = 26.60%</p> <p>The number of candidates that passed in division 2 was 3092 = 52.70%</p> <p>The number of candidates that passed in division 3 was 649 = 11.00%</p> <p>The number of candidates that passed between division one and there was 5302 = 90.40%</p> <p>Percentage improvement was 3.73%</p>	2

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

The number of candidates that registered for
UCE in 2020 was 1576

The number of absentees was 0 so the number
that sat was 1576

The number of candidates that passed in division
1 was 154 = 9.80%

The number of candidates that passed in division
2 was 345 = 22.00%

The number of candidates that passed in division
3 was 335 = 21.30%

The number of candidates that passed between
division one and there was 834 = 53.10%

The number of candidates that registered for
UCE in 2022 was 1599

The number of absentees was 16 so the number
that sat was 1582

The number of candidates that passed in division
1 was 258 = 16.30%

The number of candidates that passed in division
2 was 406 = 25.70%

The number of candidates that passed in division
3 was 421 = 26.60%

The number of candidates that passed between
division one and there was 1085 = 68.70%

The percentage improvement was 15.60%

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.

There was evidence that the average score in the education LLG performance improved by 14% between the previous year but one and the previous year:

- 1 Kyotera Town Council declined by 70% from 70% to 0%;
 - 2 Mutukula Town Council improved by 20% from 80% to 100%;
 - 3 Kalisizo Town Council declined by 20% from 100% to 80%;
 - 4 Kasaali Town Council improved by 30% from 50% to 80%;
 - 5 Kirumba Subcounty improved by 30% from 70% to 100%;
 - 6 Lwankoni Subcounty declined by 10% from 50% to 40 ;
 - 7 Kasensero Town Council declined by 30% from 100% to 70%;
 - 8 Kalisizo Subcounty improved by 40% from 20% to 60%;
 - 9 Kyebe Subcounty improved by 80% from 20% to 100%;
 - 10 Kabira Subcounty declined by 30% from 70% to 40%;
 - 11 Kasasa Subcounty improved by 40% from 30% to 70%;
 - 12 Nangoma Subcounty improved by 50% from 50% to 100%;
 - 13 Kakuuto Subcounty improved by 20% from 20% to 40%; and
 - 14 Nabigasa Subcounty improved by 40% from 0% to 40%
- The average score improved by 14% from 52% to 66%

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

From the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/2023, there was evidence that the education development budget of Ug. Shs. 324,198,427 was used on eligible activities as per sector guidelines. The following activities were undertaken;

1. Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Kasaka PS Kirumba sub county at Shs. 28,000,000.
2. Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine at Kabuwoko PS Kirumba sub county at Shs. 28,000,000
3. Construction of a 2-classroom block at Kirinda PS Kalisizo Rural sub county at 120,000,000

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that 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</p> <p>VN 5902215 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 25,227,440 to M/S Owen Services Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kasaka P/S</p> <p>Certificate signed by DEO, CDO and the Environment Officer on 24/04/2023</p> <p>VN 5868070 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 107,957,696 to M/S Enotu Construction Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a 2-Classroom Block and Office at Kirinda P/S</p> <p>Certificate signed by DEO, CDO and the Environment Officer on 11/05/2023</p> <p>VN 5902215 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 25,227,440 to M/S Owen Services Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kabuwoko CoU P/S</p> <p>Certificate signed by DEO, CDO and the Environment Officer on 24/04/2023</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>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 that the variations in the contract price for the funded education infrastructure investments for the previous FY were within +/-20% of the Engineer's estimate. The sampled projects were: the Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kikungwe PS, whose estimate was Shs 49,990,500 and contract price Shs 47,955,724 and hence the variation was - 4.03%; the Construction of a 2 classroom block, with offices and store at Kabwoko PS, whose estimate was Shs 48,000,000 and contract price Shs 47,955,724, and hence the variation was - 0.92; and Construction of a 2 classroom block, with offices and store at Kirinda PS, whose estimate was Shs 120,000,000 and contract price Shs 119,727,520, and hence the variation was - 0.23%.</p>	2
---	--	---	---	---

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	The works for the Construction of a Seed School in Kacheera Sub County, for which the contract was signed on October 25, 2022 is still at ground floor level. The works can be rated at less than 20% and the contractor is not properly mobilised.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	From the LG approved structure and from the teacher deployment list 2023, there was evidence that all the 112 (100%), registered primary schools in the LG recruited 1268 primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES guidelines. All the 112 registered primary schools have a headteacher and at least seven teachers.	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 		

Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,

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

The DES basic requirements and minimum standards are that a classroom accommodates 53 learners, a latrine stance 40 learners, a desk 3 learners and a school should have accommodation for at least 4 teachers. From the LG consolidated asset register, the LG has the following infrastructure;

UPE: The LG had an enrolment of 67308 learners.

Classrooms: the LG has 1003 classrooms (1003 x 53 learners per classroom) 79.00%

Latrine stances: The LG has 1349 latrine stances (1349 x 40 learners per stance) 80.20%

Desks: The LG has 14703 desks (14703 x 3 learners per desk) 65.50%

Teacher accommodation: 44 schools out of 112 have at least 4 teacher accommodation units 39.30%

Average percentage was 66.00%

USE: The LG had an enrolment of 3410

Classrooms: the LG has 152 classrooms (53 learners per classroom) the percentage is > 100%

Latrine stances: The LG has 225 latrine stances (40 learners per stance) the percentage is > 100%

Desks: The LG has 2461 desks (3 learners per desk) the percentage is > 100%%

Teacher accommodation: 7 schools out of have at least 4 teacher accommodation units 50%

Average percentage was 87.50%

Average percentage of UPE and USE schools was 76.75%

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p>	<p>From the LG teacher deployment list and from the sampled schools, there was evidence that the LG accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed. From the sampled schools the deployment list has the following teachers who were found at the sampled schools;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>Kyotera Township PS (Kyotera Town Council (Urban) had the following teachers: Nandege Baker, Kintu Godfrey, Bamwiriire Ikula, Wagada Peter, Turyahaabwe Moses, Mukasa Joseph, Mukabaliisa Margaret, Kuteesa Elizabeth, Mpagi Milly and Nabayinda Resty.</p>	
			<p>Mityebiri PS (Kakuuto Sub County (Rural) had the following teachers: Nasiyo Annet, Ogwara Mike Felix, Matovu Ssengabi Charles, Nakafeero Catherine, Nalubega Alice, Nambaziira Jamillah, Namwanje Pauline, Bwetunge Damiano, Namanda Sylvia, Najjuka Teo Matovu and Ninsiima Katende Amosi.</p>	
			<p>Nsambya PS Kalisizo Rural Sub County (Peri-urban) had the following teachers: Ssnyondo Julius, Matovu Fredrick, Katali Ndibaza Gorreth, Ssentongo Aloysious, Masagazi Fred, Nambajjo Teopista, Nakityo Harriet, Nsubuga Teddy, Nansubuga Hadijjah, Nakazibwe Grace, Nattabi Dorothy, Namanda Rittah, Kimera Juliet and Kibirige Barbra.</p>	
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p>	<p>From the consolidated LG asset register and from the asset register of the sampled schools, there was evidence that the LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools. In the sampled schools, the schools had the following;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>Nsambya PS had 11 classrooms, 27 latrine stances, 238 desks and 8 teacher accommodation units.</p>	
			<p>Mityebiri PS had 7 classrooms, 8 latrine stances, 97 desks and 6 teacher accommodation units.</p>	
			<p>Kyotera Township PS had 9 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 135 desks and 0 teacher accommodation units</p>	

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 - 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>From the submitted reports there was evidence that 79 (70.5%) out of 112 registered primary schools complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines. The 3 sampled schools were Nsambya PS, Mityebiri PS and Kyotera Township PS.</p>	0
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>From the departmental minutes of the meeting held with headteachers on 01/09/2022 and from minutes of departmental meeting held on 24/7/2023 (Min. V/24/07/2023 row 5) "support schools on SIP development" there was evidence that all the 112 (100%) registered primary schools were supported to develop SIPs.</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>There was no evidence that the LG collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all 112 registered schools from the previous FY.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	----------

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG has 1268 teachers and from the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/2023, there was evidence that the LG budgeted Shs. 15,997,158,000 (page 30) in the current FY for a headteacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or one teacher per class for schools with less than P7.</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 list of schools in the LG, staff lists and staff attendance registers, there was evidence that LG deployed teachers as per sector guidelines for the current FY. For the sampled schools, all the three sampled have at least a headteacher and 7 teachers as follows;

Nsambya PS has the following teachers; Ssenyondo Julius, Matovu Fredrick, Katali Ndibaza Goreth, Ssentongo Aloysious, Masagazi Fred, Nambogo Teopista, Nakityo Harriet, Nsubuga Teddy, Nansubuga Hadijjah, Nakazibwe Grace, Nattabi Dorothy, Namanda Rittah, Kimera Juliet and Kibirige Barbra

Mityebiri PS had the following teachers; Nasiyo Annet, Namabaziira Jamidah, Namazi Polly, Matovu Charles, Ogwara Mike Felix, Bwetunge Damiano, Katende Amosi, Walugabi Elasto, Namwanje Pauline, Najjuka Teopista, Nantongo Teopista, Nakafeero Catherine, Nalubega Alice and Namanda Slivia.

Kyotera Township PS had the following teachers; Nandege Baker, Kintu Godfrey, Bamwire Ikula, Wagada Peter, Turyahabwe Moses, Mukasa Joseph, Mukabaliisa Margaret, Kuteesa Elizabeth, Mpagi Milly, Nabayinda Resty, Namirembe Margaret, Nabalunda Harriet, Nankya Sarah, Nakalema Florence and Namuwulya eron.

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

There was evidence that teacher deployment data was disseminated and publicized on the school notice board,

Nsambya PS had 14 teachers: Ssenyondo Julius, Matovu Fredrick, Katali Ndibaza Goreth, Ssentongo Aloysious, Masagazi Fred, Nambogo Teopista, Nakityo Harriet, Nsubuga Teddy, Nansubuga Hadijjah, Nakazibwe Grace, Nattabi Dorothy, Namanda Rittah, Kimera Juliet and Kibirige Barbra

Mityebiri PS had 14 teachers: Nasiyo Annet, Namabaziira Jamidah, Namazi Polly, Matovu Charles, Ogwara Mike Felix, Bwetunge Damiano, Katende Amosi, Walugabi Elasto, Namwanje Pauline, Najjuka Teopista, Nantongo Teopista, Nakafeero Catherine, Nalubega Alice and Namanda Slivia.

Kyotera Township PS had 15 teachers; Nandege Baker, Kintu Godfrey, Bamwire Ikula, Wagada Peter, Turyahabwe Moses, Mukasa Joseph, Mukabaliisa Margaret, Kuteesa Elizabeth, Mpagi Milly, Nabayinda Resty, Namirembe Margaret, Nabalunda Harriet, Nankya Sarah, Nakalema Florence and Namuwulya Eron.

1

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

Ten performance appraisal reports were sampled to establish whether primary school head teachers were appraised within prescribed time period. The sampled school head teachers were appraised by DEO Mr. Ssekyondwa Lawrence on the following dates;

1. Bikira Girls PS, **Nankya Gorreth** (Kasali SC) - 31st December 2022; **2.** Kikondo PS, **Nalubowa Gaudy** (Kalisizo SC) - 31st December 2022; **3.** Ndolo PS, **Najemba Cissy** (Kabira SC) - 31st December 2022; **4.** Kateramigongo PS, **Kaweesi John** (Nabigasa SC) - 30th December 2022; **5.** Kyenvubu Parents PS, **Ndibasa Juliet** (Kurumba SC) - 31st December 2022; **6.** Nabigasa PS, **Lukyamu Gerald** (Kakuuto SC) - ; 0th December 2022; **7.** Nninsi PS, **Nakate Maddy** (Kalisizo TC) - 31st December 2022; **8.** Nangoma PS, **Rutasitula Pontazio** (Nangoma SC) - 31st December 2022; **9.** Ssanje PS, **Najjumba Lucy** (Kasasa SC) - 31st December 2022; and **10.** Kyotera Central PS, **Kasagga Baker** (Kyotera TC) 31st December 2022

T

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

Appraisal reports for secondary school head teachers were not availed for review

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>The Education Department had 10 members of staff. They were appraised by DEO Mr. Ssekyondwa Lawrenceon on the following dates:</p> <p>1. Senior Education Officer, Ntalagi Peter Serunjogi - 20th June 2023, 2. Senior Inspector of Schools, Kigoye Matheus - 30th June 2023, 3. Education Officer, special needs, Nkinzi Damalie - 30th June 2023, 4. Inspector of Schools, Sebuuma John - 30th June 2023, 5. Inspector of Schools, Ssenabulya Godfrey - 30th June 2023, 6. Inspector of Schools, Nadumba Harriet - 30th June 2023, 7. Inspector of Schools, Namagala Sylvia - 30th June 2023, 8. Inspector of Schools, Namusoke Christine - 30th June 2023, 9. Inspector of Schools, Nalugo Caroline - 30th June 2023 and 10. Inspector of Schools, Nakiberu Sharifa - 30th June 2023.</p>	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>From the LG training plan for FY 2022/2023 prepared by the LG Education Department and submitted to CAO on 13/07/202, there was evidence that the LG prepared a plan to identify capacity gaps at school and LG levels..</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>From submission letter dated 28/10/2022 from CAO to the PS MoES, there was evidence that the LG confirmed in writing the list of 112 schools, their enrolment and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th.</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>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>From the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2022/2023, there was evidence that the LG allocated Ug. Shs. 93,000,000 to monitoring and inspection reports according to the guidelines.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Monitoring: 4,500,000 + 11,200,000 (for 112 registered primary schools at 100,000 per school) = 15,700,000</p>	
			<p>Inspection: 4,500,000 + 12,544,000 (for 112 registered primary schools at 112,000 per school) = 17,044,000</p>	
			<p>The budgeted figure of Ug. Shs. 93,000,000 is greater than total calculated figure of Ug. Shs. 32,744,000.</p>	
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2022 and warrant No. 878AW-2023-06 was submitted on 09/08/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p>	
			<p>Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2022 and warrant No. 878AW-2023-14 was submitted on 07/08/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p>	
			<p>Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2022 and warrant No. 878AW-2023-15 was submitted on 09/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days); and</p>	
			<p>Q4 cash limits were received on 20/04/2023 and warrant No. 878AW-2023-23 was submitted on the same day 20/04/2023 (within 5 working days)</p>	
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p>	<p>There was no 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>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2022 and School capitation Grant was disbursed on 29/08/2022 (beyond 3 working days);</p>	
			<p>Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2022 and School capitation Grant was disbursed together with Q3 release on 06/02/2023 (beyond 3 working days);</p>	
			<p>Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2022 and School capitation Grant was disbursed on 06/02/2023 (beyond 3 working days); and</p>	
			<p>Q4 cash limits were received on 20/04/2023 and School capitation Grant was disbursed on 15/06/2023 (beyond 3 working days)</p>	

10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections. • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0	From the LG inspection work plan for the FY 2022/2023 prepared by the on 06/07/2023 submitted to CAO on 06/07/2022 and submitted to DES by CAO on 06/07/2022, there was evidence that the department prepared an inspection plan for school inspections.	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report: • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0	From the school list in the PBS and from the LG inspection reports of term three 2022, term one 2023 and term two 2022, there was evidence that all the 122 (100%) registered primary schools in the LG were inspected and monitored and findings compiled in the DEO monitoring reports for the three terms.	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up, Score: 2 or else, score: 0	From minutes of the departmental meeting held on 31/08/2022 (MIN V/31/08/2023) discussion of inspection report it was reported that the of Ssimba primary school (Kakuuto sib county) and Bukobogo primary school (Kirumba Sub county) were being mismanaged by the headteachers. It was recommended that the inspector works with the parish chief Kizibira parish to rectfy the situation. On 16/10/2023 the parish chief Kizibira parish wrote a report on on Bukobogo PS and recommending action by the LG education department. On 24/10/2023 the DEO wrote to the CAO to sanction the headteacher of Bukobogo primary school.	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0	There was evidence from inspection reports submitted by the DIS and DEO to DES for the three terms and from the submission dates the following submissions were sampled; Term three report 2022 submitted to DES on 03/04/2023. Term one report 2023 submitted to DES on 22/05/2023. Term two report 2023 submitted to DES on 28/8/2023	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>There was evidence that education sector matters at Kyotera DLG are discussed by the Committee of Health, Education and Community Services four times during the year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the Committee report of 23/08/2022, had been presented to council on 22/09/2022 and discussed under Agenda No.8, Minute No. KDLG/CoU/8/08/2022; -Committee report of 06/12/2022, presented to council on 22/12/2022 and was discussed under Agenda No.7, Minute No. KDLG/CoU/06/12/2022; and -the Committee report of 08/02/2023, presented to council on 28/02/2023 discussed under Agenda No.6, Minute No. KDLG/CoU/06/02/2023; and -the Committee report of 20/04/2023, presented to council on 30/05/2023 and discussed under Agenda No.6, Minute No. KDLG/CoU/6/05/2023 <p>Some of the issues discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How to promote games and sports in all schools in the district; -Approval of supplementary funding of UGX 6,667,000 for Association of Head Teachers; and -Consideration for reinstatement of Teacher Katusiime Joyce who had served her interdiction -Need to address the rampant problem of stray dogs injuring school children 	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 no evidence that the LG Education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school.</p>	0

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>From the LG asset register and from asset register of the sampled schools, there was evidence that there was an up-to-date LG asset register up dated on 21/09/2022 setting out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. The information from the consolidated school asset register was consistent with that found from the sampled schools as follows;</p> <p>Nsambya PS had 11 classrooms, 27 latrine stances, 238 desks and 8 teacher accommodation units.</p> <p>Mityebiri PS had 7 classrooms, 8 latrine stances, 97 desks and 6 teacher accommodation units.</p> <p>Kyotera Township PS had 9 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, 135 desks and 0 teacher accommodation units.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget on 06/02/2022 to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from Pg 87 of the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). Appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY. The District Planner present appraisal forms for the following projects for verification</p> <p>i. construction of a 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kasaka P/S at UGX 25,227,440;</p> <p>ii. construction of a 2-Classroom Block and Office at Kirinda P/S; and</p> <p>iii. construction of a 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kabuwoko CoU P/S at UGX 25,227,440</p>	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>There was evidence that the LG had conducted field Appraisals from 22/02/2022 to 25/02/2023 for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY. The District Planner presented field appraisal forms for verification</p> <p>i. construction of a 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kasaka P/S at UGX 25,227,440;</p> <p>ii. construction of a 2-Classroom Block and Office at Kirinda P/S; and</p> <p>iii. construction of a 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kabuwoko CoU P/S at UGX 25,227,440</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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>	There was evidence that LG Education department budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. The sampled projects were: Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine and Mutukula PS at UGx 32,000,000; Renovations to Ndolo PS at 119,089,000; and Construction of Kasaali Seed Secondary school at 687,711,000.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence of minute Min07/06/10/23 of the procurement committee meeting which sat on October 6, 2023 to approve the procurement of the education sector projects. There was also a letter referenced AG/2022/2057, dated October 6, 2022 from the Solicitor General clearing the procurement of the Construction of a Seed School in Kacheera Sub County.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was evidence of a letter referenced CR/KTR/156/1, dated July 15, 2022, appointing the Water Officer, the District Agricultural engineer, the District Environment officer, the Senior CDO, DEO, the DHO and the District Health Inspector on all to the District funded projects for the previous FY.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the school infrastructure in Kacheera Sub County, which was still and ground floor level followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES. The sampled dimensions were for: external dimensions for the science lab of 9.21 x 21.3 m which were in consonance with the design dimensions of 9.23 x 21.31; external dimensions for the science lab of 7.43 x 18.3 m which were in consonance with the design dimensions of 7.43 x 18.31; and the external dimensions for the staff houses of were 6.98 x 13.8 m which were in consonance with the design dimensions of 7.0 x 13.8	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence of monthly site meetings during the previous FY. The works at Seed school in Kacheera Sub county commenced during the current FY although contract was signed during the previous FY.	0

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 no evidence of monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers and CDO during the previous FY.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract</p> <p>VN 5902215 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 25,227,440 to M/S Owen Services Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kasaka P/S</p> <p>Payment was requested 17/04/2023, and was effected on 15/06/2023 (beyond 10 working days)</p> <p>VN 5868070 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 107,957,696 to M/S Enotu Construction Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a 2-Classroom Block and Office at Kirinda P/S</p> <p>Payment was requested 02/05/2023, and was effected on 15/06/2023 (beyond 10 working days)</p> <p>VN 5902215 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 25,227,440 to M/S Owen Services Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kabuwoko CoU P/S</p> <p>Payment was requested 17/04/2023, and was effected on 15/06/2023 (beyond 10 working days)</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department submitted its procurement plan on March 15, 2023.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of complete procurement files with record as required. The sampled projects were: KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/0008 Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kikungwe PS, whose requisition was made on May 1, 2022, advert was made on October 10, 2022, evaluation was completed on October 24, 2022 and contract signed on December 20, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 47,955,724; KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/0007 Construction of a 2 classroom block, with offices and store at Kabwoko PS, whose requisition was made on May 1, 2022, evaluation was completed on October 24, 2022 and contract signed on December 20, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 47,955,724 and KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/0010 Construction of a 2 classroom block, with offices and store at Kirinda PS, whose requisition was made on June 23, 2022, advert was made on November 25, 2022, evaluation was completed on December 15, 2022 and contract signed on January 9, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 119,727,520.</p>	1
----	--	---	--	----------

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no Grievance Log at the Education Department. Instead, there was a File Folder titled: 'Complaints from Community 2023 SMC'. In the File Folder were letters of complaints from sub counties. One such complaint was the transfer of a one Matovu Vincent from Bokobogo Primary School, dated 02/11/23.</p> <p>Kyotera DLG had just shifted to a newly built District Headquarters and all departments used one Central Noticeboard. This Central Noticeboard had no GRM advertised with regard to Education, or any other GRM issue.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>From minutes of headteachers meeting on 01/09/2022 (Min. vi/09/2022 (Dissemination of environmental guidelines) and from the sample schools of Nsambya PS, Mityebiri PS and Kyotera Township PS, there was evidence that the LG disseminated educational guidelines on to provide for access to land, siting of schools, 'green' schools, energy and water conservation.</p>	3

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG had in place costed ESMPs and these were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents. Costing was done by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for the following sampled schools:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kirinda P/s – Kalisizo, costed at UGX300,000/-. Costing was done on 01/11/2022. The Contractor, however, a one Enotu Construction Ltd, quoted UGX800,000/- for Environmental amelioration activities for this project; 2) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kabuwoko P/s, costed at UGX500,000/-, done on 20/10/2022. The Contractor, however, a one Owen Services Ltd, quoted UGX100,000/- for Environmental amelioration activities for this project; 3) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kikungwe Primary School, costed at UGX200,000/- done on 20/10/2022. The Contractor, however, a one Owen Services Ltd, quoted UGX500,000/- for Environmental amelioration activities for this project; and 4) Construction of a 3 Classroom block at Katabakooki Primary School, costed at UGX500,000/- done on 01/07/2022. The Contractor, however, a one Enotu Construction Ltd, quoted UGX200,000/- for Environmental amelioration activities for this project. 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There were no Agreements or MOUs on School land for the Schools in Kyotera District.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring. A Cover Letter dated 27 Sept 2023, written by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO concerning support supervision and monitoring of Education projects covered the following supervision and monitoring activities for the different dates indicated on the reports as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kirinda P/s – Kalisizo, done on 07/03/2023, 11/04/2023, and 08/05/2023; 2) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kabuwoko P/s, done on 09/02/2023, 13/03/2023, 24/04/2023 and 24/04/2023; 3) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kikungwe Primary School, done on 10/02/2023, 15/03/2023, 19/04/2023 and 19/04/2023; and 4) Construction of a 3 Classroom block at Katabakooki Primary School, done on 06/12/2022, 09/01/2023, 05/02/2023 and 05/02/2023. 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG had E&S certifications approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments. E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments. Those availed were signed by Sebudde Harold District Engineer, Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer, Namuwawu Prossy, CDO, Ssekyondwa Lawrence District Education Officer and Approved by Nfitumukiza Muhammed Deputy CAO for the following sampled schools:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kirinda P/s – Kalisizo, signed on 11/May/2023; 2) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kabuwoko P/s, done on 20/10/2022; 3) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kikungwe Primary School, signed on 02/05/2023; and 4) Construction of a 3 Classroom block at Katabakooki Primary School, signed on 08/02/2023. 	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>There was no evidence that the Kyotera District Local Government attained a 20% or more increase in the coverage of institutional deliveries. The total number of institutional deliveries in the three sampled health facilities in FY 2021/22 was 2524, dropping to 1931 in FY 2022/23, a decrease of 23.4%.</p> <p>1. Kakuuto HC3 (1913) - (1576)</p> <p>2. Mitukula HC3 (165) - (104)</p> <p>3. Kasasa HC3: (446) - (251)</p> <p>Total 2022/23 (2524) - Total 2021/22 (1931)/2524 = -23.4%</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment was 66%.</p> <p>The assessment results in the District Planners office were verified and the scores were as follows:</p> <p>1 Kyotera Town Council 0%</p> <p>2 Mutukula Town Council 100%</p> <p>3 Kalisizo Town Council 80%</p> <p>4 Kasaali Town Council 80%</p> <p>5 Kirumba Subcounty 100%</p> <p>6 Lwankoni Subcounty 40%</p> <p>7 Kasensero Town Council 70%</p> <p>8 Kalisizo Subcounty 60%</p> <p>9 Kyebe Subcounty 100%</p> <p>10 Kabira Subcounty 40%</p> <p>11 Kasasa Subcounty 70%</p> <p>12 Nangoma Subcounty 100%</p> <p>13 Kakuuto Subcounty 40%</p> <p>14 Nabigasa Subcounty 40%</p> <p>The average score was 66%</p>	1

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>RBF was not implemented in FY 2023/24.</p>	<p>0</p>
	<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>There was evidence that 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. From Pg. 17 of The Annual Performance report, the district had 100% of the PHC Development grant of UGX 1,019,029,000. The two projects that were implemented during the year are the following:</p>	<p>2</p>
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. construction of a staff house at Nangoma H/C III at UGX 50,715,771 by M/S Zombe Enterprises Ltd; 2. construction of a general ward at Kakuuto H/C IV at UGX 79,781,558 by M/S Kyamulibwa Carpentry and Workshop Ltd 	
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 DHO, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers</p>	<p>2</p>
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>The following two projects were implemented during the year:</p> <p>VN 6440129 of 28/06/2023 being payment of UGX 50,715,771 to M/S Zombe Enterprises Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a staff house at Nangoma H/C III</p> <p>Certificate signed by DHO, the Engineer, CDO and the Environment Officer on 19/06/2023</p> <p>VN 4279529 of 16/03/2023 being payment of UGX 79,781,558 to M/S Kyamulibwa Carpentry and Workshop Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a general ward at Kakuuto H/C IV</p> <p>Certificate signed by DHO, the Engineer, CDO and the Environment Officer on 20/01/2023</p>	

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the variations in the contract price for the funded education infrastructure investments for the previous FY were within +/-20% of the Engineer's estimate. The sampled projects were: the Completion of upgrade of Nangoma HC II to HCIII, whose estimate was Shs 294,665,334 and contract price Shs 292,928,805 and hence the variation was -.589%; the Construction of a staff house at Nangoma HC III, whose estimate was Shs 48,000,000 and contract price Shs 47,955,724, and hence the variation was -.092; and Construction of a 2 classroom block, with offices and store at Kirinda PS, whose estimate was Shs 120,000,000 and contract price Shs 119,727,520, and hence the variation was -4.91%.	2
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	The LG did not have a project for HC II's being upgraded to HC III during the Previous FY. The Completion of the upgrading of Nongoma HC II to HC III was signed on May 3, 2023 and commenced during the Current FY.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	There was no evidence that the Kyotera LG had recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure. Although the average number of staff for all the 12 HCIII was 78.5%, - and that for the only HCIV was 95.8%, four of the HCIII had less than 75% of the minimum standards (Nabigasa HCIII (63.2%), Kasali HCIII (73.7%), Nangoma HCIII (57.9%), Nsumba HCIII (52.6%).	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 		

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>There was evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction project at Nangoma HC III meets the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Design. The sampled dimensions were Center to Centre dimensions were for the female ward, which were 5.2m x 6.8 m, which were the same as the design dimensions; and the Prenatal ward whose Centre to Centre dimensions were 3.2m x 5.0m, which were as per the design drawings.</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>There was no evidence that the health workers were in place as indicated in the staff list from the District Health Office and that this matched the list on the noticeboard at the three sampled facilities. The noted discrepancies were as follows:</p> <p>1) Kakuuto HCIV (40/43 on the DHO list matched those at the health facility level (Staff list 9th November 2023). The health facility list had three names that were not included on the DHO list – Nanono Angela an Enrolled Nurse, Walusimbi Emma, an Enrolled Psychiatric Nurse, Namuddu Fausta, a porter. Namiro Annet, an enrolled midwife was not known at the health facility;</p> <p>2) Kasasa HCIII (this was not assessed as there was no staff list).</p> <p>3) Mitukula HCIII (dated 28/10/23, 14/15 staff - Kalanda Andrew an Askari, had been transferred out and replaced with Wilber Namanya who was on the health facility list but not the DHO one).</p>	0
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the information submitted in the PBS on construction status and functionality was accurate. The Annual PBS (2022/23) report under Vote 878 includes the same projects that were documented in the Kyotera Local Government 'Health Department Procurement Plan'. These included – i) Construction of a ward at Kakuuto HCIV ii) Construction of a staff house at Nangoma HCIII iii) Construction of a 2maternity ward at Kirumba HCIII.</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>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 no evidence that the annual work plans and budgets of the three sampled facilities were submitted by 31st March of the previous FY. The submission dates are much later as indicated for the sampled health facilities:</p> <p>1) Kakuuto HCIV (13/07/2022); 2) Mitukula HCIII (26/08/2022); and 3) Kasasa HCIII (not submitted). The budgets that were available conformed to the prescribed formats in the planning guidelines (i.e., key issues and challenges were prioritized).</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence that the sampled health facilities submitted their budget performance reports by the 15th July of 2023. The submission dates for two out of three sampled facilities were much later or non-available as indicated: 1) Kakuuto HCIV (13/07/2022); 2) Mitukula HCIII (in draft form, to be submitted by 15/11/2023); and 3) Kasasa HCIII (not available).</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence that the three sampled health facilities - 1) Kakuuto HCIV (not dated), 2) Mitukula HCIII (30/03/23), and 3) Kasasa HCIII had health facility improvement plans that included issues that had been identified in the DHMT monitoring and assessment reports.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</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.

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

There was evidence that the three sampled health facilities 1) Kakuuto HCIV, 2) Mitukula HCIV, and 3) Kasasa HCIII had submitted timely monthly and quarterly reports 7 days following the end of the month and quarter.

Kakuuto HCIV: 05/08/2022, 06/09/2022, 05/10/2022, 07/11/2022, 06/12/2022, 06/01/2023, 06/02/2023, 07/03/2023, 03/04/2023, 02/05/2023, 03/06/2023, 01/07/2023;

Mitukula HCIII: 04/08/2022, 05/09/2022, 05/10/2022, 04/11/2022, 03/12/2022, 06/01/2023, 06/02/2023, 06/03/2023, 06/04/2023, 05/05/2023, 04/06/2023, 04/07/2023; and

Kasasa HCIII: 03/08/2022, 04/09/2022, 06/10/2022, 04/11/2022, 04/12/2022, 04/01/2023, 03/02/2023, 03/03/2023, 06/04/2023, 03/05/2023, 04/06/2023, 04/07/2023.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

RBF was not implemented in the FY 2022/23.

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>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>RBF was not implemented in FY 2022/23.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</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>There was evidence that DHO had compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports within the first month of the following quarter:)</p> <p>The quarterly reports were submitted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Q1 was submitted on 20th Sep. 2022 through the PBS (within one month); -Q2 was submitted on 17th Jan. 2023 through the PBS (within one month); -Q3 was submitted on 18th Apr. 2023 through the PBS (within one month); and -Q4 was submitted on 20th Jul. 2023 through the PBS Tool (submitted within one month) 	1
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kyotera LG had developed and approved a Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities as this was not presented for assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kyotera LG had implemented an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities since this had not been developed.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

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>a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Kyotera district had budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines. The PBS (Performance Budgeting System) indicates a budget of UGX 8,855,492 for an average staffing level of 73.7% for the current FY which is less than the minimum norm of 75% .</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>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>There was no evidence that Kyotera district had deployed health workers as per the guidelines. The staff registers for the current FY indicates that the average staffing level was at 72.8% for current FY. Only 3/20 HCII had the full complement of staff (range 33-100%; average 62.4%). Although the average number of staff for all the 12 HCIII was 80.3%, - and that for the only HCIV was 89.6%, four of the HCIII had less than 75% of the minimum standards (Nabigasa HCIII (63.2%), Kasali HCIII (73.7%), Nangoma HCIII (57.9%), Nsumba HCIII (52.6%).</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).	b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0	There was no evidence from the arrival and departure register that health staff in the sampled health facilities on the deployment list for the current FY were working where they were deployed. The number of staff who had registered arrival/departure out of those on the list were as follows:	0
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure		<p>1) Kakuuto HCIV 384/46 staff (Ssekigoye Richard a porter was not in the register, and this was explained that he was illiterate; Namiro Annet on the DHO list was not known at the health facility and was not in the arrival/departure register;</p> <p>2) Kasasa HCIII 15/16 staff (Namujuzi Sandra, a nursing assistant had not signed in the arrival/departure register); and</p> <p>3) Mitukula HCIII (15/15 staff).</p>	
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).	c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the list of health workers deployed at the sampled facilities was displayed on the health facility notice boards for only two out of the three . At Kakuuto HCIV (09/11/23) and Mitukula (28/10/23), the list of health workers was displayed. At Kasasa HCIII, the staff list was not displayed.	0
	Maximum 9 points on this performance measure			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	<p>Ten appraisal reports of health facilities Officers In Charge were sampled to establish whether they were appraised within the prescribed time period. They were appraised by DHO, Mr. Muwanga Edward on the following dates:</p> <p>1. Namugabo Victoria (Kijegga HC II) - 30th June 2023, 2. Namayanja Joan (Kasali HC II) - 30th June 2023, 3. Mugeru Steven (Kirumba HC III) - 30th June 2023, 4. Kato Francis Otim (Kasensero HC III) - 30th June 2023, 5. Nalumu Rita (Nsumba HC III) - 30th June 2023, 6. Musoke Aloysius Nanseera (Kakuuto HC IV) - 30th June 2023, 7. Kasule Gabriel (Nangoma HC III) - 30th June 2023, 8. Kibalama Donozio (Mutukula HC III) - 30th June 2023, 9. Nakabiito Safina (Mitukula CC III) - 30th June 2023 and 10. Kadumya Matheus Njagala (Kasana HC II) - 30th June 2023.</p>	1
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure			

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Ten appraisal reports of health workers were sampled to establish whether they were appraised within the prescribed time period. They were appraised on the following dates;</p> <p>1. Enrolled Nurse, Namuleme Christine (Nangoma HC III) by Mr. Kasule Gabriel- 30th June 2023, 2. Enrolled Midwife, Nalule Hajarah (Kirumba HC III) by Mr. Mugeru Steven - 30th June 2023, 3. Enrolled Midwife, Nakajwaya Lillian (Kakuuto HC III) by Mr. Musoke Aloysius Nanseera - 30th June 2023, 4. Enrolled Nurse, Nakyondwa Mauricia (Kasana HC III) by Mr. Kadumya Matheus Njagala - 30th June 2023, 5. Clinical Officer, Muwanguzi Violet (Nabigasa HC III) - 30th June 2023 6 . Enrolled Nurse, Bagalalina Marion (Kasali HC III) by Namayanja Joan- 30th June 2023, 7. Clinical Officer, Nsibambi Faiswali (Mitukula HC III) by Mrs .Nakabiito Safina - 30th June 2023, 8. Enrolled Nurse, Nambejja Stella (Kykanyomozi HC II) - 30th June 2023, 9. Enrolled Midwife, Zalwango Josephine (Kabira HC III) appraised by - 30th June 2023, and 10. Enrolled Midwife, Kawudha Easter (Kasali HCIII) by Namayanja Joan- 30th June 2023.</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>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Information on corrective actions taken, basing on the appraisal reports, was not availed for review</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the training activities for the previous FY were conducted. The training plan listed 5 activities that reportedly took place on the following dates:</p> <p>1) Orientation on school health provider communication - 19-20 October 2023;</p> <p>2) Ebola Virus Disease Surveillance - 31st October 2023;</p> <p>3) The RING concept - 12-13 January 2023;</p> <p>4) Training of District Rapid Response Team - 29/05/23 - 2/06/23; and</p> <p>5) Mentorship on Malaria communication - 26/06/23.</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 Rakai local government had training activities for the previous FY e.g., the report on the mentorship on malaria communication was on file and 148 health workers had been trained during the period (26/06/23).</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 no evidence that the CAO had notified the MoH of the status of health facilities whether correct or wrong. The letter provided dated 20th August 2023 had not been received by the Ministry of Health and had wrong classifications for categories of Health facilities e.g., Kyebe HCII, Nyangoma HCII, and Nsumba HCII had been upgraded to HCIII and yet this change was not reflected in the list.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no 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)</p> <p>Deriving from Pg.30 of the approved budget, the allocation for PHC NWR Grant for LLHF was UGX 802,768,000.00 out of which UGX 78,262,000.00 had been allocated to monitoring of health activities, representing 9.7% (less than 15%)</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG had made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget.

Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2022 and warrant No. 878AW-2023-06 was submitted on 09/08/2022 (beyond 5 working days);

Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2022 and warrant No. 878AW-2023-14 was submitted on 07/08/2022 (beyond 5 working days);

Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2022 and warrant No. 878AW-2023-15 was submitted on 09/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days); and

Q4 cash limits were received on 20/04/2023 and warrant No. 878AW-2023-23 was submitted on the same day 20/04/2023 (within 5 working days)

2

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that 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.

Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2022 and invoiced (and communicated) to LLHFs on 14/07/2022 (beyond 5 working days);

Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2022 and invoiced (and communicated) to LLHFs on 21/10/2022 (beyond 5 working days);

Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2022 and invoiced (and communicated) to LLHFs on 08/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days); and

Q4 cash limits were received on 20/04/2023 and invoiced (and communicated) to LLHFs on the same day 02/05/2023 (beyond 5 working days)

0

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>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 no evidence that the LG 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:</p> <p>Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2022 and invoiced (and communicated) to LLHFs on 14/07/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2022 and invoiced (and communicated) to LLHFs on 21/10/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2022 and invoiced (and communicated) to LLHFs on 08/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days); and</p> <p>Q4 cash limits were received on 20/04/2023 and invoiced (and communicated) to LLHFson the same day 02/05/2023 (beyond 5 working days)</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>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Kyotera health department implemented actions recommended by the DMHT quarterly performance review meetings of the previous FY. There were several action points raised during the meetings held during Q1 (27/08/22), Q2 (29/11/22)., Q3 (21/03/23); and Q4 (25/04/2023). Examples of actions points that had been followed up included: 1) Q2 report under Min 8/DHMT/12/2022 had an action point to verify source of the drug exhibits on 21/12/22. Subsequently the DHO on the same day investigated with Police, DMMS and produced the results in report dated 21/12/22. 2. Q2 report under Minute 8/27/08/22 required the DHT to inform the political leadership on the health facilities accredited to test for HIV. Subsequently the DHO wrote a communication to that all facilities in the district were accredited to test.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the attendance of quarterly performance review meetings involved health facility in charges, implementing partners, health monitoring teams, and other departments. The composition of attendees was:</p> <p>Q1: Health facility in charges (12/34); Implementing Partners (RHSP), DHT (7/8); Other departments (Town Clerk, Asst CAO),</p> <p>Q2: Health facility in charges (12/34); Implementing Partners (WHO, Red Cross), DHT (8/8); Other Departments (RDC, Deputy RDC, CAO, CFO, DISO</p> <p>Q3: Health facility in charges (9/34); Implementing Partners (Living Goods), DHT (6/8); Town Clerk, Secretary for Health</p> <p>Q4: Health facility in charges (17/34); DHT (8/8); Implementing Partners (BAMA), RDC, Deputy CAO, LCV.</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>Kyotera LG has one HC4 (Kakuuto HC4) and one hospital – Kalisizo Hospital. There was no evidence that the LG supervised both facilities at least once every quarter within the previous FY. The supervision dates for the sampled health facilities are as follows:</p> <p><u>Kakuuto HC4</u></p> <p>Q1: No Supervision Visit; Q2: (11/11/22 (Health Facility Support Supervision Report dated 4/4/23); Q3: 25/01/23 (Health Facility Support Supervision Report dated 4/4/23); and Q4: 24/04/23 (Health Facility Support Supervision Report dated 4/4/23).</p> <p><u>Kalisizo Hospital</u></p> <p>Q1: 14/09/22 (Health Facility Support Supervision Report dated 30/09/22); Q2: 29/12/22 (Health Facility Support Supervision Report dated 4/4/23); Q3: 16/03/23 (Health Facility Support Supervision Report dated 4/4/23); and Q4: 08/06/23 (Health Facility Support Supervision Report dated 4/4/23)23).</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>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score 	<p>There was evidence that the LG supervised the three sampled facilities at least once during the previous FY. The supervision dates for the sampled health facilities are as follows:</p> <p>1) Mutukula HCIII: Q1 (No visit); Q2 (03/11/22); Q3 (14/03/23); Q4 (16/06/23).</p> <p>2) Kasasa HCIII: Q1 (No visit); Q2 (03/11/22); Q3 (27/03/23); Q4 (16/06/23).</p> <p>3) Mitukula HCIII: Q1 (No visit); Q2 (12/12/22); Q3 (20/03/23); Q4 (13/06/23).</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>There was evidence that the health department provided recommendations from the supervision visits during the previous FY, and that their implementation was followed up at the sampled health facilities -</p> <p>1) Kakuuto HCIV: on the 08/07/23 it was recommended for better linkage for testing of HIV exposed infants and the subsequent testing rates displayed more coverage.</p> <p>2) Kasasa HCIII; on 28/03/23, it was recommended that IPC measures are intensified. Subsequently, an additional handwashing facility was located at the OPD.</p> <p>3) Mitukula HCIII: On 25/08/22 a recommendation was made to transfer in a clinical officer and subsequently, as per the visitor's book on the 20/03/23, a new clinical officer was transferred in.</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>There was no evidence that Kyotera DLG had provided guidance to health facility in charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies. However, the overall proportion of health facilities where this guidance had been provided at least once in the year is 19/34. Those who received the guidance by date are as follows; Q1:0/34; Q2: 5/34 (Q2 -November 2022); Q3: 7/34 (Q3 -Jan-March 2023); and Q4: 10/34 (Q4 -May&June 2023).</p>	0

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	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	There was evidence that the LG allocated at least 30% of District Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities. Deriving from Pg.30 and 31 of the approved budget, the budget for the District Health Office (PhC NW) was UGX 73,262,000.00 out of which UGX 23,633,100.00 had been allocated to health promotion (representing 32% allocation) -more than 15%	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the Kyotera DHT had implemented health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in the previous FY. Q1: Report dated 24/10/22 – Conducted radio talk shows on the Measles Rubella Vaccination campaign; Q2: Report dated 12/12/22 – Conducted community awareness campaigns on malaria prevention 2nd-6th December 2023; Q3: Report dated 27/03/23 – conducted community awareness campaigns from 18th-21st March 2023; and Q4: Report dated 03/07/23 – During the 4th quarter reported on activities on hygiene and sanitation monitoring at Kasali Town Council.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the Kyotera DHT had implemented follow-up actions on health promotion, disease prevention, and social mobilization activities in the previous FY. Action points were raised in the reports for Q3, Q2, and Q1. All three reports had the same action point which was that the Ministry of Health should provide IEC materials ahead of campaigns. There was no evidence that this was followed up.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

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>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Assets register details health facilities and equipment in the LG relative to the medical equipment list and service standards. The file containing the Assets register included some individual information for only 22/34 GoU facilities. All those included had information on infrastructure, gadgets, and vehicles. Of these, 20 had historic dates (FY 2020/21)., Only 7 of these individual registers document equipment by department. Only 3 included information on functionality status.</p>	0	
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>12 Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the Pg.86 of the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII); (ii) desk appraisal by the LG on 06/02/2022; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source. Appraisal forms for the following 2 projects were verified</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. construction of a staff house at Nangoma H/C III at UGX 50,715,771 by M/S Zombe Enterprises Ltd; 2. construction of a general ward at Kakuuto H/C IV at UGX 79,781,558 by M/S Kyamulibwa Carpentry and Workshop Ltd 	1	
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DLG had conducted field Appraisal on 23/03/2022 to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions; The Appraisal forms were presented for verification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. construction of a staff house at Nangoma H/C III at UGX 50,715,771 by M/S Zombe Enterprises Ltd; 2. construction of a general ward at Kakuuto H/C IV at UGX 79,781,558 by M/S Kyamulibwa Carpentry and Workshop Ltd 	1
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>					

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG screened health facility investments for environmental and social risks. Screening was done by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for the following sampled Health projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a Staff House at Nangoma HC II, done on 01/07/2022; 2) Construction of a General Ward at Kakuuto HC IV Phase III, done on 06/07/2023 <p>There were also projects screened by the Environment Department that did not appear on the District Planner's list for the previous FY, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Renovation of a Staff House at Nangoma HC II, done on a date not mentioned on the screening Form; 4) Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Kabira H/C III, done on 27/09/2023; 5) Construction of a General Ward at Kakuuto HC IV Phase II, done 01/07/2022; 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department submitted its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU on March 10, 2023.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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 under minute Min04/10/06/22 of the PDU meeting that sat on June 10, 2023 that the LG Health department submitted procurement request form during the 1st quarter of the current FY.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>				
<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>				
<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>				

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 minute Min04/10/06/22 of the contracts committee meeting which sat on 10th June, 2022 and approved the procurement of health infrastructure investments for the previous FY.</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 a letter referenced CR/KTR/156/1, dated July 15, 2022, appointing the Water Officer, the District Agricultural engineer, the District Environment officer, the Senior CDO, DEO, the DHO and the District Health Inspector on all to the District funded projects for the previous FY.</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>There was that the Nangoma health center III facilities being upgraded followed the technical designs by the MOH. The sampled dimensions were for the prenatal ward, whose internal dimensions were: 4.8m x 3.0 m which compare well with the designs dimensions of 4.8m x 3.0 m; and the Centre to Centre dimensions of the 7.1 m x 7.2m which were similar to the design dimensions of the 7.1 m x 7.2m.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence of daily records by the Clerk of Works.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence of monthly site meetings chaired by the CAO for the for the completion of the upgrade of the Nangoma HCII t HC III.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days). The following two projects were implemented during the year:</p> <p>VN 6440129 of 28/06/2023 being payment of UGX 50,715,771 to M/S Zombe Enterprises Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a staff house at Nangoma H/C III</p> <p>Payment was requested 07/06/2023, and was effected on 28/06/2023 (beyond 10 working days)</p> <p>VN 4279529 of 16/03/2023 being payment of UGX 79,781,558 to M/S Kyamulibwa Carpentry and Workshop Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of a general ward at Kakuuto H/C IV</p> <p>Payment was requested 13/12/2022, and was effected on 16/03/2023 (beyond 10 working days)</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 with record as required. The sampled projects were: KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00015 Completion of upgrade of Nangoma HC II to HCIII, whose requisition was made on February 1, 2023, advert was made on March 10, 2023, evaluation was completed on March 30, 2023, Solicitor Generals clearance was obtained on May 3, 2023 through a letter referenced DLAS/mbr/079/2023 and contract signed on May 23, 2023 at an award price of Ug Shs 292,928,805; KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00003 Construction of a staff house at Nangoma HC III, whose requisition was made on April 27, 2022, advert was made on June 27, 2022, evaluation was completed on July 19, 2022 and contract signed on October 17, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 161,640,073; and KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00002 Construction of a General ward of at Kakuto HC II, whose requisition was made on June 21, 2022, advert was made on June 27, 2022, evaluation was completed on July 19, 2022 and contract signed on October 17, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 93,455,528.</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 no Grievance Log at the Health Department.</p> <p>Kyotera DLG had just shifted to a newly built District Headquarters and all departments used one Central Noticeboard. This Central Noticeboard had no GRM advertised.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no distribution list on health care / medical waste management. The distribution list that was available was for IPC. The assessor was not sure whether the two meant the same thing, and the officer concerned was not available to explain. However, from previous assessments in other DLGs, the assessor knew that distribution lists had been availed for each of these separately, and therefore that for waste management was missing in this particular DLG.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste. An MOU dated 15 Feb 2023 signed by CAO Rakai District and Dr. Grace Mugume representing Green Label Services Limited was available. Apart from the signature, the CAO did not print his/her name on the MOU. In the same file were District Waste Transfer Forms ranging from March to October 2023.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no training and awareness raising on waste management done. The Officer concerned with Environmental Health was not on duty at the time of assessment. S/He had left behind documentation necessary for the assessment exercise but these did not have any concerning training on waste management. The DHO tried to check for availability of any such files in vain.</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG costed ESMPs and incorporated these into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY. Costing for ESMPs was done by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for the following sampled Health projects:</p> <p>1) Construction of a Staff House at Nangoma HC II, done on 01/07/2022. The costed value Was UGX300,000/-. The BoQ reflected UGX200,000/-;</p> <p>2) Construction of a General Ward at Kakuuto HC IV Phase III, done on 06/07/2023. The costed value Was UGX200,000/-.The BoQ reflected UGXUGX200,000/-</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Documentation on land acquisition status was as follows:</p> <p>i) For Nangoma HCII, it is located on Plot 30, Block 899 at Mizinda-Kasherero, Kyotera. The title specifies the ownership as 'NANGOMA SUB-COUNTY LOCAL COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION'</p> <p>But</p> <p>ii) Kakuuto HC IV is on Kabaka's land and has no Land Title, according to Kyotera District Staff Surveyor.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provided monthly reports.</p> <p>Support supervision reports availed. The supervision reports were prepared by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for the two Health projects implemented as follows:</p> <p>1) Construction of a Staff House at Nangoma HC II, dated 18/06/2023 and another dated 28/04/2023;</p> <p>2) Construction of a General Ward at Kakuuto HC IV Phase III, dated 18/12/2022 and another dated 08/11/2023.</p>	2

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence 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. E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments. Those availed were signed by Sebudde Harold District Engineer, Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer, Namuwawu Prossy, CDO, Dr. Muwanga Edward DHO, and Approved by Bwayo G.R. CAO for the following sampled projects.

1) Construction of a Staff House at Nangoma HC II, dated 19/06/2023;

2) Construction of a General Ward at Kakuuto HC IV Phase III, dated 20/01/2023.

**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 	<p>According to Management Information System of the Ministry of Water and Environment, the functionality of Kyotera district rural water sources is 68%.</p>	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 	<p>According to Management Information System of the Ministry of Water and Environment the percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees (document water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs) is 78%.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY was 20%</p> <p>The scores were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Kirumba Subcounty scored 0% 2 Lwankoni Subcounty scored 20% 3 Kalisizo Subcounty scored 30% 4 Kyebe Subcounty scored 60% 5 Kabira Subcounty scored 30% 6 Kasasa Subcounty scored 0% 7 Nangoma Subcounty scored 0% 8 Kakuuto Subcounty scored 0% 9 Nabigasa Subcounty scored 20% <p>the average scored 20%</p>	0

2

N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

- o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2
- o If 80-99%: Score 1
- o If below 80 %: Score 0

Based on the Ministry MIS, Kyotera District has six sub counties and Five Town council namely Kabira Sub county (with a coverage of 46%); Kalisizo Sub County (with a coverage of 82%); Kasali Sub County (with a coverage of 95%); Kirumba Sub county (with a coverage of 30%); Lwankoni Sub county (with a coverage of 62%); and Nabigasa Sub county (with a coverage of 84%). The Town Councils are Kyotera Town Council, Mutukura TC, Kasensero TC, Kasali TC, and Kalisizo TC. Kyotera District had average water coverage of 61% which implies that two sub counties of Kabira Sub county (with a coverage of 46%), and Kirumba Sub County (with a coverage of 30%) had a water coverage below the district average. Annual Report (also Fourth Quarter Report) was presented for review during assessment.

Annual Report (Also Fourth Quarter Report) submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated July 13th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 17th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer - Kyotera, District Engineer - Kyotera District, the Team Leader RWRC 4, and the Principal Internal Auditor- Kyotera District.

According to the above named report, of the 36 projects planned, all of which were implemented in the year namely:

- Construction of public latrine (#01);
- Construction of Ferro Cement Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#07);

2

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

Annual Work Plan 2022-2023 submitted under cover letter Ref - CR/10314 dated July 13th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 15th, 2022. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the Chairperson LCV/ Kyotera, the Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Team Leader/ TSU 7 Masaka, Chief Finance Officer- Kyotera, District Engineer- Kyotera, the Principal Internal Auditor - Kyotera, and District Planner -Kyotera

According to this work plan 36 projects were planned namely:

- Construction of public latrine (#01) at a cost of UGX 42,000,000/=
- Construction of Ferro Cement Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#07) at a cost of UGX 77,000,000/=;

- Supply and Installation of HDPE Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#08) at a cost of UGX 80,000,000/=;
- Rehabilitation of Hand Pumped Boreholes (#018)- supply of spare parts at a cost of UGX 65,000,000/= ; and
- Drilling of Production Boreholes (#02) at a cost of UGX 108,000,000/=.

Three of the Contracts of the above activities were analyzed for cost variation as outlined below:

- Construction of 5 stance latrine (#01) in Kabanyaga Landing Site, Nangoma Sub County at a cost of UGX 41,039,015 by MS Kamuzanda General Enterprises Contract No. KYOT878/WRKS/22-23/00011 signed on March 27th, 2023- this is different from the engineering estimates by 2%;
- Construction of Seven Ferro Cement Rain water Harvesting Tanks (#07) in Nabigasa Sub County (#01), Kalisizo Sub County (#01), Kirumba Sub County (#02), and Kasali TC (#03) at a cost of UGX 66,447,180 by MS Kolm Technical Services Limited s Contract No. KYOT621/WRKS/22-23/00004 signed on November 18th, 2022 - this is different from the engineering estimates by 14 %; and
- Supply and Installation of Eight HDPE Rain water Harvesting Tanks (#08) in Nabigasa Sub County (#02), Lwankoni Sub County (#02), Kyebe Sub County (#02), Kabira Sub County (#01), and Kakuuto Sub County (#01) at a cost of UGX 71,929,142 by MS Kats Civil and Water Works Ltd Contract No. KYOT621/WRKS/22-23/00002 signed on November 30th, 2022 - this is different from the engineering estimates by 10%;

Variations in the contract prices of all the three sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY was within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates.

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

Annual Work Plan 2022-2023 submitted under cover letter Ref – CR/10314 dated July 13th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 15th, 2022. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the Chairperson LCV/ Kyotera, the Resident District Commissioner – Kyotera, Team Leader/ TSU 7 Masaka, Chief Finance Officer- Kyotera, District Engineer- Kyotera, the Principal Internal Auditor – Kyotera, and District Planner -Kyotera

According to this work plan 36 projects were planned namely:

- Construction of public latrine (#01) at a cost of UGX 42,000,000/=
- Construction of Ferro Cement Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#07) at a cost of UGX 77,000,000/=;
- Supply and Installation of HDPE Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#08) at a cost of UGX 80,000,000/=;
- Rehabilitation of Hand Pumped Boreholes (#018)- supply of spare parts at a cost of UGX 65,000,000/= ; and
- Drilling of Production Boreholes (#02) at a cost of UGX 108,000,000/=.

Annual Report (Also Fourth Quarter Report) submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated July 13th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 17th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, District Engineer - Kyotera District, the Team Leader RWRC 4, and the Principal Internal Auditor- Kyotera District.

According to the Fourth Quarter Report, 34 of the 36 planned projects (94.4%) mentioned above were implemented before the end of the year 2022/2023 FY.

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>According to Management Information System of the Ministry of Water and Environment, the functionality of the district rural water sources is 68 % while functionality in the previous year was still 68%. This represents no increase (0%) in the functionality of water facilities in the district.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>According to Management Information System of the Ministry of Water and Environment the percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees (document water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCS) is 78% while facilities with functional WSCs in the previous year was still 78%. This represents no increase (0%) in the functionality of water user committees in the district.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>Annual Work Plan 2022-2023 submitted under cover letter Ref – CR/10314 dated July 13th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 15th, 2022. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr.Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the Chairperson LCV/ Kyotera, the Resident District Commissioner – Kyotera, Team Leader/ TSU 7 Masaka, Chief Finance Officer- Kyotera, District Engineer- Kyotera, the Principal Internal Auditor – Kyotera, and District Planner -Kyotera</p> <p>According to this work plan 36 projects were planned namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of public latrine (#01) at a cost of UGX 42,000,000/= • Construction of Ferro Cement Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#07) at a cost of UGX 77,000,000/=; • Supply and Installation of HDPE Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#08) at a cost of UGX 80,000,000/=; • Rehabilitation of Hand Pumped Boreholes (#018)- supply of spare parts at a cost of UGX 65,000,000/= ; and • Drilling of Production Boreholes (#02) at 	3
---	---	--	---	---

a cost of UGX 108,000,000/=.

The WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY (2022/2023) were accurately reported upon as reflected in the Annual Progress Report.

Three projects were sampled during the assessment. They included:

- Supply and Installation of 10 cubic Meter HDPE Rain Water Harvesting Tank at Nakasoga SSS. System is located at Coordinates: 36M0337754, UTM 9942189 Altitude 1248m. Ssendagire Hamza - Tel: 0701617680 (Head Teacher) was met during the field work. At the time of verification, the system was functional but with some minor defects (a small damage on the tank) to be fixed before expiry of defect liability period;
- Construction of a (#01) 20 cubic Meter Ferro Cement Rain Harvesting Tank at Kinawa Village, Matale Parish, Kalisizo Sub County. Facility is located at Coordinates: 36M0345287, UTM9942398. Met with Teacher Cissy Namuwonge - Head Teacher Tel: 0754169728. At the time of verification the system was functional but with minor defects that needed to be rectified; and
- Borehole Rehabilitation of a borehole (#01) DWD No. at 53583 at Zziwa Village, Kyanika Parish. Borehole is located at coordinate: 36M0345458, UTM9921987, at Altitude 1185m. Met with Mrs. Ssekaweke Annet 0752449669, Treasurer Borehole was functional during field work at the time of verification

Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

During the assessment, the four undermentioned quarterly reports were reviewed:

- First Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated October 4th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on October 10th, 2022. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, the Head TSU 7, and the Ag. District Engineer – Kyotera District.
- Second Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated January 02nd, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on January 10th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, the Head TSU 7, and the Ag. District Engineer – Kyotera District;
- Third Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref CR.851/1dated April 05th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on April 05th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, District Engineer - Kyotera District, the Team Leader RWRC 4, and the Principal Internal Auditor- Kyotera District; and
- Annual Report (Also Fourth Quarter Report) submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated July 13th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 17th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, District Engineer - Kyotera District, the Team Leader RWRC 4, and the Principal Internal Auditor- Kyotera District.

There was no Evidence attached on the reports that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation situation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community that was attached to each of the four Quarterly Reports.

Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

During the assessment, the four undermentioned quarterly reports were reviewed:

- First Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated October 4th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on October 10th, 2022. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, the Head TSU 7, and the Ag. District Engineer – Kyotera District.
- Second Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated January 02nd, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on January 10th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, the Head TSU 7, and the Ag. District Engineer – Kyotera District;
- Third Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref CR.851/1dated April 05th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on April 05th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, District Engineer - Kyotera District, the Team Leader RWRC 4, and the Principal Internal Auditor- Kyotera District; and
- Annual Report (Also Fourth Quarter Report) submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated July 13th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 17th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, District Engineer - Kyotera District, the Team Leader RWRC 4, and the Principal Internal Auditor- Kyotera District.

The above mentioned reports were reviewed. There was evidence found in the respective quarterly reports to show 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.) Further, the DWO MIS was on the Laptop in the DWO – the same was last updated on November 03rd, 2023. This data was also kept on the Lap top in the DWO.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>The average score of water and environment based LLG assessment results for the current FY according to the report dated August 30th, 2023 shared by the District Planner Mr. Mulema Stuarthe (Tel 0700803620), the average LLG average score for water was 29%.</p> <p>The score for Nangoma Sub County was 0%, for Kakuuto Sub County was 20%, for Kyebe Sub County was 30%, Kasasa Sub County was 0%, Kabira Sub County was 30%, Nabigasa 0%, Kalisizo Sub County 50 %, Kirumba Sub County 80% while that of Kabira Sub County was 30% which give an average score of 29%</p> <p>The lowest performing sub counties were Nangoma, Kasasa and Nabigasa sub counties all scoring 0%. There was however no evidence of existence of Performance Improvement Plan for these three sub County presented for review during the assessment.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The water office had 2 members of staff and were both budgeted for. Water Officer, Kirumira, Shillings 2,250. 000 (monthly) and Borehole Maintenance Technician, Wasswa Anatoli, Shillings 316,393 (monthly), as per the costed staff structure</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>The Natural Resources Department had 10 members of staff. They were all budgeted for as per the departmental costed staff structure.</p> <p>1. District Natural Resources Officer, Kiyangi Jamil - 6,000,000; 2. Physical Planner, Nakaliili Olivia - 4,000,000; 3. Forest Guard, Ssentongo Matia Lukwago - 313,832; 4. Forest Ranger, Mugenyi Fred - 377,781; 5. Forest Officer, Ngoloobe Michael - 4,000,000; 6. Sekajugo Gadafi, Environment Officer - 4,000,000; 7. Senior Land Management Officer Matovu Tom - 4,000,000; 8. Staff Surveyor, Kimuli Teddy - 4,000,000; 9. Forest Guard, Kiggundu Patrick - 187,660; and 10. Forest Guard, Male Moses - 209,859</p>	2

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p>The water office had 2 members of staff. They were both appraised by Ag. District Engineer Mrs. Nakayote Marion Judith on the following dates; 1. Senior Civil Engineer (water) - 30th June 2023; and Borehole Maintenance Technician - 30th June 2023.</p>	3
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>There was also no evidence of training plan made; consequently was no training scheduled and hence no Capacity Building Report.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • • If 80-99%: Score 2 • • If 60-79: Score 1 • • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>Based on the Ministry MIS, Kyotera District has six sub counties and Five Town council namely Kabira Sub county (with a coverage of 45%); Kalisizo Sub County (with a coverage of 80%); Kasali Sub County (with a coverage of 95%); Kirumba Sub county (with a coverage of 29%); Lwankoni Sub county (with a coverage of 61%); and Nabigasa Sub county (with a coverage of 84%). The Town Councils are Kyotera Town Council, Mutukura TC, Kasensero TC, Kasali TC, and Kalisizo TC. Kyotera District had average water coverage of 61% which implies that two sub counties of Kabira Sub county (with a coverage of 45%), and Kirumba Sub County (with a coverage of 29%) had a water coverage below the district average. Annual Report (also Fourth Quarter Report) was presented for review during assessment.</p> <p>Annual Work Plan 2023-2024 submitted under cover letter Ref – CR/KTR/210/1 dated July 13th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 17th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the Chairperson LCV/ Kyotera, the Resident District Commissioner – Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer- Kyotera, District Planner –Kyotera, Team Leader/RWRC4, Ag. District Engineer- Kyotera, and the Principal Internal Auditor – Kyotera,</p> <p>Besides, Supplementary Annual Work Plan 2023-2024 submitted under cover letter Ref – CR/KTR/750/1 dated October 30th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

Environment on November 03rd, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the Chairperson LCV/ Kyotera, the Resident District Commissioner – Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer- Kyotera, District Planner –Kyotera, Team Leader/RWRC4, Ag. District Engineer- Kyotera, and the Principal Internal Auditor – Kyotera,

According to the above named annual work plan, 47 Hardware projects planned in 2023/2024 are contained in the work plan and reflected in the Budget Annexed to the work plan at a cost of UGX 513,954,221/= (of the total UGX 655,034,990/=).

The projects included:

- Construction of public latrine (#02) at a cost of UGX 90,000,000/=
- Construction of Ferro Cement Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#05) at a cost of UGX 47,500,000/=;
- Supply and Installation of HDPE Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#011) at a cost of UGX 93,500,000/=;
- Rehabilitation of Hand Pumped Boreholes (#024)- supply of spare parts at a cost of UGX 72,000,000/= ;
- Construction of Mini Solar Piped Water Scheme (#01) at a cost of UGX 176,454,221/=;
- Drilling of three deep boreholes (#03) at a cost of UGX 79,500,000; and
- Extension of Piped water scheme (#01) at a cost UGX 45,000,000.

Of these projects, 15 were planned in locations with water coverage below the district average rural water coverage namely:

- Rehabilitation of a hand pumped boreholes (#07 - #03 in Kirumba and #04 in Kabira) at a Cost of UGX 21,000,000/=;
- Supply and installation of HDPE Rain Water Harvesting Tanks (#05 - #03 in Kirumba and #02 in Kabira) at a Cost of UGX 42,500,000/=;
- Borehole Drilling (#02) in Kabira Sub County at a Cost of UGX 53,000,000/=;
- Construction of Ferro Cement Tank at Kabira at a Cost of UGX 9,500,000/=;

This means that of the total budget of UGX 513,954,221/= (UGX 126,000,000 which translates to 25% of the total budget for hard ward projects) was budgeted for activities in sub counties with water

coverage below the district average coverage.

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>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO conducted sub county advocacy meetings during which he publicized to the LLGs their respective allocations sources to be constructed in the current financial year 2023/2024. Minutes of the advocacy meetings were dated June 26th, 2023 and were prepared by Ms. Eva Nabasumba – Tel: 0701489116. Copy of minutes of this advocacy meetings was shared for review during the assessment. The same were also attached to the Annual Progress Report outlined below:</p>	3
	<p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>Annual Report (Also Fourth Quarter Report) submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated July 13th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 17th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer – Kyotera, District Engineer - Kyotera District, the Team Leader RWRC 4, and the Principal Internal Auditor- Kyotera District.</p>	
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</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>	<p>The monitoring of the old WSS facilities were evidenced by the Form 4 which were submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment under cover letter CR/KTR/D/750/1 dated on July 13th, 2023 where it was received on July 17th, 2023 along with the respective quarterly report.</p>	4
	<p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></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		

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings comprised of a four sets of minutes which were presented to the assessor for review namely:

The same evidence was contained in the software reports attached to the respective Quarterly reports as outlined below:

- First Quarter Report submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated October 4th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on October 10th, 2022. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer - Kyotera, the Head TSU 7, and the Ag. District Engineer - Kyotera District and
- Annual Report (Also Fourth Quarter Report) submitted under cover letter Ref CR/KTR/210/1 dated July 13th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 17th, 2023. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the District Chairperson LCV- Kyotera District, Resident District Commissioner - Kyotera, Chief Finance Officer - Kyotera, District Engineer - Kyotera District, the Team Leader RWRC 4, and the Principal Internal Auditor- Kyotera District.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There no evidence that the DWO publicized to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current financial year 2023/2024. This evidence was neither contained on the Local Government Notice Board nor on the District Notice Board.

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 	<p>Annual Work Plan 2022-2023 submitted under cover letter Ref – CR/10314 dated July 13th, 2022 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 15th, 2022. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the Chairperson LCV/ Kyotera, the Resident District Commissioner – Kyotera, Team Leader/ TSU 7 Masaka, Chief Finance Officer- Kyotera, District Engineer- Kyotera, the Principal Internal Auditor – Kyotera, and District Planner -Kyotera</p> <p>According to the budget attached to the work plan, the total NWR budget was UGX 71,006,777/= of which UGX 47,173,000/= (UGX 17,993,000 for activities 1.1-1.4 and UGX 29,181,000 for activities 6.1-6.19) was spent on software activities which represented 66.4% of NWR budget.</p>	3
----	---	--	---	----------

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>There was evidence that for the previous FY 2022/2023, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained Water and Sanitation Committees (WSCs) on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities. This evidence was contained in Software Activity Report that was attached to the Quarter 2 Sector Report. According to the report, 60 water user committee members – 30 of whom were female were trained for 12 Point water sources in the district. The training was conducted between 2nd – 19th, December, 2022.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	----------

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG. The available asset register had been last updated on November 3rd, 2023.</p>	4
----	--	--	--	----------

11

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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.

There was evidence that the LG DWO had 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

Desk appraisals forms dated 21/04/2022 for the following projects were seen. (The projects were derived from Pg 87-88 of the DDP):

-Construction of 20 cement-ferro tanks in all RGCs;

-Construction of pit-latrines at Kyakudduse T/C

-Extension of piped water scheme to Minziro Parish

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>Annual Work Plan 2023-2024 submitted under cover letter Ref – CR/10314 dated July 13th, 2023 and received at the Ministry of Water and Environment on July 17th, 2022. Letter was signed by Chief Administrative Officer Mr. Bwayo Gabriel Rogers with copies to the Chairperson LCV/ Kyotera, the Resident District Commissioner – Kyotera, Team Leader/RWRC4, Chief Finance Officer- Kyotera, Ag. District Engineer- Kyotera, the Principal Internal Auditor – Kyotera, and District Planner -Kyotera</p> <p>30 Hardware projects planned in 2023/2024 were contained in the work plan and reflected in the Budget Annexed to the work plan. They included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of Public Latrine (#02) at St Rapheal Bulinda Primary School in Kalisizo TC and Kasambya Market in Kyotera TC; • Drilling of three Hand Pumped Boreholes at Bakka and Kyamayembe villages both in Kabira Sub County (#02) and in Lubimba Village Kasasa Sub County; • Construction of Mini Solar Piped System in Kigazi Minziro RTC in Kyebe Sub County; and • Rehabilitation of 24 boreholes in selected Sub Counties Kirumba Sub County (#4), Kyebe Sub County (#05), Nabigasa Sub County (#05), Lwankoni Sub County (#04), Kakuuto Sub County (#03), and Kasali Sub County (#03) <p>Some of the Letters of request or Application Forms for some of these projects planned for 2023/2024 namely application form for Rehabilitation of eight Boreholes were not available during the field visit of the assessment.</p>
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had conducted field appraisal on 27th & 28/04/2022 to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. The field appraisal forms were verified</p> <p>-Construction of 20 cement-ferro tanks in all RGCs;</p> <p>-Construction of pit-latrines at Kyakudduse T/C</p> <p>-Extension of piped water scheme to Minziro Parish</p>

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents.</p> <p>Score 2</p>	<p>There were no DLG projects to screen for the Current FY.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. The sampled investments were: Supply and installation of 5 HDPE tanks busgeted at Ugx 40,000,000; Construction of Fero Cement tanks bidgeted at Ugx 80,000,000; and Borehole drilling and rehabilitation budgeted at Ugx 74,000,000.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence of Min04/10/06/22 of the contracts committee meeting which sat on June 10, 2022 to approve the procurement of the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence of a letter referenced CR/KTR/156/1, dated July 15, 2022, appointing the Water Officer, the District Agricultural engineer, the District Environment officer, the Senior CDO, DEO, the DHO and the District Health Inspector on all to the District funded projects for the previous FY.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence of standard designs for the provided by the DWO.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the District Engineer, Environment and Community Development Officer participated in supervising WSS.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts:</p> <p>VN 5861751 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 37,004,670 to M/S Kamuzinda General Enterprises Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kabanyaga landing Site</p> <p>The Certificate had been signed by DWO on 30/05/2023</p> <p>VN 4201703 of 02/03/2023 being payment of UGX 59,915,084 to M/S Kolma Technical Co. Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of 7-ferro-cement water tanks in Nabigasa S/C, Kalisizo S/C, Kirumba S/C and Kasaali T/C</p> <p>The certificate was signed by DWO on 30/05/2023</p> <p>VN 5904292 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 64,858,142 to M/S Kats Civil & Water Works Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the supply and installation of 8-HDPE Water Tanks @ 20 Cubic Liters at Nabigasa S/C, Lwankoni S/C, Kyebe S/C, Kabira S/C and Kakuuto S/C</p> <p>The Certificate was signed by DWO, CDO and the Environment Officer on 31/01/2023</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of complete procurement files with record as required. The sampled projects were: KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00004 Supply and Installation of water harvesting tanks, whose requisition was made on March 20, 2022, advert was made on June 27, 2022, evaluation was completed on July 19, 2022 and contract signed on November 11, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 66,447,180; KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00011 Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kabanyaga landing site, whose requisition was made on March 20, 2023, the advert was placed on March 20, 2023, evaluation was completed on March 7, 2023 and contract signed on April 27, 2023 at an award price of Ug Shs 41,039,015 and KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00002 Supply and installation HDPE tanks, whose requisition was made on March 20, 2022, advert was made on June 17, 2022, evaluation was completed on July 19, 2022 and contract signed on November 30, 2022 at an award price of Ug Shs 71,929,142.</p>
----	---	---	--

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was a Grievance Log at the Water and Environment Department .</p> <p>Kyotera DLG had just shifted to a newly built District Headquarters and all departments used one Central Noticeboard. This Central Noticeboard had no GRM advertised.</p>
----	---	--	---

14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs. There were two types of Guidelines disseminated namely:</p> <p>1) Water Source protection and Natural Resources Management Plan. The Guidelines were disseminated to 14 recipients starting with Ssali Charles Sango, SACAO - Nangoma of Tel: 0702 411160, through to Nabasumba Eva, CDO Kabira of Tel: 0701 489116;</p> <p>2) There was also another dissemination list of a document titles: FRAMEWORK AND GUIDELINES FOR WATER SOURCE PROTECTION. Volume 1: Framework for Water Source Protection'. This was disseminated to 14 Centres starting with Nabasumba Eva - CDO Tel: 0701 489116 to with Ssali Charles Sango, SACAO - Nangoma of Tel: 0702 411160</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that water source protection plans and Natural resource management plans for WSS Facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented. Two Reports were availed namely:</p> <p>1) A report on Monitoring and Inspection of Sikaningu Water Catchment in Kyebe Sub County dated 16/08/2023. The report was prepared by Ngolobe Michael District Forest Officer - Kyotera, and Kirumira Steven District Water Officer; and</p> <p>2) A Report dated 20/09/2023 titled: Re: Community sensitization meeting on production and sustainable use of Bukoola River and its banks in Kakuuto sub county as per Water source Protection and Natural Resources Management Plan. The report was written by Kirumira Steven District Water Officer and Ntambaazi Paul Senior Agricultural Officer.</p>	3

Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence to show that some WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances.

For each of the drilled production boreholes, the land consent agreements were as follows:

- Agreement for Land for drilling of Production borehole for Minziro was signed by Matovu Roger for land Owner and Matovu Anjero on behalf of Community of Minziro-Land Agreement was signed on October 20th, 2023; and
- Agreement for Land for drilling of Production borehole for Balole Village, Kibumba Parish was signed by Kibirise Celeste for land Owner and Ssembatya Willy on behalf of Community of Balole Village-Land Agreement was signed on August 02nd, 2022.

For the Constructed Public Latrine, there was no Land Consent Agreement.

However, there was no agreements for the Fifteen Rain water Harvesting Constructed (#08 HDPE and #07 Ferro Cement) that were constructed during the period.

Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was 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:

VN 5861751 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 37,004,670 to M/S Kamuzinda General Enterprises Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of 5-Stance Pit Latrine at Kabanyaga Landing Site

The Certificate had been signed by DWO, CDO and the Environment Officer on 30/05/2023

VN 4201703 of 02/03/2023 being payment of UGX 59,915,084 to M/S Kolma Technical Co. Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of 7-ferro-cement water tanks in Nabigasa S/C, kalisizo S/C, Kirumba S/C and Kasaali T/C

Certificate had been signed by DWO, CDO and the Environment Officer on 30/05/2023

VN 5904292 of 15/06/2023 being payment of UGX 64,858,142 to M/S Kats Civil & Water Works Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the supply and installation of 8-HDPE Water Tanks @ 20 Cubic Liters at Nabigasa S/C, Lwankoni S/C, Kyebe S/C, Kabira S/C and Kakuuto S/C

Certificate was signed by DWO, CDO and the Environment Officer on 31/01/2023

Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2, If not score 0

There was evidence that the CDO and Environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs. A Cover Letter dated 02 March 2023 written by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO detailing Monitoring activities was presented with projects as follows:

1) Construction of a mini solar piped water system at Kagezi Minziiro, done on 26/06/2023;

2) Construction of a Ferro Cement Tank at Kiwenda - Kalisizo, dated 01/12/2023;

3) Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Kabanyaga, Nangoma Parish, dated 12/09/2023;

4) Construction of a Ferro Cement Tank at Kabira - Njara, dated 01/12/2023;

5) Construction of a Ferro Cement Tank at Kabira-Njara Parish, dated 21/01/2023; and

6) Construction of a Ferro Cement Tank at Lunyinya - Kirumba Parish , done on 01/12/2023.

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of 5 beneficiaries with 12.5 acres and 52 non beneficiaries with 65.5 acres in the financial year 2021/2022. There was evidence of 17 beneficiaries with 42.5 acres and 130 non beneficiaries with 369 acres in the financial year 2022/2023</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>There is evidence that the LG had increased acreage of newly irrigated land where in the financial year 2021/2022 the acreage was 78 acres which increased to 412 acres in the financial year 2022/2023 giving a percentage increase of 81.1%</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment was 78.57%</p> <p>1 Kalangala T/C 80%</p> <p>2 Bujumba S/C 80%</p> <p>3 Bubeke S/C 50%</p> <p>4 Bufumbira S/C 80%</p> <p>5 Mazinga S/C 100%</p> <p>6 Mugoya S/C 80%</p> <p>7 Kyamuswa S/C 80%</p> <p>The average score was 78.57%</p>	4

Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines

Maximum score 6

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

There was evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant amounting to 1,033,953,804/= for the financial year 2022/2023 had been used on eligible activities. Sampled activities included;

1. VN 5167659 of 03/05/2023 being payment of UGX 89,304,465 to M/S Anjana Projects Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the supply and installation of irrigation equipment for 6 farmers: Tebendeke John, Nannyangu Jane, Namboze Jesca, Ssemuju Stephen, Kimera Godfrey and Mulinda Henry

2. VN 6438710 of 28/06/2023 being payment of UGX 204,411,500 to M/S Anjana Projects Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the supply and installation of irrigation equipment for 11 farmers: Ssembebwa Miiro, Ssenyondo Frank, Nakato Paulina, Kasiita Girisimu, Mugisha Enos, Mulindwa John, Ssendi Valerie, Kavuma Steven, Bwanika Steven, Settuba Danier and Lwanga Henry.

3. Awareness raising of leaders both at district and LG as detailed in report dated 03/05/2023,13/6/2023 and 17/05/2023.

4. Farm visits to farmers with farmer IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemuju Stephen) dated 05/11/2021 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) dated 07/12/2022 of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) dated 10/8/2021 of Kabira SC who had successful expressions of interests

5. Awareness raising of farmers at LLG level dated 5/09/2023, 5/06/2023 and 28/06/2023

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the approved farmers signed Acceptance Forms confirming that equipment were working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers:	1
	Maximum score 6		VN 5167659 of 03/05/2023 being payment of UGX 89,304,465 to M/S Anjana Projects Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the supply and installation of irrigation equipment for 6 farmers: Tebendeke John, Nannyangu Jane, Namboze Jesca, Ssemuju Stephen, Kimera Godfrey and Mulinda Henry	
			All the 6-Farmers signed the Acceptance Forms on 30/03/2023	
			VN 6438710 of 28/06/2023 being payment of UGX 204,411,500 to M/S Anjana Projects Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the supply and installation of irrigation equipment for 11 farmers: Ssembewa Miir, Ssenyondo Frank, Nakato Paulina, Kasiita Girisimu, Mugisha Enos, Mulindwa John, Ssendi Valerie, Kavuma Steven, Bwanika Steven, Settuba Danier and Lwanga Henry.	
			All the 11 farmers were invited to the district and signed Acceptance Forms on 06/06/2023	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of contracts done by Anjana Projects Limited	1
	Maximum score 6		1. Anjana Projects Limited had a contract sum of 315,214,800/= and the Agricultural Engineers estimate was 368,200,000/= creating a variation of 14.4% which falls within the -/+20% variation of Agricultural Engineers Estimate.	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY	There was evidence that 17 contracts were signed on 29/02/2023, installed and completed under procurement reference numbers KYOT878/SUPLS/22-23/0008 in the financial year 2022/2023 which gave 100% installation and completion rate.	2
	Maximum score 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	Sampled installed and completed sites included farmer IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) completed on 12/04/2023 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) completed on 06/06/2023 of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) completed on 06/06/2023 of Kabira SC.	

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	The Production Department had 48 approved positions of Extension workers, 24 were filled and 60 vacant. The filled positions constituted 28% of the staffing level	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	There was evidence that irrigation demonstration site(s) in different LLGs met standards as defined by MAAIF such as a water source, transmission and distribution lines from an approved supplier like gentex with accessories such as reservoir, pipes and fittings and a power source for sampled farmers with farmer IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) of Kabira SC	2
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	There was evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems installed during last FY are functional for sampled installed irrigation facilities with farmer IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) of Kabira SC	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Three LLGs of Kyotera TC, Kasasa and Nabigasa Sub Counties were sampled to ascertain the accuracy of information on filled positions of extension workers. Kyotera TC staff list had 2 filled positions of extension workers and the list obtained from the HR division had 2 . The Kasasa SC staff list had 2 and the HR list had 1 . The Nabigasa SC list had 3 and the HR list had 3 . The extension staff deployment at Kasasa SC was not accurate	0
---	---	---	---	---

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The was evidence that information on established irrigation demonstration site(s) installed and functioning was accurate with the existence of a water source, transmission and distribution lines from an approved supplier like gentex with accessories such as reservoir, pipes and fittings and a power source for sampled facilities with farmer IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) of Kabira SC</p>	2
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of quarterly reports dated 20/10/2022 for First quarter, 24/01/2023 for second quarter, 5/5/2023 for third quarter and 5/5/2023 for Fourth quarter.</p> <p>There was evidence of expression of interest for sampled farmers IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) dated 01/11/2021 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) dated 07/12/2022 of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) dated 16/10/2020 of Kabira SC who had successful expressions of interests</p>	2
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of quarterly reports dated 20/10/2022 for First quarter, 24/01/2023 for second quarter, 5/5/2023 for third quarter and 5/5/2023 for Fourth quarter.</p> <p>There was evidence of 946 expressions of interest where 748 were successful having 62.5% male and 37.5% female with 198 unsuccessful EOIs. There was evidence of 374 farm visits prepared where 248 were successful farm visits, 126 unsuccessful and 0 ongoing</p>	1
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>c.Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had prepared quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs such as Kasali SC, Kasesa SC, Kakuto SC, Kalisizo TC, Mutukula TC, Kabira SC, Nabigasa SC in the MIS dated 20/10/2022 for First quarter, 24/01/2023 for second quarter, 5/5/2023 for third quarter and 5/5/2023 for Fourth quarter</p>	1

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	There was evidence that LG developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs such as Mutukula TC dated July-2023 approved by the District Production Officer on July 2023	1
	Maximum score 6			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that LG Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLG of Mutukula TC with report dated Jan 2023 for 122 sensitized farmers	1
	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	There was evidence of a 2,612,400,000/= budget for extension workers/services for the financial year 2023/2024. The staffing norms provided for 80 extension workers but only 26 extension workers are filled up giving a 32.5% position fill up.	1
	Maximum score 6			

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	There was evidence of deployed extension workers as per stations below;	1
	Maximum score 6		District Dr. Lutaya John M-DPO- Lubinga Geoffrey-DAO Kitaka SF-SVO Rusoke Jonana-SFO Ssekyanzi Baker-SAE Nassuna Monica-Lab Technician Kembabazi Bright- AIO Nabirye Agnes-Secretary Mbabali Badiru-Driver	

Kalyango Moses- Driver
Matovu Achilles- Askari
Male Moses- Forest Graduate
Kimuli Joseph- SAA
Kakuto SC
Ntabaazi Paul-SAO
Kabagenyi Justine-AAHO
Namboze Susan-AFO
Kirumba SC
Matovu Patrick-AO
Lubyayi Tonny-AAO
Miiro Emmanuel-AAHO
Nabigasa SC
Nimbimanya Alex-AO
Ssendaula Vincent-AAHO
Kamya Andrew-AAHO
Kalisizo SC
Nantogo Teddy-AO
Jjumba Vincent-AAHO
Namirimu Sarah-AO
Kasali TC
Kayinga Fiona-AO
Namagembe Getrude-AAHO
Mutukula TC
Ssempija Edward-AO
Ssemuli Micheal-AAHO
Tumwebaze Vicent- AAHO
Kirumba SC
Lubyayi Tonny-AAO
Kyebe SC
Ssebaduka Henry-AAO
Ssekirevu Vorah-AAHO
Lwakoni SC
Ssempija Emmanuel-AAO
Kyotera TC
Mabirizi Geoffrey-AAO
Namagembe Getrude-AAHO

Nabulya Janat-AFO

Nangoma SC

Ssenko John-AAO

Kasasa SC

Nakamyia Jenefer-AAO

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

The extension workers deployed at the sampled LLGs of Kyotera TC, Kasasa and Nabigasa sub counties were working at their duty stations. Their activity reports were presented for review as follows;

Kyotera TC. Agriculture Officer, Ntabaazi Paul's reports were dated 30th December 2022 and 30th June 2023. Veterinary Officer, Namagembe Gertrude's reports were dated 4th December 2022 and 29th June 2023

Kasasa SC. Agriculture Officer, Namirimu Sarah's reports were dated 16th November 2022, March 2023, February 2023 and 9th June 2023, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Tumwebaze Vincent's reports were dated 1st January 2023 and 30th June 2023

Nabigasa SC. Agriculture Officer, Nimbimanya Alex's reports were dated August 2022, December 2022, 7th April 2023 and 30th June 2023. Veterinary Officer, Sendawula Martin and Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Kamya Andrew's joint reports were dated 29th November 2022, 30th December 2022, and 30th June 2023

2

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

Extension workers' deployment was publicized and disseminated to the 3 sampled LLGs. Their names and telephone contact numbers were displayed on the LLGs notice boards;

Kyotera TC. Agriculture Officer, Ntabaazi Paul and Veterinary Officer, Namagembe Gertrude

Kasasa SC. Agriculture Officer, Namirimu Sarah and Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Tumwebaze Vincent

Nabigasa SC. Agriculture Officer, Nimbimanya Alex, Veterinary Officer, Sendawula Martin and Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Kamya Andrew

2

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The LG had 24 filled positions of extension workers. Ten appraisal reports were sampled to establish the dates of their appraisal by District Production Officer Lutaaya John Mary, as follows:</p> <p>1. Assistant Agriculture Officer, Lubyayi Tony (Kurumba SC) - 30th June 2023, 2. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Kabagenyi Justine - (Kakuuto SC) - 30th June 2023, 3. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Ssekirevu Violah (Kyebe SC) - 30th June 2023, 4. Assistant Agriculture Officer, Mabirizi Godfrey - (Kyotera TC) - 30th June 2023, 5. Assistant Agriculture Officer, Nakamya Jennifer - (Kasasa SC) - 30th June 2023, 6. Agriculture Officer, Kayinga Fiona (Kasali SC) - 30th June 2023, 7. Assistant Agriculture Officer, Nabimanya Alex - (Nabigasa SC) - 30th June 2023, 8. Senior Agriculture Officer, Ntabaazi Paul - (Kyotera TC) - 30th June 2023, 9. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Tumwebaze Vincent - (Lwenkoni SC) - 30th June 2023 and 10. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Namagembe Gertrude - (Kyotera TC) - 30th June 2023</p>	1
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;</p> <p>Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Information on corrective action taken, arising from performance appraisals, was not availed for review</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that:</p> <p>i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of a document with training plans at District level but training activities with reports dated 9/5/2023 by Assistant Agricultural Officer- Kitaka Fred (Kasasa SC), 28/6/2023 by Mabirizi Geoffrey, Assistant Agricultural Officer (Kabira SC), 27/05/2023 by Namirimu Sarah, Agricultural Officer (Kasali SC)</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of training activities by extension officers dated 9/5/2023 by Assistant Agricultural Officer- Kitaka Fred (Kasasa SC), 28/6/2023 by Mabirizi Geoffrey, Assistant Agricultural Officer (Kabira SC), 27/05/2023 by Namirimu Sarah, Agricultural Officer (Kasali SC)</p>	1

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	There was evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): This is derived from Page 21 of the approved budget as follows: 75% allocation for Capital Development of UGX 775,464,813; and 25% allocation for Complimentary Services of UGX 258,488,271 Total UGX 1,033,953,084	2
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	There was 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): This is derived from Page 22 of the approved budget as follows: 10% allocated for monitoring of procurements UGX 25,848,827 15% allocated for raising awareness UGX 38,773,241 75% mobilisation of farmers UGX 193,866,203 Total of UGX 258,488,271	2
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	There was evidence that a revenue projection for co-funding of UGX 250,000,000 was reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines on Pg.21 of the Approved Budget for 2022/23.	2

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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>There was evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant since the revenue estimate UGX 250,000,000 had been integrated in the approved budget (Pg.21) and formed part of the resource pool duly allocated for micro-scale irrigation activities during the year.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of sensitization meetings and minute report dated 15/6/2023, 15/5/2023 and 25/01/2023 where 3 leaders attended of which DPO and DTTC and LLGs were party to the meetings.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</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>There was evidence of monitoring and supervision reports dated 28/04/2023, 23/6/2022 and 23/08/2022. Quarterly reports also form part of the supervision and monitoring reporting dated 20/10/2022 for First quarter, 24/01/2023 for second quarter, 5/5/2023 for third quarter and 5/5/2023 for Fourth quarter.</p> <p>Field visits indicated evidence of adequacy and efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation for the sample farmers IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) dated 01/11/2021 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) dated 07/12/2022 of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) dated 16/10/2020 of Kabira SC</p>	2
Maximum score 8				

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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	There was evidence of trainings of farmers about the servicing and maintenance of equipment at sites where installations were completed in the financial year 2022/2023 with farmer IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) completed on 12/04/2023 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) completed on 06/06/2023 of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) completed on 06/06/2023 of Kabira SC. There was evidence of a training dated 12/4/2023, 13/4/2023 and 6/6/2023	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	There was evidence of that the LG had provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines through; Reports detailing sensitization on micro scale irrigation programme sampled and dated 9/5/2023 by Assistant Agricultural Officer-Kitaka Fred (Kasasa SC), 28/6/2023 by Mibirizi Geoffrey, Assistant Agricultural Officer (Kabira SC), 27/05/2023 by Namirimu Sarah, Agricultural Officer (Kasali SC)	2
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG had established and run farmer field schools/irrigation demo sites as per the guidelines at Mitiebiriri with start date 05/01/2022 and Kalagala with start date 05/01/2022	2
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG had conducted activities to mobilize and sensitize farmers as per guidelines (i.e. farmer meetings, radio talk shows, farmer-to-farmer events, demonstrations by irrigation equipment suppliers) meetings and minute report dated 12/4/2023 and 13/4/2023. There was evidence of radio talk show at CBS dated 2/2/2023 and 9/2/2023 presented by SAE and DAO	2
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the district had trained staff and sensitized political leaders at District and LLG levels (mobilizing farmers to participate on irrigation and irrigated agriculture) meetings and minute report dated 13/06/2023 (140 attendees), 17/5/2023 (70 attendees) and 28/04/2023 (51 attendees)	2

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	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	There was evidence of a register containing delivery notes of equipment such as solar modules, pipes and accessories, pumps and tanks with the last update dated 14/7/2023	2
	Maximum score 8			
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG kept and up-to-date database of applications (EOIs) for the current and previous FY at the time of the assessment with EOIs from sampled farmers with farmer KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) dated 01/11/2021 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) dated 07/12/2022 of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) dated 16/10/2020 of Kabira SC who had successful expressions of interests	2
	Maximum score 8			
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the district had carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI) for sampled farmers with farmer KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) dated 01/11/2021 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) dated 07/12/2022 of Kasali SC and KYOI/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) dated 16/10/2020 of Kabira SC who had successful expressions of interests.	2
	Maximum score 8			

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</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>Kyotera TC. The TC had one eligible and approved farmer. His name was neither publicized nor displayed on the TC notice board.</p> <p>Kasasa SC. The list of eligible farmers was displayed on the notice board, it included the following names;</p> <p>1, Mibirizi Godfrey of Mityebiri parish, Kasasa A village, 2. Lwanga Henry, of Mityebiri Parish, Kasasa village, 3, Lwanga Lillian (Mrs.) of Mityebiri village, Kasasa A village, 4. Kanaye, of Kijonju parish, Kijonju B village and 5. Mukisa Fred, of Mityebiri Parish, Kasasa village</p> <p>Nabigasa SC. The SC had 16 eligible farmers and their names were displayed on the notice board. They included the following;</p> <p>1. Ssenyimba Vincent, of Kyansimbi Parish, Nabikomago village, 2. Nkalubo Denis, of Nabigasa parish, Kasambya village, 3. Sempebwa Miro, of Lusese parish, Beteremu village, 4. Kayinga Fiona, of Butasimbi parish, Kyansimbi, village, 5. Rev. Father Sembatya Joseph, of Kyansimbi parish, Bulyana village, 6. Walukagga Akim, of Nakatoogo parish, Nakatoogo village and 7, Mukasa Charles, of Nabigasa parish, Bunjuzi village</p> <p>Kyotera TC did not display eligible farmer on the notice board</p>	0
Maximum score 8				
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</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>There was evidence that the LG incorporated the supply and installation micro-scale irrigation equipment in the Procurement Plan for the current FY. The project was the Design, supply and installation of Micro irrigation systems at Ugx 920,000,000.</p>	1
Maximum score 18				
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</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>There was evidence of request for quotation dated January 9, 2023 to NEC Agro CMC Limited, Anjana Projects Limited, Davis and Shirliff, Adritex Limited, Balton U Limited, all of whom were MAAIF pre-qualified suppliers.</p>	2
Maximum score 18				

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence of: minute Min04/10/06/22 of the procurement committee meeting which took place on that June10, 2022 which approved the procurement of Micro irrigation systems and all other procurements; and evidence of evaluation reports dated February 20, 2023 for the supply and installation micro irrigation systems to: Mrs. Namboze Jessica; Mr. Kasita Geresm; and Mr. Ssenyomo Frank.	2
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	There was evidence of minute Min04/10/06/22 of the contraxts commitee meeting which sat on June 10, 2023 5o approve the procurement of the projects fro micro-scale irrigation systems.	1
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	There was evidence of of signed contracts with Ms Anjana Projects Limited dated January 25, 2023 for the supply and installation of micro irrigation systems to several farmers. The farmers included: Mrs. Namboze Jessica, Mr. Kasita Geresm and Mr. Ssenyomo Frank.	2
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	There was no evidence that the irrigation demonstration site(s) installed were in line with the design output sheet (generated by the MIS/IrriTrack App. Note that this sheet was not provided however the contracts were a design, supply and install	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	There was evidence that the LG had conducted regular technical supervision of the irrigation demonstration sites dated 20/10/2022 for quarter one, 24/01/2023 for quarter two, 30/3/2023 for quarter three and 12/6/2023 for quarter four.	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:	There was evidence that the LG had overseen the irrigation equipment supply, installation and testing for functionality with supervision reports dated 6/4/2023 to 18/6/2023 and 18/8/2023 sampled that included sampled farmer IDs KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) completed on 12/04/2023 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) completed on 06/06/2023 of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) completed on 06/06/2023 of Kabira SC	1
	Maximum score 18	i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer):	There was evidence that the LG had overseen the irrigation equipment hand-over to the Approved host/beneficiary Farmer with sampled signed acceptance form of irrigation system dated 2/6/2023 for Ssempebwa Miro(KYO/2020-09-16/M/3193)	1
	Maximum score 18	Score 1 or 0		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the suppliers within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form:	0
	Maximum score 18		VN 5167659 of 03/05/2023 being payment of UGX 89,304,465 to M/S Anjana Projects Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the supply and installation of irrigation equipment for 6 farmers: Tebendeke John, Nannyangu Jane, Namboze Jesca, Ssemuju Stephen, Kimera Godfrey and Mulinda Henry	
			Payment was requested 11/04/2023, and was effected on 03/05/2023 (beyond 10 working days). All the 6-Farmers signed the Acceptance Forms on 30/03/2023	
			VN 6438710 of 28/06/2023 being payment of UGX 204,411,500 to M/S Anjana Projects Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the supply and installation of irrigation equipment for 11 farmers: Ssembebwa Miiro, Ssenyondo Frank, Nakato Paulina, Kasiita Girisimu, Mugisha Enos, Mulindwa John, Ssendi Valerie, Kavuma Steven, Bwanika Steven, Settuba Danier and Lwanga Henry.	
			Payment was requested on 05/06/2023, and was effected on 28/06/2023 (beyond 10 working days) All the 11 farmers signed Acceptance Forms on 06/06/2023	

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of complete procurement files for the micro scale irrigation projects with record as required. The sampled projects were: KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00008 Supply and Installation irrigation equipment to Mrs. Namboze Jessica, whose requisition was made on November 29. 2022, advert was made on January 9, 2023, evaluation was completed on January 25, 2023 and contract signed on February 20, 2023 at an award price of Ug Shs 24,080,000; KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00008 Supply and Installation irrigation equipment to Mr. Kasita Geresm, whose requisition was made on November 29. 2022, advert was made on January 9, 2023, evaluation was completed on January 25, 2023 and contract signed on February 20, 2023 at an award price of Ug Shs 20,235,000; and KYOT878/WRKS/2022-23/00008 Supply and Installation irrigation equipment to Mr. Ssenyomo Frank, whose requisition was made on November 29. 2022, advert was made on January 9, 2023, evaluation was completed on January 25, 2023 and contract signed on February 20, 2023 at an award price of Ug Shs16,200,000.</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Local Government had displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance in public areas</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>i). Recorded score 1 or else 0</p> <p>ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a Grievance Log in the Irrigation Department. There were cases recorded from 03/08/2022 to 26th /06/2023 in the Grievance Log. One was of Bakali Katunzi, dated 26th June 2023, who had an unpaid balance of UGX1,500,000/- from a sand mining Contractor, quoted herein at the Central Log at the District;</p> <p>The other case was of Ssekyanzi baker dated 20th June 2023, who complained of pump failure.</p>	1

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	Micro-scale irrigation grievances had been investigated. The case was of Ssekyanzi Baker dated 20th June 2023, who complained of pump failure was investigated and he was advised to deepen the Well.	1
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	Micro-scale irrigation grievances had been responded to. The case was of Ssekyanzi Baker dated 20th June 2023, who complained of pump failure was investigated and he was advised to deepen the Well.	1
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	Micro-scale irrigation grievances had been reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework. The case was of Ssekyanzi Baker dated 20th June 2023, who complained of pump failure was investigated and he was advised to deepen the Well. When he deepened the Well, it was reported that the problem was solved.	1

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	There was evidence that LGs had disseminated Micro-scale irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agro-chemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers. Farm visits for sampled farmers with farmer KYOTERA/2021-11-01/M/21595 (Ssemujju Stephen) dated 01/11/2021 of Kalisizo TC, KYOTERA/2022-12-07/M/29103 (Kavuma Steven) dated 07/12/2022 of Kasali SC and KYO/2020-10-16/M/11738 (Mugisha Enoc) dated 16/10/2020 of Kabira SC	2
----	--	---	--	---

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents. Many irrigation projects costed and included in BoQs. Costing was done by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for farmers. Those sampled that were costed and later were included in BoQs were:</p> <p>1) Supply of Demo materials by Gatsby Nursery Tree Project, dated 24 Feb. 2023 who quoted UGX100,000 against an internal ESMP of the same value;</p> <p>2) Supply of Solar Powered irrigation System Drag Hose for Sanje Farm School by Topher Maric Services who quoted UGX100,000/- against an ESMP of the same value.</p>	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>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</p>	<p>There was no evidence of 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. No documentation on such issues was presented.</p>	0

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

There was evidence that 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. Payment Certificates were availed signed by Sekyanzi Baker District Agricultural Engineer, Lubinga Godfrey District Agricultural Officer, Ssekajjugo Gadafi District Environment Officer, Namuwawu Prossy District Community development Officer and Approved by Bwayo G.R, the CAO. The Payment Certificates were for:

1) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mrs. Ssemujju Stephen at Kalisizo Sub County, date 13th April 2023;

2) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mr. Kimera Godfrey Kaganda at Kasaali sub county, dated 13th April 2023;

3) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mr. Mulindwa John at Kirumba sub county, dated 13th June 2023;

4) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mr. Kimera Godfrey Kaganda at Kasaali sub county, dated 13th April 2023; and

5) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mr. Nakato Pauline at Kalisizo sub county, dated 8th June 2023.

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

There was evidence that 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. Payment Certificates were availed signed by Sekyanzi Baker District Agricultural Engineer, Lubinga Godfrey District Agricultural Officer, Ssekajjugo Gadafi District Environment Officer, Namuwawu Prossy District Community development Officer and Approved by Bwayo G.R, the CAO. The Payment Certificates were for:

1) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mrs. Ssemujju Stephen at Kalisizo Sub County, date 13th April 2023;

2) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mr. Kimera Godfrey Kaganda at Kasaali sub county, dated 13th April 2023;

3) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mr. Mulindwa John at Kirumba sub county, dated 13th June 2023;

4) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mr. Kimera Godfrey Kaganda at Kasaali sub county, dated 13th April 2023; and

5) Design, supply and installation of micro-scale irrigation systems for Mr. Nakato Pauline at Kalisizo sub county, dated 8th June 2023.

**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 Chief Finance Officer, Kyambadde Robert, Robert, was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter dated 7th October, 2022, DSC Min. no 287/09/2022 (8).	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 District Planner, Nakayotte Marion Judith, was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter dated, 4th November, 2021, DSC Min. no 204/10/2021.	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 District Engineer was not substantively appointed. Duties were performed by the Senior Engineer, Ssebudde Harold, as per his appointment letter, dated 29th June 2018, DSC/212/5.vol.1 pp.17/23	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District Natural Resources Officer is assessed under the Water and Environment	0

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District Production Officer, Lusaka John Mary, was substantively appointed, as per his appointment letter, dated 7th October 2022, DSC Min. no 87/09/2022 (1)	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.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The District Community Development Officer was not substantively appointed. Duties were performed by the Principal Community development Officer, Mukasa Deo, as per his appointment letter, dated 3rd December 2021, DSC Min. no. 211/11/2021	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.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The District Commercial Officer was not substantively appointed. Duties were performed by the Principal Commercial Officer, Kisekulo Matheus, as per his appointment letter, dated 19th January 2022, DSC Min no. 231/01/2022	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The Senior Procurement Officer position was not provided for on the staff structure	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Procurement Officer, Musakira David, was substantively appointed as per his appointment letter, dated 7th January 2021, DSC Min. no 148/08/2021	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Principal Human Resource Officer, Kabiito Jamil, was substantively appointed, as per his appointment letter, dated 22/1/2010, DSC Min. no. 60/2010 (1)	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Environment Officer position was not provide for on the staff structure	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Land Management Officer, Matovu Tom, was substantively appointed, as per his appointment letter, dated 7th December 2021, DSC Min. no. 146/01/2021	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Accountant position was Vacant	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.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The Principal Internal Auditor, Nakabuye Olive, was substantively appointed, as per her appointment letter, dated 29th November 2022, DSC Min. no. 303/11/2022	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), was not substantively appointed. Duties were performed by the Senior Human Resource Officer, Nakyanzi Teddy, as per her appointment letter, dated 20th January 2022, DSC Min. no. 26/01/2022</p>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).</p>	<p>The LG had 14 LLGs, 9 Sub Counties and 5 Town Councils and therefore, 9 Senior Assistant Secretaries and 5 Town Clerks. Their appointment details are as follows;</p> <p>Senior Assistant Secretaries</p> <p>1. Mwebe Daniel, Kabira SC, 17th July 2018, DSC Min. no. 23/2018 (6), 2. Sekitoleko Fred, Kyebe SC, 18th August 2006, DSC Min. no. 112/2006 (Refers), 3. Luyombya Ivan, Kasasa SC, 17th July 2018, DSC Min. no. 23/2018 (5), 4. Namugga Jolly, Kakuuto SC, 15th May 2019, DSC Min. no. 12/04/2019 (2), 5. Kasumba Henry, Lwankoni SC, 2nd February 2011, DSC Min. no. 24/2011 ((2), 6. Nyanzi Lawrence, Kalisizo SC, 2nd September 2021, DSC Min. no. 194/08/2021, 7. Kayabula John, Kirumba SC, 3rd February 2015, DSC Min. no. 5/2015, 8. Kalega Baker, Nabigasa SC, 4th November 2003, DSC Min. no. 107/2003, 9. Nakazzi Barbara, a CDO, performed duties of the SAS, Nagoma SC, 3rd February 2015, DSC Min. no. 15/2015 (2)</p> <p>Town Clerks</p> <p>1. Nabbala Harriet, Kasensero TC, 18th August 2006, DSC Min. no. 113/2006 (Refers) 2. Ssebaduka Francis, a Senior Assistant Town Clerk performed duties of the Town Clerk, Kasali TC, 7th July 2017, DSC Min. no. 04/07/2017LDSC (R), 3. Kisilinya Jude, Kyotera TC, 25th January 2011, DSC Min. no. 7/2011, 4. Nabatanzi Reste, Kalisizo TC, 30th June 2017, DSC Min. no. 04/06/2017 (Refers) (R) and 5. Kaweesi Michael Fred, Mutukula TC, 22nd February 2013, DSC Min. no. 29/2013</p> <p>Senior Assistant Secretary, Nangoma SC and Town Clerk, Kasali TC were NOT substantively appointed.</p>	0

New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG
Maximum score is 15

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

The LG had 14 LLGs, 9 Sub Counties and 5 Town Councils and therefore, 9 CDOs and 5 S/CDOs. Their appointment details are as follows;

Senior Community Development Officer

1. Nawawu Prossy, Kyotera TC, 26th June 2018, DSC Min.no. 212//5/vol.1 PP.17 - 23

CDOs- Sub Counties

1. Namayanja Pamela, Kakuuto SC, 15th May 2019, DSC Min. no 07/04/2019 (5), **2.** Kyeyune Moses, Kyebe SC, 15th May 2019, DSC Min. no. 07/04/(7), **3.** Nabbale Namuju, Kirumba SC, 4th March 2015, DSC Min. no. 45/2015/ (2), **4.** Nabasumba Eva, Kabira SC, 15th April 2019, DSC Min. no. 07/04/2019 (1), **5.** Wasajja Vincent, Kalisizo SC, 15th May 2019, DSC Min. no. 07/04/2019 (2), **6.** Senjiri Francis, Nabigasa SC, 15th May 2019, DSC Min. no. 07/04/2019 (4), **7.** Nassozi Barbara, Nangoma SC, 3rd February 2015, DSC Min. no. 115/2015 (2), **8.** Lutaaya Geffrey, Lwenkoni SC, 4th March 2015, DSC Min. no. 4/2015 (6) and **9.** Namugenyi Prossy, Kasasa SC, 12th February 2021, DSC Min. no. 153/02/2020

CDOs - Town Councils

1. Najumba Mary Gorette, Kasali TC, 24th November 2022, DSC Min. no. 292/11/2022 (1), **2.** Nakalyango Doreen, Kalisizo TC, 30th October 2018, DSC Min, no 47/2018 (1), **3.** Iga Steven - Parish Chief, performed duties of a CDO, Kasensero TC, 25th June 2013 DSC Min. no 61/2013 (2), **4.** Muddu Philip, Mutukula TC, 7th January 2021, DSC Min. no. 149/01/2921 (2)

Of the required 5 S/CDOs, the LG had only 1 and one CDO was not substantively appointed.

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had 14 LLGs and therefore, 14 Senior Accounts Assistants / Accounts Assistants. Their appointment details are as follows;</p> <p>1. Nakanjako Betty, Lwenkoni SC, 20th January, 2022, DSC Min. no. 258/1/2022 (4), 2. Mubiru Eva, Kasasa SC, 8th February, 2022, DSC Min. no. 262/1/2022 (5), 3. Ssebuufu Richard, Kabira SC, 8th February, 2022, DSC Min. no. 262/2022 (3), 4. Mugalu Isaac, Kirumba SC, 8th August, 2022, DSC Min. no. 262/01/2022 (2022 (3), 5. Namatovu Veronica, Kakuuto SC, 4th February, 2022, DSC Min. no. 262/01/2022 (2), 6. Kakungulu Emmanuel, Kasali TC, 29th January, 2022, DSC Min. no. 260/01/2022 (2), 7. Nsubuga Karim, Kyebe SC, 8th August, 2022, DSC Min. no. 262/01/2022 (6), 8. Sekyewa Ronald, Kyotera TC, 9th September, 2003, DSC Min. no. 55/2003 (1) (Refers), 9. Namunje Scovia, Mutukula TC, 9th September, 2004, DSC Min. no. 149/2005/Refers, 10. Lutaaya Henry, Kasensero TC, 20th January, 2022, DSC Min. no. 259/2022 (1), 11. Nassimba Rehema, Kalisizo SC, 20th January, 2022, DSC Min. no. 258/2022 (2), 12. Nakivumbi Josephine Kalisizo TC, 4th January, 2011, DSC Min. no. 28/2011, 13. Luyinda Paul, Nabigasa SC, 9th September, 2005, DSC Min. no. 149/2005 (Refers) and 14. Nsubuga Karim, Nongoma SC, 8th January, 2022, DSC Min. no. 262/01/2022 (6).</p>	5
---	---	--	---	---

Environment and Social Requirements

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG has released only 87% of funds allocated in the previous FY to Natural Resources Department</p> <p>Deriving from Pg.23 of the annual financial statement: Statement of Appropriations; The budget for Natural Resources was UGX 208,523,231.00 out of which only UGX 186,834,928.00 was disbursed to the department representing 87% of the budget.</p>	0
3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had released only 90% of funds allocated in the previous FY to Community Based Services department</p> <p>Deriving from the Statement of Appropriations on Pg.23 of the Annual Financial Statements, the budget for Community Based Services was UGX 208,523,231.00 out of which only UGX 186,834,928.00 was disbursed representing 90% of the budget.</p> <p>The district did not receive UGX 21,688,303.00 for the Youth Livelihood Support and UWEP</p>	0

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>There was only one DDEG project implemented by Kyotera DLG. This was Completion of the District Headquarters. The Screening was done at project inception in 2018 and there was no need for rescreening at the completion stage.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG), score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was no need for ESIA since screening was not necessary.</p>	4
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);; score 4 or 0</p>	<p>There was no need for costing since there was no need for any screening.</p>	4

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>From the list of Audit Opinions for FY 2022/2023, issued by the Auditor General on 17th Jan. 2024, Kyotera DLG (Vote No.878) received an clean (un-qualified) audit opinion for the year.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year (but one) after February 2023 (PFMA s. 11 2g)</p> <p>The responses were submitted on 06/03/2023 vide CAO's forwarding letter Ref CR/KTR/103/1</p>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had submitted the annual performance contract for 2023/24 on 04/07/2023 (before August 31st of the current FY.) A copy was physically verified and also on https://budget.finance.go.ug/</p>	4

8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year maximum score 4 or else 0	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year, score 4 or else 0.	There was no evidence that The LG submitted the Annual Performance Reports for the year 2022/2023 to PSST before August 31, 2023: Q1 submitted through the PBS on 24th Jan. 2023; Q2 submitted through the PBS on 21st Feb. 2023; Q3 there was no proof of submission at all (both at the district and on https://budget.finance.go.ug/); and Q4 Ref. CR 212 was submitted on 1st Aug. 2023 (before 31st Aug. 2022)	0
9	Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year 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.	There was no evidence that the LG submitted all the Annual Performance Reports for the year 2022/2023 to PSST before August 31, 2020. Further verification of the records revealed the following: Q1 submitted through the PBS on 24th Jan. 2023; Q2 submitted through the PBS on 21st Feb. 2023; Q3 there was no proof of submission at all (both at the district and on https://budget.finance.go.ug/); and Q4 was submitted on 1st Aug. 2023 (before 31st Aug. 2022) All reports were submitted through the PBS	0

**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 District Education Officer, Sekyondwa Lawrence, was substantively appointed as per his appointment letter, dated 20th January 2022, DSC Min. no. 232/1/2022	30
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office. <i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The LG had 7 Inspectors of Schools. They were all substantively appointed as per their appointment letter as follows; 1 . Senior Inspector of Schools, Kagoye Matheus, 30th May 2019, DSC Min. no. 44/2016 (1). Inspectors of Schools; 2 . Senabulya Jater, 19th January 2022, DSC Min. no. 253/1/2022 (4), 3 . Nalugo Caroline, 19th January 2022, DSC Min. no. 253/01/2022 (1), 4 . Nakiberu Sharifa, 19th January 2022, DSC Min. no. 253/1/2022 (4), 5 . Namukasa Christine, 19th January 2022, DSC Min. no. 253/01/2022 (2), 6 . Namagala Sylvia, 15th May 2022, DSC Min. no. 25/5/2019 and 7 . Nadumba Harriet, 9th September 2005, DSC Min. no. 163/2005 (Refers)	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)

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

There was evidence that Kyotera DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for Education projects implemented. Screening was done by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for the following sampled schools:

- 1) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kirinda P/s - Kalisizo, done on 01/11/2022;
 - 2) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kabuwoko P/s, done on 20/10/2022;
 - 3) Construction of a 2-classroom block with office and store at Kikungwe Primary School, done on 20/10/2022;
 - 4) Construction of a 3 Classroom block at Kattabakooki Primary School, done on 01/07/2022; and
 - 5) Construction of Kasaali Seed SS. Though implementation of this project was done this FY, screening had been done earlier on 02/7/2020. It was clear that there were some constraints that hindered and/or delayed implementation in the FY it was screened.
- There were schools screened the previous FY by the Environment Department but were not in the list of projects implemented that year according to the Planner's list. These included:
- 6) Construction of a 3-classroom block at Noolo P/S - Kabira. done on 07/07/2023;
 - 7) Renovation of Kijonjo P/s at Kijonjo - Kasaali T/Council, done on 20/02/2023; and
 - 8) Renovation of Kayunga P/s, Kayunga - Buzilanduulu, done on 20/02/2023.

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)

The Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:

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

Screening results indicated no need for ESIAs.

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The District Health Officer, Muwanga Edward was substantively appointed, as per his appointment letter, dated 15th May, 2019, DSD Min. no. 30/05/2019.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health was not substantively appointed. Duties were performed by the Assistant Nursing Officer (Midwifery) , Bakanasa Sarah, 2nd September 2021, DSC Min. no. 192/08/2021 (1)</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, Nakafeero Harriet, was substantively appointed as per her appointment letter, dated 30th March, 2023, DSC Min. no. 332/03.2023.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Principal Health Inspector position was not provided for on the staff structure</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The Senior Health Educator, Kintu Ezekiel Max, was substantively appointed as per his appointment letter , dated 2nd September 2021, DSC Min. no. 185.08/2021.</p>	10

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	The Biostatistician position was vacant	0
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	The District Cold Chain Technician, Nakkazi Susan, was substantively appointed as per her appointment letter , dated 30th March 2023, DSC Min. no. 328/03/2023 (1)	10
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0		

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for Health projects implemented during the previous FY. Screening was done by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for the following sampled Health projects:</p> <p>1) Construction of a Staff House at Nangoma HC II, done on 01/07/2022; and</p> <p>2) Construction of a General Ward at Kakuuto HC IV Phase III, done on 06/07/2023</p> <p>There were also projects screened by the Environment Department that did not appear on the District Planner's list for the previous FY, namely:</p> <p>3) Renovation of a Staff House at Nangoma HC II, done on a date not mentioned on the screening Form;</p> <p>4) Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Kabira H/C III, done on 27/09/2023; and</p> <p>5) Construction of a General Ward at Kakuuto HC IV Phase II, done 01/07/2022.</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>Screening results indicated no need for ESIAs.</p>	15

**Micro-scale Irrigation
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The Senior Agricultural Engineer, Sekyanzi Baker, was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter dated 7th October 2022, under DSC Min. no. 288/09/2022 (1)</p>	70
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p><i>score 30 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that Kyotera DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for Micro-scale Irrigation projects implemented the previous FY. Screening was done by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for the following sampled. Demonstrations at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Kasasa sub county, dated 20/05/2021; 2) Kalisizo T/Council, done 20/05/2021; and 3) Sande farm School, dated 02/05/0223. <p>There were also projects on Installation of micro-scale irrigation system for private farmers at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Bulinda - Kalaali on 12/04/2023; 5) Kawule - Kirimba on 12/04/2023; and 6) Kalisizo on 11/04/2023. <p>Screening results indicated no need for ESIAAs.</p>	30

**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.	The Civil Engineer (Water), Kirumira Steven Murazi, was substantively appointed as per his appointment letter, dated 14th July, 2019. DSC Min. no. 81/2019 (1).	15
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.	The Assistant Water Officer for mobilization position was not provided for on the staff structure	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.	The Borehole Maintenance Technician, Wasswa Anatoli, was substantively appointed as per his appointment letter, dated 3rd October 2022, DSC Min. no. 277/06/2022	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	The Natural Resources Officer, Kiyangi Jamil, was substantively appointed, as per his appointment letter, dated 3rd February 2015, DSC Min. no. 2/2015	15
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.	The Environment Officer, Semajugo Gadafi, was substantively appointed as per his appointment letter, dated 15th July, 2019, DSC Min. No. 39/07/2019 (1)	10
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.	The Forestry Officer, Ngoloobe Michael, was substantively appointed as per his appointment letter dated 7th February 2021, DSC Min. no. 144/01/2021	10

Environment and Social Requirements

2

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

If the LG:

a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.

There was evidence that Kyotera DLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for Water and Environment projects implemented the previous FY. Screening was done by Ssekajjugo Gadafi, District Environment Officer and Namuwawu Prossy, CDO for the following sampled Water and Environment projects:

1) Construction of a mini solar piped water system at Kagezi Minziro, done on 26/06/2023;

2) Construction of a Ferro Cement Tank at St. Steven High School, done on 23/06/2023;

3) Construction of a 5-stance lined pit latrine at Kabanyaga, Nangoma Parish, done on 20/02/2023;

4) Construction of a Ferro Cement Tank at Kabira – Njara, done on 25/11/2022;

5) Construction of a Ferro Cement Tank at Banda, Kabira Parish, done on 10/11/2022; and

6) Construction of a Ferro Cement Tank at Lunyinya – Kirumba Parish , done on 18/11/2022.

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.

Screening results indicated no need for ESIAs

10

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.

There were no such permits secured from anywhere. Water was being extracted by some agencies like borehole drilling and factories but no Abstraction Permits were obtained. The DWO showed an application for such a Permit by one of the Contractors but it had not yet been obtained.