



LGMSD 2022/23

Masaka city

(Vote Code: 857)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	65%
Education Minimum Conditions	60%
Health Minimum Conditions	80%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	49%
Educational Performance Measures	66%
Health Performance Measures	28%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	7%

**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 infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</p> <p>During the year, the city planned for DDEG funding of UGX 12,183,499,000 allocated as follows (Pg 2&9 of the Approved Budget):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -USMID Project Component UGX 11,270,795,896 -USMID Capacity Building Component UGX 542,158,104 -LLG Component: Nyendo - Mukungwe Div. UGX 221,010,000 -LLG Component: Kimaanya - Kabonera Div. UGX 149,535,000 <p>Total UGX 12,183,499,000</p> <p>The USMID component was allocated at the City H/Q as follows (Pg.41-43 of the approved Budget):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitation of Kampala Road, Elgin Road Nyendo-Market Loop, and Nyendo Market Circular Road (Total cost: UGX 9,943,190,750) and Charge for the year UGX 2,105,319,563 2. Rehabilitation of Kooki Street at UGX 2,093,185,227 3. Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass Rd, Circular Rd, and Kigamba Road (Total Cost: UGX 33,401,646,361) and Charge for the year UGX 7,072,291,106 <p>The total capital budget component for 2022/23 was UGX 11,270,795,896</p> <p>The roads had been rehabilitated in Phases and according to Pg. 21 of the Annual Performance Report, the roads were being utilised already</p>	4

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 3 • 1 to 5% increase, score 2 • If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased by 0.5% in the previous two successive assessment.</p> <p>1 Kimaanya - Kabonera City Division: the score increased by 1% from 97% to 98%</p> <p>2 Nyendo – Mukungwe City Division: maintained a score of 99% for both years</p> <p>The average Score increased by 0.5% from 98% to 98.5%</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the USMID/DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per the annual performance report. [from Pg.21 of the annual Performance Report]</p> <p>i. 2nd Phase of Rehabilitation of Elgin Road & Others (Batch-1) UGX 2,160,358,434 was 100% complete and paid (initial total Cost was UGX 9,943,190,750)</p> <p>ii. Rehabilitation of Kooki Street (Batch-2) UGX 2,093,185,227 was 100% complete and was already paid</p> <p>iii. Phase-II, Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass & Others (Batch-3) UGX 7,257,180,339 was 100% complete and paid (Total Cost was UGX 33,401,646,361)</p> <p>Total investment costs 2022/23 was UGX 11,510,724,000</p>	3

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 city had budgeted and spent all (100%) of the DDEG (UGX 12,183,499,000) for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Deriving from Pg.21 of the Fourth Quarter Report, 2022/23; the city budgeted for and spent the DDEG/USMID Grant as follows:</p> <p>1 USMID -Capital Development Component UGX 11,270,795,896</p> <p>2 USMID -Capacity Building Component UGX 542,158,104</p> <p>3 DDEG: LLG Component UGX 370,545,000</p> <p><i>[Nyendo - Mukungwe Div. UGX 221,010,000 and Kimaanya - Kabonera Div. UGX 149,535,000]</i></p> <p>Total UGX 12,183,499,000</p> <p>This had been fully spent (100%) as reported on Pg.21 of the annual Performance report:</p> <p>i. Rehabilitation of Elgin Road & Others (Batch-1) UGX 2,105,319,563 (Initial cost: UGX 9,943,190,750)</p> <p>ii. Rehabilitation of Kooki Street (Batch-2) UGX 2,093,185,227</p> <p>iii. Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass & Others (Batch-3) UGX 7,072,291,106 (Initial Cost UGX 33,401,646,361)</p> <p>Total UGX 11,510,724,000</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>The LG did not procure any infrastructure project funded by DDEG and USMID during the previous FY.</p> <p>There was however evidence of ongoing works under USMID which were procured in Previous FY but one, supervised by an external consultant M/S UB Consulting Engineers. The Sampled projects were: Rehabilitation of Kampala Road, Elgin Road Nyendo-Market Loop, and Nyendo Market Circular Road, procured in the FY 2021-22 whose estimate was Ugx 9,944,072,362 and Contract award Ugx 9,943,190,750 hence the variation was -0.009%; Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass Rd, Circular Rd, and Kigamba Road , procured in the FY 2020-21, whose estimate was Ugx 33,555,720,150 and Contract award Ugx 33,401,646,361 and hence the variation -0.46%; and Rehabilitation of Kooki Street, procured in the FY 2021-22, whose estimated was Ugx 2,160,919,661 and Contract award Ugx 2,093,185,227, hence the variation was -3.13%.</p>	2

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>Kimaanya-Kabonero staff list had 26 filled positions. Nyendo-Mukungwe Division and the HR the Division did not submit staff lists for comparison</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> <p>• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.</p> <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that infrastructures constructed using the DDEG were in place as reported on Pg.21 of the annual Performance Report.</p> <p>i. Rehabilitation of Elgin Road & Others (Batch-1) UGX 2,160,358,434 (Total Cost was UGX 9,943,190,750)</p> <p>ii. Rehabilitation of Kooki Street (Batch-2) UGX 2,093,185,227</p> <p>iii. Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass & Others (Batch-3) UGX 7,257,180,339 (Total Cost was UGX 33,401,646,361)</p> <p>Total UGX 11,510,724,000</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 evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise as per the data below as extracted from the OPAMS information provided by OPM:</p> <p>The city has only 2-divisions: (a) Kimaanya - Kabonera, and (b) Nyendo - Mukungwe, and were both assessed.</p> <p>1 Nyendo - Mukungwe Division: the LG Assessors scored 99%, and IVA Scored 93%, variance of -06%, Credible ; and</p> <p>2 Kimaanya - Kabonera Division: the LG Assessors scored 98%, and IVA Scored 92%, variance of -7% , Credible</p>	4
<p>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p>				

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.	There was no evidence that the city developed any performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest-performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results. The Head of Human Resources did not present any	0
		Score: 2 or else score 0		

5	N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:	There was no evidence that The city had implemented any PIPs for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY since no PIPs had been developed	0
		Score 2 or else score 0		

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.	The CLG consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS as per the submission letter CR/115/1 dated 27th September 2023	2
		Score 2 or else score 0		

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):	The LG did not conduct the tracking and analysis of staff attendance. No information was presented for review	0
		Score 2 or else score 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 Local Government did not present any appraisal reports of HoD for the FY 2022/2023, for review</p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented as per the minutes of the meeting held on 2nd October 2023, during which the interdiction case of one officer was discussed and a resolution to re-instate him was passed</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 on the establishment of the staff grievance redress committee 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 CLG did not recruit any new employees</p>	1

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.

Six employees retired during the previous FY, as per the retirement list presented for review. Their names were traced on the IPPS payroll to establish when they accessed it, as follows;

1. Mukiibi Abby, Head Teacher, retired on 16th June 2022 and accessed payroll during the month of October 2022; **2.** Opio Bazilio, Deputy Principal PTC, retired on 4th August 2022 and accessed during the month of November 2022; **3. Mugabo Katarbarwa, Tutor retired on 28th October 2022 and accessed during the month of December 2022;** **4.** Lukwago Daniel, Education Assistant retired on 11th November 2022 and accessed during the month of January 2023; **5.** Kasozi Joe Billy retired on 22nd September 2022 and accessed during the month of February 2023; and **6.** Kasasa Godfrey William, Education Assistant, retired on September 2022 and accessed during the month of February 2023

Only one retired Officer accessed the payroll within the prescribed time period

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 budget for DDEG was UGX 370,545,000 [Nyendo - Mukungwe Div. UGX 221,010,000 and Kimaanya - Kabonera Div. UGX 149,535,000] Pg.14 of the approved budget.

The DDEG funds were received in Q2 + Q3 only and disbursed as follows:

1 Quarter-II Nyendo - Mukungwe Division (04/11/2022) UGX 73,669,922

2 Quarter-III Nyendo - Mukungwe Division (27/01/2023) UGX 147,340,078

Total (Nyendo Div.) UGX 221,010,000

3 Quarter-II Kimaanya - Kabonera Division (04/11/2022) UGX 49,845,027

4 Quarter-III Kimaanya - Kabonera Division (27/01/2023) UGX 99,690,054

Total (Kimaanya Div.) UGX 149,535,081

Total UGX 370,545,081 (100%)

2

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	There was no evidence that the city did timely warranting of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: DDEG funds were received only in Q2 & Q3 and warrants were prepared as follows: Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-11 was prepared on 17/10/2022 (beyond 5 working days); and Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-20 was prepared on 25/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days)	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0		
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	There was no evidence that the city 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: DDEG funds were received only in Q2 & Q3 and were invoiced as follows: Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2023 and was published and invoiced on 04/11/2022 (beyond 5 working days); and Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2023 and was invoiced and communicated on 27/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days)	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		
11	Routine oversight and monitoring	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:	There was no evidence that the City had supervised or mentored LLGs within the City at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines. The City planner did not have any mentorship reports to present for verification.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0		

11	Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up: Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the city to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up. The City Planner did not have any of such reports or minutes to present for verification	0
----	--	--	--	----------

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: Score 2 or else score 0 Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0	There was evidence that The District maintained an up-dated assets register covering details of different categories of assets such as Buildings and motor vehicles as per the format in the accounting manual. The Asset Register was opened on 01/07/2021 and was last updated on 30/06/2023. 1 Land UGX 6,700,000,000 2 Buildings UGX 13,435,433,727 3 Transport Equipment UGX 2,144,417,916 4 Roads n Bridges UGX 115,564,996,916 5 Furniture n Fittings UGX 1,104,280,000 6 Medical Equipment UGX 1,001,725,000 7 Machinery UGX 641,014,554 8 Office Equipment UGX 165,767,816 9 ICT Equipment UGX 622,989,878 Total UGX 141,380,625,807	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 City 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 survey report was produced on 30th Aug. 2023, and had been duly signed by the City Clerk.

The report had 10 recommendations on Pg. 5 but none had been implemented by the time of assessment:

1. That the BoS be comprised of a bigger team in future to handle the exercise since the geographical scope of Masaka City has increased from 42 SqKm to over 362 SqKm
2. The activity should be given ample time that was accorded this time round
3. Almost all Schools had fair to bad latrines with some that were almost full, some were being shared by both girls and boys.
4. Most of the buildings in the Schools had outlived their useful stages and needed to be demolished
5. There was absence of ICT equipment in Schools such as computers and internet

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 City had a functional physical planning committee in place and had submitted 12-Sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to Masaka MoLHUD Zonal Office as follows:

i. 5-Sets of Minutes submitted to the Zonal Office on 03/11/2022 [Reports dated: 20/04/2022, 25/05/2022, 28/06/2022, 01/08/2022 and 01/09/2022]

ii. 3-Sets of Minutes submitted to the Zonal Office on 27/02/2023 [Reports dated: 14/10/2022, 18/10/2022 and 14/12/2022]

iii. 4-Sets of Minutes submitted to the MoLHUD Kampala Office on 11/09/2023 [Reports dated: 14/03/2023, 18/04/2023, 05/06/2023 and 28/07/2023]

The physical planning committee was composed of only the following 6 Members:

1. The City/Town Clerk (Chairman)
2. The Senior Physical Planner (Secretary)
3. The Environmental Officer (Member)
4. Senior Health Inspector (Member)
5. City Engineer (Member)
6. Staff Surveyor (from Masaka District LG) - Member

All copies of 6-Appointment Letters CR/153/1 dated 27/07/2017 were verified

The (Register of Development Applications) Building Plans Registration book was opened during the introduction of IRAS in the City on 01/03/2022 and was last updated on 24/11/2023

The Physical Development Plan was approved on 09/03/2016 vide MoLHUD Letter Ref PPD/45/01 dated 09/03/2016.

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 no evidence that the city had conducted desk appraisals for the projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are:</p> <p>(i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). The planner did not have any such desk appraisal reports or forms for the projects that had been implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitation Kampala Road, Elgin Road Nyendo-Market Loop and Nyendo Market Circular Road UGX 9,943,190,750 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) 2. Rehabilitation of Kooki Street UGX 2,093,185,227 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) 3. Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass Rd, Circular Rd, and Kigamba Road UGX 33,401,646,361 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) 	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the city 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. The planner did not present any appraisal forms or reports for verification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitation Kampala Road, Elgin Road Nyendo-Market Loop and Nyendo Market Circular Road UGX 9,943,190,750 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) 2. Rehabilitation of Kooki Street UGX 2,093,185,227 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) 3. Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass Rd, Circular Rd, and Kigamba Road UGX 33,401,646,361 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) 	0

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC on 15/01/2020 for all investments in the AWP for the current FY as per USMID guidelines:</p> <p>The following three projects are in the work plan of the current FY:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitation Kampala Road, Elgin Road Nyendo-Market Loop and Nyendo Market Circular Road UGX 9,943,190,750 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) 2. Rehabilitation of Kooki Street UGX 2,093,185,227 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) 3. Katwe Bypass Rd, Circular Rd, and Kigamba Road UGX 33,401,646,361 (derived from Pg.15 of the LG DP and Pg.43 of the Approved Budget) <p>These profiles had been discussed in the TPC of 15/01/2020, Agenda No.5, Minute MTPC/05/Jan/2020</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 evidence that Masaka City LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG). There was only one DDEG project namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kimwanyi Primary School and installation of a water tank. <p>Screening was done by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer on 7/9/2000.</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>The procurement plan submitted to the Ministry of local Government and the ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban development on October 13, 2023 indicated that the planned expenditure under DDEG/USMID included: Supply of 10,000 Litre water tanks at Ugx 35,000,000; The purchase of office furniture at Ugx 45,195,000; and purchase of laptops at Ugx 68,000,000; Road opening and road maintenance in Nyendo Mukungwe City Division at Ugx 201,542,000; Maintenance of boreholes in the Division KKD at Ugx 10,000,00.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee.	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 no evidence of letter establishing PITs. There were instead letters appointing contract managers for the various projects. The sampled letters were: Letter reference CR/214/14, dated April 11, 2023 appointing Turibarungi Augustus as a project manager for the the phased Upgrade of Kyabakuza HC II to HC IV; and a letter referenced CR/214/14, dated April 7, 2023 appointing Mr. Matovu Mugaga, the Division engineer as contract manager for the education sector projects.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	The Masaka City LG did not procure any infrastructure project funded by DDEG and USMID. There were however road construction projects funded under USMID but were procured in 2021-22, some of which were ongoing while others were substantially complete. The supervision of the works were undertaken by a private consulting firm namely UB Consulting Engineers Limited. The Contractor followed specifications and designs provided by UB Consulting Engineers Limited. The contracts sampled were: Rehabilitation of Kooki Street, which was overlaid by asphalt concrete, provided with sub surface drainage(covered by concrete slabs) and provided with street lights; Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass Rd, a dual carriage way road also overlaid with asphalt concrete and provided with subsurface drains (covered by concrete slabs; and the Rehabilitation of Katwe Bypass Rd, Circular Rd, and Kigamba Road which were all dual carriage way roads, also overlaid with asphalt concrete and provided with subsurface drains (covered by concrete slabs).	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 the environmental officer, CDO during the execution of the LG Projects. The projects sampled were: Renovation of a classroom block at Kaddugala PS and Completion of a Classroom at Senya PS; and the Construction works for the upgrade of Kyabakuza HC II to HC IV phase II.	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of some of the payments for the various projects executed which determined that the payments were appropriately certified. The sampled payments were for: Payment for a Pit latrine at Kiziba Primary school, where the requisition was made on June 14, 2023, the certificate was prepared by the LG Engineer on June 15, 2023, and payment was effected July 4, 2023 under voucher no. 6391176; Payment for Retention money for Construction of staff house at Mirembe PS, where the requisition was made on June 11, 2023, the payment was approved by the LG Engineer on June 16, 2023, and payment was effected June 27, 2023 under voucher no. 6373264.</p> <p>There was however evidence that some payments were not executed within the specified timeframes. The sampled payment was for Renovation of classroom at Kaddugala PS and completion of classroom lock at Senya PS, where the requisition was made on May 18, 2023, the payment was approved by the LG Engineer on May 19, 2023, and payment was effected November 8, 2023 (about 6 months) under voucher no. 6404448.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of complete procurement files with record as required. The sampled projects were: MASA857/WRKS/2022-23/00011 Renovation of a classroom block at Kaddugala PS and Completion of a Classroom at Senya PS, whose requisition was made on January 4, 2023, advert was made on February 1, 2022, evaluation was completed on March 10, 2023 and contract signed on April 13, 2023 at an award price of Ug Shs 108,745,632; MASA857/WRKS/2022-23/00006 Construction works for the upgrade of Kyabakuza HC II to HC IV phase II, whose requisition was made on December 28, 2022, advert was made on February 1, 2023, evaluation was completed on March 10, 2023 and contract signed on April 11, 2023 at an award price of Ug Shs 199,672,638; and MASA857/WRKS/2021-22/00021 Construction of a 5 stance VIP pit latrine at Kimwanyi PS, whose requisition was made on April 4, 2022, advert was made on April 22, 2023, evaluation was completed on May 9, 2023 and contract signed on May 11, 2023 at an award price of Ugx 24,688,845.</p>	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

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.

Score: 2 or else score 0

There was evidence that Masaka City LG 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:

i) A letter Ref: CR/135/1 dated March 3, 2021 written by John M. Behangana, the Town Clerk, appointed Ibanda Maureen Leticia Assistant Law enforcement Officer as Focal Officer for Complaints in Masaka City;

ii) A letter Ref: CR/201/9 dated 6th July, 2020 written by John M. Behangana, the Town Clerk, appointed seven staff to the GRC as follows:

Mr. Mugisha Emmanuel Gacharo Deputy Town Clerk – Chairperson;

Ms. Ibanda Maureen Letitia the Law Enforcement Officer – Member/Secretary;

Mr. Mugerwa Ronald Joseph the Senior Commercial Officer – Member;

Ms. Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer - Member;

Ms, Kafeero Harriet the CT. Principal treasurer - Member;

Mr. Musisi Ssebata Joseph the CDF representative - Member;

And

Turibalungi Augustus the Principal Executive Engineer – Member.

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.	There was evidence that Masaka City LG had specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included 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 'Complaints Register Masaka City Council' was presented.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 2 or else 0	The first recorded complaint was dated 07/2020 and was that of Ssemuwemba Muhammad who complained of salary increment – that he had spent the last seven years without a salary increment. T.C asked HRO to verify allegation. The Feedback was that the matter was settled.	
			The last complaint recorded was dated 31/10/2023 and was that a school in Gayaza called St. Paul and Pauline Secondary School. He said there was mismanagement of the sewerage that was now flowing into people's homes. He needed the City to take Action. The matter was still in the T.Cs Office and the GRM Focal Person was yet to find out the stand of events.	
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational.	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	There was no evidence that Masaka City LG had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties knew where to report and get redress. The GRM was not advertised on the Main Noticeboard. It was mentioned by the Probation and Welfare Officer, who was the Focal Person for Grievance Redress, that the GRM had earlier been advertised on the Noticeboard but was later pulled down to give way for other adverts.	0
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	If so: Score 1 or else 0	The City had a website: https://www.masakacity.go.ug	
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with.	1
	Maximum 11 points on this performance measure		On Pg. 204, 219 and 235 of the development Plan, the city had provided up to UGX 145,905,000 for Planting Trees, safe effluent and wastewater discharge and management, restoration of borrow-pits, and green-city interventions within the budget of the following projects:	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Rehabilitation of city roads ii. Construction of 6-Stance Pit Latrines at Kiziba and Butende P/Ss iii. Construction (upgrade) of Kyabakuza H/C III 	

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the city 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. The planner did not present any distribution lists or minutes of dissemination meetings for verification	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	Costing for the construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kimwanyi Primary School and installation of a water tank was costed by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer on 20th /9/2000. However, it was not possible to confirm whether this costing was included in the BoQs or not. The BoQs could not be availed.	0
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	The LG did not implement any additional projects so there was no such costing done.	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:	The Land status of Kimwanyi Primary School where the DDEG project was implemented could not be ascertained. It was mentioned that Land Titles for such schools were kept with the Founding Bodies (Church of Uganda, Roman Catholic, UMEA etc) but in this case, it was not even clear which Founding Body was behind this School. The only certain thing was that there was no documentation between the City Authority and any such Body.	0
		Score 1 or else score 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:	It was mentioned by the Environment Officer that the supervision and monitoring files had been misplaced and could not be located.	0
		Score 1 or else score 0		
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:	There was evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms had been completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. E & S Payment certification prepared by the Division Engineer (Project Manager) on (date not indicated), Checked by the City Education Officer (on 14 June 2022), CDO (on 13 June 2022), Environment Officer (on 13 June 2022), Certified by the City Engineer (on 15 June 2022) and approved by the Town Clerk (on 15 June 2022) were presented for the construction of a 6 stance lined pit latrine at Kimwanyi Primary School. It was of UGX23,753,396/-.	1
		Score 1 or else score 0		

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>The following accounts had last been reconciled on 30/06/2023:</p> <p>1 Masaka City General Fund (DFCU) A/C No. 01033659248269 (Balance UGX 3,225,225 30/06/2023);</p> <p>2 Masaka City Hall Project Masaka City (Bank of Africa) A/C No. 02378540004 (Balance UGX 1,500,501,997 30/06/2023); and</p> <p>3 Masaka City UWEP Recovery Masaka City (Bank of Africa) A/C No. 02381480005 (Balance UGX 5,558,800 30/06/2023)</p>	0
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the city had produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY</p> <p>Q-I report was produced on 31/10/2022;</p> <p>Q-II report was produced on 09/02/2023;</p> <p>Q-III report was produced on 24/04/2023; and</p> <p>Q-IV report was produced on 25/07/2023</p> <p>Some of the findings include the following:</p> <p>i. Local Revenue shortfall of UGX 1,769,964,759 (38%) Out of a budget of UGX 4,625,256,101 only UGX 2,855,291,342 (62%) had been realized</p> <p>ii. Irregular overpayment of salaries amounting to UGX 11,396,000</p> <p>iii. Failure to absorb residual salary arrears of UGX 63,644,977</p> <p>iv. Failure to remit payroll deductions amounting to UGX 1,992,663,117 to different deduction codes</p>	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the city had provided information to the Mayor and the 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>Q-I report was produced on 31/10/2022 and distributed to the Mayor and to DPAC on 18/11/2022;</p> <p>Q-II report was produced on 09/02/2023 and distributed to the Mayor and to DPAC on 22/02/2023;</p> <p>Q-III report was produced on 24/04/2023 and distributed to the Mayor and to DPAC on 11/05/2023; and</p> <p>Q-IV report was produced on 25/07/2023 and distributed to the City Mayor and to PAC on 01/08/2023</p>	1
----	--	---	---	----------

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY had been discussed by LG PAC by the time of assessment. The reports had been produced and circulated as follows:</p> <p>Q-I report was produced on 31/10/2022 and distributed to the Mayor and to DPAC on 18/11/2022;</p> <p>Q-II report was produced on 09/02/2023 and distributed to the Mayor and to DPAC on 22/02/2023;</p> <p>Q-III report was produced on 24/04/2023 and distributed to the Mayor and to DPAC on 11/05/2023; and</p> <p>Q-IV report was produced on 25/07/2023 and distributed to the City Mayor and to PAC on 01/08/2023</p> <p>But had not been discussed by PAC by the time of assessment</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) was 62% (variance of 38%, beyond -10%)</p> <p>From Pg. 36 of the Financial Statements –“Statement of Revenues Collected”, the City planned to collect UGX 4,625,256,101 but actually collected only UGX 2,855,291,342 representing a 62% budget performance hence revenue shortfall of 38%.</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 City's own source revenue increased by UGX 883,385,022 (45%) ie more than 10% from UGX 1,971,906,320 in FY 2021/22 to UGX UGX 2,855,291,342 in FY 2022/23</p> <p>As derived from Pg. 36 of the Financial Statements-“Statement of Revenues Collected”</p>	2
----	--	--	--	---

20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the City had remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY to the divisions as follows.</p> <p>From Pg. 36 of the Financial Statements "Statement of Revenue Collected"</p> <p>The city collected UGX 2,855,291,342 out of which UGX 1,707,293,062 was the component transferable to the divisions; the transfers had been executed as follows:</p> <p>Kimanya Kabonera Division: UGX 425,846,044</p> <p>Nyendo - Mukungwe Division: UGX 1,281,447,018</p> <p>Total Disbursement UGX 1,707,293,062</p>	2
----	--	--	---	---

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a notice board at the LG headquarters with procurement information. The sampled information was for: a notice dated September 15, 2023 for best evaluated bidder for the supply of Uniforms, Council attire and corporate wear however the list of prices had been reportedly attached but was not on the display; a notice dated September 15, 2023 for best evaluated bidder for Revenue collection from Kyabakuza market at Ugx 1,306,600; and a notice dated September 15, 2023 for best evaluated bidder for the revenue collection from street parking and off loading in Nyendo at Ugx 3,200,000.</p>	2
----	--	---	---	---

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the previous performance assessment results and implications were published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year; this was the 1st National Assessment for the city</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the city 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; the Planner was unable to provide any of such evidences</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; these documents had been placed on the Notice Boards on 12/10/2021.</p> <p>These policies had been passed together with the budget for FY 2022/23 on 25/05/2022, Agenda No.5, Minute No. 059/MCC/COUNCIL/25/MAY/2022</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the city had prepared any report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations WITHIN THE FY, 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.</p> <p>The last status report had been prepared on 23/06/2022 (CR/213/4) and had no pending investigations. the last set of investigations had been discharged on 06/07/2020 (CR/954/01) ie Interdiction of Namuleme Sauda (The Principal Treasurer) and Serubiri David (senior Accounts Assistant)</p>	0

**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 2022 was 4111</p> <p>The number of absentees was 22 so the number that sat was 4089</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 1 was 1754 = 42.89%</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 2 was 1879 = 45.95%</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 3 was 227 = 5.55%</p> <p>The number that passed between Div. 1 and 3 was 3860= 94.39%</p> <p>The number of candidates that registered for PLE in 2022 was 7282</p> <p>The number of absentees was 137 so the number that sat was 7145</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 1 was 2705 = 37.85%</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 2 was 3111 = 43.54%</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 3 was 685 = 9.58 %</p> <p>The number that passed between Div. 1 and 3 was 6501 = 90.98%</p> <p>There was a decline in performance of 3.41%</p>	0

1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>The number of candidates that registered for UCE in 2020 was 1410</p> <p>The number of absentees was 31 so the number that sat was 1379</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 1 was 392 = 28.42%</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 2 was 334 = 22.22%</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 3 was 324 = 23.49%</p> <p>The number that passed between Div. 1 and 3 was 1050 = 76.14%</p> <p>The number of candidates that registered for UCE in 2022 was 1776</p> <p>The number of absentees was 19 so the number that sat was 1757</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 1 was 518 = 29.48%</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 2 was 464 = 26.45%</p> <p>The number that passed in Div. 3 was 485 = 27.60%</p> <p>The number that passed between Div. 1 and 3 was 1467 = 83.49%</p> <p>There was a percentage improvement of 7.35%</p>	3
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 2 • Between 1 and 5%, score 1 • No Improvement, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the two city divisions maintained an average score of 100% in the education LLG performance in both two previous assessments (no percentage change recorded)</p> <p>1 Kimanya - Kabonera City Division maintained a score of 100% for both years</p> <p>2 Nyendo - Mukungwe City Division also maintained a score of 100% for both years</p> <p>The average score was maintained at 100% for both divisions for two years</p> <p>Hence, a Score of 2, given that it is above 95%. The performance was the maximum possible</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>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>From the City investment plan FY 2022/2023 submitted to the Town Clerk on 29/05/2022, there was evidence that Ug. Shs. 220,000,000 education development grant was invested on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 5 stance latrine at at Mpugwe PS at Ug. Shs. 25,000,000 2. Construction of a 5 stance latrine at Kiziba PS at Ug. Shs. 25,000,000 3. Completion of Senya Primary school classroom block at Ug. Shs 30,000,000 4. Renovation of 1 classroom at Kadugala PS at Ug. Shs. 65,000,000 5. Construction of a 5 stance latrine and installation of water at Kimwanyi PS at 35,000,000 	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the City Education Officer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. VN 6404448 of 26/06/2023 being payment of UGX 15,848,250 to M/S Kyamulibwa Carpentry Workshop Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the completion of a 2-Classroom Block at Ssenya P/School <p>The payment certificate was signed by City Education Officer, Environment Officer and CDO on 19/05/2023</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. VN 6373264 of 26/06/2023 being payment of UGX 6,275,265 to M/S Kamuzinda General Enterprises Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the completion of Teachers' House at Mirembe RC P/S <p>The payment certificate was signed by the Engineer, City Education Officer, Environment Officer and CDO on 19/05/2023</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. VN 6391176 of 26/06/2023 being payment of UGX 23,530,410 to M/S Kabonera Traders Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of 6-Stance Pit Latrines at Kiziba and Butende P/Ss <p>The payment certificate was signed by the Engineer and the City Education Officer on 13/06/2023, and by the Environment Officer and the CDO on 14/06/2023</p>	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the variations in the contract prices for the Education sector projects were within +/-20%. The sampled projects were: Renovation of a classroom block at Kaddugala PS and Completion of a Classroom at Senya PS, whose estimate was Ugx 113,267,900 and contract award Ugx 108,745,632 hence the variation was -3.99%; Construction of VIP latrines at Kiziba and Butende PS, whose estimate was Ugx 25,000,000 and contract award Ugx 108,745,632 hence the variation was -0.75%; and Completion of a 2 unit staff teacher house and construction of a kitchen at Mirembe RC PS, whose estimate was Ugx 40,000,000 and contract award Ugx 38,166,147 hence the variation was -4.58%	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	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 LG did not have a project for a Seed Secondary School in the previous FY.	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines

- If 100%: score 3
- If 80 - 99%: score 2
- If 70 - 79% score: 1
- Below 70% score 0

From the city staff structure, there was evidence that all the 54 schools (100%) with P7 class had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines of a headteacher and 7 teachers. Masaka school for special needs which had 5 classes had a head teacher and five teachers.

From sampled schools

St. Paul Kitovu Mixed PS: Nabagala Cate, Ddungu Franck, Nakayiwa Glory, Nankabirwa Jenifer, Akulu Margaret, Nsude Rebecca, Mukasa Kizito Joseph, Nakayaga Grace, Nanfuka Angel, Nassazi Sarak, Kayanja Florence, Namuyanja Marrium, Kababiito Teopista and Nakirijja Betty.

Hill Road PS: Nkata Benedict, Nakawunde Jannet, Nantege Joice Matovu, Kiggundu George William, Nakyanjja Anjela, Sande Enid, Ndagire Sarah, Namugga Gloria, Nanyunja Milly, Nagayi Betty, Namala Agatha Kalanda, Namukasa Mary, Namagembe Agnes, Mande Lillian, Nassejje

Scovia, Nanyondo Gorreth, Nakyanja Cissy, Kizza Regina, Akankwaasa Regina, Nayiga Gorreth, Atuhair Christine, Ayebare Ronah, Nabbanja Annet, Ssenabulya David, Matovu Dickson, Namirembe Betty and nammugga Robinah.

Kimanya Blessed PS: Kagolo Sarah, Arinaitwe Serecitina, Semwanga Joseph, Namutebi Gorret, Namutebi Eduidge, Ntende Imelda, Nankabirwa Miildred, Kayinza Rose, Bakisuula Florence, Nabukeera Regina, Kirumira Moses, Nalumansi Nuliati, Mpalugamba Oliva, Nalukwago Jascent

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 city has 55 registered UPE schools with an enrollment of 30840 learners.

There are 333 classrooms and at a classroom learner ratio of 1:53; $53 \times 333/30840 = 57.22\%$

There are 489 latrine stances and a stance learner ratio of 1:40; $40 \times 489/30840 = 63.42\%$

There are 6885 desks and at a desk learner ratio of 1:3; $3 \times 6885/30840 = 66.97\%$

there are 20 schools with at least 4 teacher accommodation units $20/55 = 36.36\%$

Average percentage 56.00%

There are 8 registered secondary schools with an enrolment of 13058 learners.

There are 230 classrooms and at a classroom learner ratio of 1:53; $53 \times 230/13058 = 93.35\%$

There are 141 latrine stances and a stance learner ratio of 1:40; $40 \times 141/13058 = 43.19\%$

There are 2561 desks and at a desk learner ratio of 1:3; $3 \times 2561/13058 = 58.83\%$

there are 6 schools with at least 4 teacher accommodation units $6/8 = 75/100\%$

Average percentage 67.50%

Percentage for UPE and USE schools = 61.15%

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

From the teacher deployment list and from the list of teachers found at the sampled schools, there was evidence that the city accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed. The following teachers were found at the sampled schools;

St. Paul Kitovu Mixed PS: Nabagala Cate, Ddungu Franck, Nakayiwa Glory, Nankabirwa Jenifer, Akulu Margaret, Nsude Rebbeca, Mukasa Kizito Joseph, Nakayaga Grace, Nanfuka Angel, Nassazi Sarak, Kayanja Florence, Namuyanja Marrium, Kababiito Teopista and Nakirijja Betty.

Hill Road PS: Nkata Benedict, Nakawunde Jannet, Nantege Joice Matovu, Kiggundu George William, Nakyanjja Anjela, Sande Enid, Ndagire Sarah, Namugga Gloria, Nanyunja Milly, Nagayi Betty, Namala Agatha Kalanda, Namukasa Mary, Namagembe Agnes, Mande Lillian, Nassejje

Scovia, Nanyondo Gorreth, Nakyanja Cissy, Kizza Regina, Akankwaasa Regina, Nayiga Gorreth, Atuhaire Christine, Ayebare Ronah, Nabbanja Annet, Ssenabulya David, Matovu Dickson, Namirembe Betty and nammugga Robinah.

Kimanya Blessed PS: Kagolo Sarah, Arinaitwe Serecitina, Semwanga Joseph, Namutebi Gorret, Namutebi Eduidge, Ntende Imelda, Nankabirwa Miildred, Kayinza Rose, Bakisuula Florence, Nabukeera Regina, Kirumira Moses, Nalumansi Nuliati, Mpalugamba Oliva, Nalukwago Jascent

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2

- Else score: 0

From the city consolidated school asset register and from the asset registers of the sampled schools, there was evidence that the city had an asset register accurately reporting on on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.

St Paul Kitovu Mixed PS had 15 classrooms, 32 latrine stances, 265 desks and 10 teacher accommodation units.

Kimanya Blessed PS had 14 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 216 desks and 15 teacher accommodation units.

Hill Road PS had 20 classrooms, 26 latrine stances, 720 desks and 8 teacher accommodation units.

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 copies of reports submitted to the DEO and from copies of submitted reports from sampled schools of Hill Road PS (submitted on 05/12/2022), Kimanya Blessed PS (submitted on 21/01/2023) and St. Paul Kitovu Mixed PS (submitted on 12/12/2023), there was evidence that all the registered primary schools complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and submitted reports to the DEO by January 30.</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30– 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>From the activity report on training of headteachers in performance management dated 04/08/2022 (item 8.0) and copies of school improvement plans found at the sampled schools (Hill Road PS, Kimanya Blessed PS and St. Paul Kitovu PS) there was evidence that 100% of the registered primary schools were supported to prepare and implement SIPs (the dates of support were not given).</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>From the submission letter by the TC submitted on 28/10/2022 and received by PS MoES on 03/11/2022, there was evidence that the city collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY.</p>	4

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision	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:	From the approved budget estimates FY 2023/2024 (page 2 education), there was evidence that Ug. Shs. 5,165,503,179 for a headteacher and 7 teachers with schools with P7 for the 597 teachers in the 55 registered primary schools.	4
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Score 4 or else, score: 0		
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	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, staff lists and staff attendance registers at the sampled schools, there was evidence that the city deployed teachers as per the guidelines of a headteacher and 7 teachers for schools with P7.	3
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		St. Paul Kitovu Mixed PS: Nabagala Cate, Ddungu Franck, Nakayiwa Glory, Nankabirwa Jenifer, Akulu Margaret, Nsude Rebecca, Mukasa Kizito Joseph, Nakayaga Grace, Nanfuka Angel, Nassazi Sarak, Kayanja Florence, Namuyanja Marrium, Kababiito Teopista and Nakirijja Betty.	
			Hill Road PS: Nkata Benedict, Nakawunde Jannet, Nantege Joice Matovu, Kiggundu George William, Nakyanjja Anjela, Sande Enid, Ndagire Sarah, Namugga Gloria, Nanyunja Milly, Nagayi Betty, Namala Agatha Kalanda, Namukasa Mary, Namagembe Agnes, Mande Lillian, Nassejje	
			Scovia, Nanyondo Gorreth, Nakyanja Cissy, Kizza Regina, Akankwaasa Regina, Nayiga Gorreth, Atuhairé Christine, Ayebare Ronah, Nabbanja Annet, Ssenabulya David, Matovu Dickson, Namirembe Betty and nammugga Robinah.	
			Kimanya Blessed PS: Kagolo Sarah, Arinaitwe Serecitina, Semwanga Joseph, Namutebi Gorret, Namutebi Eduidge, Ntende Imelda, Nankabirwa Miildred, Kayinza Rose, Bakisuula Florence, Nabukeera Regina, Kirumira Moses, Nalumansi Nuliati, Mpalugamba Oliva, Nalukwago Jascent	

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

From staff lists and actual deployment per school, there was evidence that the teacher deployment data had been publicized on the city and school notice boards,

St. Paul Kitovu Mixed PS: Nabagala Cate, Ddungu Franck, Nakayiwa Glory, Nankabirwa Jenifer, Akulu Margaret, Nsude Rebbeca, Mukasa Kizito Joseph, Nakayaga Grace, Nanfuka Angel, Nassazi Sarak, Kayanja Florence, Namuyanja Marrium, Kababiito Teopista and Nakirijja Betty.

Hill Road PS: Nkata Benedict, Nakawunde Jannet, Nantege Joice Matovu, Kiggundu George William, Nakyanjja Anjela, Sande Enid, Ndagire Sarah, Namugga Gloria, Nanyunja Milly, Nagayi Betty, Namala Agatha Kalanda, Namukasa Mary, Namagembe Agnes, Mande Lillian, Nassejje

Scovia, Nanyondo Gorreth, Nakyanja Cissy, Kizza Regina, Akankwaasa Regina, Nayiga Gorreth, Atuhaire Christine, Ayebare Ronah, Nabbanja Annet, Ssenabulya David, Matovu Dickson, Namirembe Betty and nammugga Robinah.

Kimanya Blessed PS: Kagolo Sarah, Arinaitwe Serecitina, Semwanga Joseph, Namutebi Gorret, Namutebi Eduidge, Ntende Imelda, Nankabirwa Miildred, Kayinza Rose, Bakisuula Florence, Nabukeera Regina, Kirumira Moses, Nalumansi Nuliati, Mpalugamba Oliva, Nalukwago Jascent

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0

The CLG had 12 Primary schools. The Head Teachers were appraised on the following dates, by the Education Officers, Luyima Dais

1. Gumomwiru Benon, Kitengesa PS - 22nd November 2022; **2.** Nkata Ben, Hill Road PS - 30th December 2022; **3.** Nabadda Noelene, 17th December 2022; **4.** Nakawombe Grace, Kiyumba PS - 17th December 2022; **5.** Nassali Edith, Kako PS - 28th November 2022; **6.** Nakabuye Sarah, Ndegeya SNE PS - 29th November 2022; **7.** Zawedde Sura St. Mathew Kyosula PS - 28th December 2022; **8.** Nsubuga Francis, Mpugwe PS - 28th December 2022; **9.** Nakidde Harriet, Gayaza PS - 28th December 2022; **10.** Beingana Sula, Bisanje PS - 28th December 2022; **11.** Kasagga Moses, Kikungu PS - 28th December 2022; and **12.** Kamusi Moses, Kijjabwemi PS - 28th December 2022

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Appraisal reports for secondary school Head Teachers were not presented for review</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>Appraisal reports for the Education Department staff for FY 2022/2023 were not presented for review.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The city prepared a training workplan for the period July 2022 to June 2023 (dated 22/07/2022) to address staff capacity gaps at departmental and school levels. The training plan targets, school headteachers, teachers, school management committees and PTAs.</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 the submission made by the TC on 28/10/2022 and acknowledged by PS MoES on 03/11/2022, there was evidence that the city confirmed in writing the list of schools and their enrolment in the 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>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>From the approved budget estimates FY 2023/2024 (page 4 education) a budget of Ug. Shs. 21,562,000 was allocated to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Monitoring: 4,500,000 + 100,000 x 55 schools = 10,000,000</p> <p>Inspection: 4,000,000 + 112,000 x 55 schools = 10,160,000</p> <p>10,000,000 + 10,160,000 = 20,160,000</p> <p>The budgeted figure of Shs. 21,562,000 is greater the calculated figure of Shs. 20,160,000</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the city had submitted warrants for schools' capitation within 5 days</p> <p>Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-06 was prepared on 08/08/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-13 was prepared on 17/10/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-21 was prepared on 24/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days); and</p> <p>Q4 cash limits were received on 06/04/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-29 was prepared on 11/05/2023 (beyond 5 working days)</p>	0

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the city had invoiced and the City Educ. Officer had communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2023 and was invoiced and communicated to schools on 25/08/2022 (beyond 3 working days);</p> <p>Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2023 and had been published and invoiced on 27/10/2022 (beyond 3 working days);</p> <p>Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2023 and were invoiced and communicated to schools on 31/01/2023 (beyond 3 working days); and</p> <p>Q4 cash limits were received on 06/04/2023 and invoiced on 15/05/2023 (beyond 3 working days) and published on 20/07/2023</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>From the minutes of the departmental meeting held on 04/07/2022 (Min. 02/DM/07/2022) and the city inspection plan for FY 2023/2024, there was evidence that the department prepared an inspection plan for school inspections. The plan targeted 55 registered government and 150 privately owned primary schools and 8 secondary and 30 privately owned secondary schools.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>The education department prepared three inspection reports for term three 2022 (dated 15/11/2022), term one 2023 (dated 22/06/2023 and term two 2023 (dated 04/09/2023), there was evidence that the three inspection reports covered all the 55 (100%) registered UPE schools.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that inspection reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that these reports were submitted to DES.</p>	0

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that 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.

1. Committee Report of 31/08/2022 was discussed in council meeting of 27/09/2022 under Agenda No. 6, Minute No. 015/MCC/COUNCIL/27/SEPTEMBER/2022

2. Committee Report of 21/10/2022 was discussed in council meeting of 30/03/2023 under Agenda No. 6, Minute No. 041/MCC/COUNCIL/30/MARCH/2023

3. Committee Report of 23/12/2022 was discussed in council meeting of 30/03/2023 under Agenda N. 6, Minute no. 041/MCC/COUNCIL/30/MARCH/2023

4. Committee Report of 26/04/2023 was discussed in council meeting of 26/05/2023 under Agenda N. 5, Minute No. 050/MCC/COUNCIL/26/MAY/2023

The following issues were discussed:

31/08/2022

Monitoring of Projects by Committee

Monitoring of Safety and Security in sampled schools
Hosting of National Ball games

21/10/2022

Mobilisation of parents to participate in education activities. Orientation of teachers on roles and responsibilities.

Teachers, day and annual stake holders review meeting.

23/12/2022

Launching of PLE result and e-inspection tools introduced by the

ministry.

List of closed schools

Transfer of Headteachers, Deputies and Teachers

26/04/2023

Workplan F/Y 2023/ 2024

Budget FJY 2023/ 2024

11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	From the workplan for meetings with teachers, SMCs, PTAs and parents (from 19/09/2022 to 19/10/2022), and from reports on mobilization meetings for retention of learners (photos attached), there was evidence that the department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain learners in school.	2
----	--	--	--	----------

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	From the department city school asset register up dated on 07/09/2023 and from sampled schools, there was evidence that the department had an up to-date asset register setting out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. The information from the LG consolidated school asset register was consistent with that from the three sampled schools as follows; Hill Road PS had 20 classrooms, 26 latrine stances, 720 desks and 8 teacher accommodation units. Kimanya Blessed PS had 14 classrooms, 20 latrine stances, 216 desks and 15 teacher accommodation units. St.Paul Kitovu Mixed PS had 15 classrooms, 32 latrine stances, 265 desks and 10 teacher accommodation units	2
----	---	--	---	----------

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i>	There was no evidence that the LG had conducted any desk appraisals 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 The City Planner did not present any desk or field appraisal reports for verification. The following infrastructure projects had been implemented: i. Completion of a 2-Classroom Block at Ssenya P/School UGX 15,848,250 ii. Completion of Teachers' House at Mirembe RC P/S UGX 6,275,265 iii. Construction of 6-Stance Pit Latrines at Kiziba and Butende P/S UGX 23,530,410	0
----	---	---	---	----------

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY</p> <p>The City Planner did not present any field appraisal reports for verification.</p> <p>The following infrastructure projects had been implemented:</p> <p>i. Completion of a 2-Classroom Block at Ssenya P/School UGX 15,848,250</p> <p>ii. Completion of Teachers’ House at Mirembe RC P/S UGX 6,275,265</p> <p>iii. Construction of 6-Stance Pit Latrines at Kiziba and Butende P/S UGX 23,530,410</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG Education department did not budget for a seed secondary school for the current FY.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of minute 11/MC/06/22-23 of the contracts committee meeting which sat on February 27, 2023 and approved the procurement of the Education sector project. There was also no project above the Ugx 200,000,000 threshold which needed the Solicitor General's clearance.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of the establishment of PIT. There was just a letter referenced CR/214/14, dated April 11, 2023 appointing Eng. Tibarungi Augustus as a project manager for the Education sector projects.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	The LG did not have a project for Seed Secondary Schools.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	The LG did not have a project for Seed Secondary Schools.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence of the participation of the environment officers, CDOs in the supervision activities of the LG education projects.	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 the sector infrastructure projects had been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract.</p> <p>1. VN 6404448 of 26/06/2023 being payment of UGX 15,848,250 to M/S Kyamulibwa Carpentry Workshop Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the completion of a 2-Classroom Block at Ssenya P/School</p> <p>Payment was requested on 10/05/2023, and was effected on 26/06/2023 (beyond 10 working days)</p> <p>2. VN 6373264 of 26/06/2023 being payment of UGX 6,275,265 to M/S Kamuzinda General Enterprises Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the completion of Teachers' House at Mirembe RC P/S</p> <p>The payment was requested 14/06/2023, and was effected on 26/06/2023 (within 10 working days)</p> <p>3. VN 6391176 of 26/06/2023 being payment of UGX 23,530,410 to M/S Kabonera Traders Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the construction of 6-Stance Pit Latrines at Kiziba and Butende P/Ss</p> <p>Payment was requested 14/06/2023, and was effected on 26/06/2023 (within 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 requisition of April 14, 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 <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>The LG did not have a project for Seed Secondary Schools.</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 GRM advertised on the Education Noticeboard.</p> <p>The department used an old Delivery Book to record cases of absenteeism of teachers and not record grievances.</p> <p>The first case recorded was Ref: 011/3/22 where complainant was the Headteacher of St. Bruno Ndegeya Primary School, a one Nyombi Stephen dated 11 March 2022. She disappeared and did not report for Term I. She was at first suspended and then Action after 90 Days was that she was recommended for termination of Appointment.</p> <p>The last case on the Log book was that of Ref: 29/11/23 and was that of the Area Inspector, a one Sigenda David. The complaint was irregularity in place of work, failure to register learners on EMIS, failure to supervise teachers and failure to account for UPE funds. Action was recommended for attachment to Town Clerk. Action after 30 Days the Town Clerk recommended to be sent on attachment to Education Headquarters for strict monitoring and mentoring.</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 copies of educational guidelines on environment found at sampled schools of Hill Road PS, Kimanya Blessed PS and St. Paul Kitovu Mixed PS) and from the green schools arising from green compounds and trees planted on the compounds of sampled schools, there was evidence that the department disseminated the guidelines (dates of dissemination not evident).</p>	0

16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence that Masaka City LG had in place a costed ESMPs and these were incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents. Costing for schools was done by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer on 20th /9/2022. But evidence for those included in BoQs was provided for only one school, namely:</p> <p>1) Completion of Mirembe Roman Catholic Staff house. Under Element 12: - ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURES (Plant 10 Trees and Paspalm 30m2) and</p> <p>ELEMENT 14: - OCCUPATION, HEALTH AND SAFETY, HIV/AIDS AND GENDER (Sensitisation, counselling and prevention). The BoQ included UGX300,000/- for each Element;</p> <p>No evidence of inclusion in BoQs for the following Education projects:</p> <p>2) Construction of pit latrine at Mpugwe Primary School;</p> <p>3) Construction of pit latrine at Kiziba Primary School;</p> <p>4) Completion of Ssenya Primary School;</p> <p>5) Renovation of one classroom at Kadugula Primary School; and</p> <p>6) Construction of a kitchen at Mirembe Roman Catholic Primary School</p>	0
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>Land ownership status presented for:</p> <p>1) Construction of pit latrine at Kiziba Primary School. A school Application Form for facilities Improvement' dated 13/02/23 signed by Kayondo Godfrey, Chairperson of the SMC and Lubowa S the 2nd Representative of the SMC was presented. It was dated 03 Feb. 2022;</p> <p>But no documentation on land status was availed for the following Education projects:</p> <p>2) Completion of Mirembe Roman Catholic Staff house;</p> <p>3) Construction of pit latrine at Mpugwe Primary School;</p> <p>4) Completion of Ssenya Primary School;</p> <p>5) Renovation of one classroom at Kadugula Primary School; and</p> <p>6) Construction of a kitchen at Mirembe Roman Catholic Primary School</p>	0

16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	There was no 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 action, and prepared monthly monitoring reports. No evidence was presented to support this.	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments <i>Score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was evidence that Masaka City LG had E&S certifications approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments. E & S Payment certification prepared by the Division Engineer (Project Manager), Checked by the City Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Certified by the City Engineer and approved by the CAO were presented as sampled for: 1) Completion of Mirembe Roman Catholic Staff house dated 12/06/2023; 2) Construction of pit latrine at Kiziba Primary School dated 13/06/2023; 3) Completion of Ssenya Primary School; and 4) Renovation of one classroom at Kadugala Primary School dated 18/05/2023.	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 Masaka City Local Government attained a 20% or more increase in the coverage of institutional deliveries. There was no information for one of the sampled health facilities – Kiyumba HCIV (October-December 2021). Even with that information gap in the baseline year, the total number of institutional deliveries in the three sampled health facilities in FY 2021/22 was 967 increasing by only 15.0% to 1115 in FY 2022/23.</p> <p>1. Kiyumba HCIV (405) – (510)</p> <p>2. Mpugwe HCIII (332) – (291)</p> <p>3. Nyendo HCIII: (230) – (314)</p> <p>Total 2022/23 (1114) – Total 2021/22 (967)/528 = 15.3%</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 the Health Sector for LLG performance assessment was 100%:</p> <p>1 Kimaanya - Kabonera City Division scored 100%</p> <p>2 Nyendo – Mukungwe City Division scored 100%</p> <p>The average Score was 100%</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 – 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>RBF was not implemented in 2022/23.</p>	0

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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.	There was evidence that the city spent only UGX 213,573,000 (93%) out of the health development grant of UGX 228,702,000 for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines as reported on Pg.17 of the annual performance report 2022/23.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		The following two infrastructure projects were implemented: 1. Upgrade of Kyabakuza H/C-II to H/C-III at UGX 205,000,000 2. Procurement and installation of 40" Storage Container at UGX 23,702,000	
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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	There was no evidence that the Director of Health Services in the City, the LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO had certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		The city implemented the following two infrastructure projects: 1. VN 6411575 of 27/06/2023 being payment of UGX 190,573,419 to M/S Kaleeta Construction Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the upgrade of Kyabakuza H/C II to H/C III The payment certificate was only signed by the Engineer on 19/06/2023 2. VN 6371972 of 26/06/2023 being payment of UGX 21,620,000 to M/S Matsazan Company Ltd against Certificate No.1 for supply and installation of 40ft container at the City Health Dept. There was no payment certificate attached to the voucher	
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 variation in the contract price for the Health sector project which was the Phased the upgrade of Kyabakuza HC II to HC IV phase II was within +/-20%. The estimate was Ugx 205,000,000 and contract award Ugx 199,672,638 hence the variation was -2.60%;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure			

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's. The project available was a phased transformation of Kyabakuza HC II to a HC IV.	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	Masaka City has 3 HCIII and 1 HCIV. There was no evidence that the LG had recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure. The average number of staff for the 3 HCIII was 70.2% (range 68.4-73.7), with two of them Bukoto HCIII and Nyendo Senyange HCIII having only had 68.4% of positions filled. The staffing levels for the only HCIV (Kiyumba HCI) was only 64.6%.	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	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	The LG did not have a project for HC II's being upgraded to HC III's. The project available was a phased transformation of Kyabakuza HC II to a HC IV.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 		

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 evidence for only 1/3 of the sampled health facilities that the health workers were in place as indicated in the staff list from the City Health Office and that this matched the list on the noticeboard at the three sampled facilities. The details were as follows:</p> <p>1) Kiyumba HCIV (2023/24 30/31) as <u>Mbambu Janet, a Laboratory Technician was not on the list and instead the listed position was filled by Nkusa Richard;</u></p> <p>2) Nyendo HCIII (2023/24 12/13) as Teopista Nabakooza, a Nursing Assistant had absconded; and</p> <p>3) Mpugwe HCIII (2023/24 14/14).</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 health department submitted a procurement plan on 18/4/22 which included an estimated UGX 205 million to construct Kyabakuzza health centre. The Annual PBS (2022/23) report on page 18 of 181 included a budget of 213.6 million. The PBS work plan had a budget of 205 million to upgrade Kyabakuzza HCII to 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>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence that the annual work plans and budgets of the three sampled facilities were submitted by 31st March of the previous FY as these were not available for 1) Kiyumba HCIV, 2) Nyendo HCIII 3)Mpugwe HCIII.</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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' annual budget performance reports for the previous FY conformed to the Budget and Grant Guidelines. These were not available for 1) Kiyumba HCIV, 2) Nyendo HCIII 3) Mpugwe HCIII.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	----------

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 facility improvement plans for the current FY 2023/24 i) Kiyumba HCIV, ii) Nyendo HCIII, Mpugwe HCIII as these were not available.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	----------

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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) Kiyumba HCIV, 2) Nyendo HCIII 3) Mpugwe HCIII had submitted timely monthly and quarterly reports 7 days following the end of the month.

Monthly reports

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

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

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

Quarterly reports

1. Kiyumba HCIV: 07/10/2022, 07/01/2023, 07/04/2023, 07/07/2023;

2. Nyendo HCIII: 07/10/2022, 07/01/2023, 07/04/2023, 07/07/2023; and

3. Mpugwe HCIII: 06/10/2022, 07/01/2023, 07/04/2023, 07/07/2023.

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 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 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 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 no evidence that the city made timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>The city uses the PBS Tool for reporting and there was no audit trail feature to illustrate the trend of quarterly reporting, the city had not maintained any physical registers to track reporting nor were there any forwarding letters to be verified.</p> <p>The Assessor made extra efforts in obtaining the evidence in vain</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: 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 Masaka City had developed and approved a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the lowest performing health facilities.</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>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Masaka City had implemented the approved Performance Improvement Plan.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Masaka City had budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines. The PBS (Performance Budgeting System) indicates a budget of UGX 2,062,000,000 for an average staffing level of 58.8% for the current FY.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>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 Masaka City had deployed health workers as per the guidelines. Although the overall average for filled positions for HCII, HCIII, and HCIV was 58.9%. At HCII the range of filled positions was 33.3-66.7%, HCIII range 68.4-73.7%; staffing positions for the only HCIV was 64.6%.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the arrival and departure register that health staff at two out of the three sampled health facilities: 1) Nyendo HCIII (12/13) as Teopista Nabakooza, a Nursing Assistant had absconded; Mpugwe HCIII (13/13). At Mpugwe HCIV (26/31) Yiga David a Health Inspector, Nakatto Christine a Stores Assistant and Lutemwa Lilian an Assistant Health Educator were assigned to the health facility although their usual day stations were at the City Health Office; Namukwaya Resty a Vector Control Officer and Namujuzzi Betty were reportedly on study leave. Mbambu Janet, a Laboratory Technician was neither on the health facility list nor in the arrival and departure register.</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>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the list of health workers deployed at the sampled facilities for the current FY 2023/24 was displayed on the health facility notice boards at three of the sampled health facilities: 1) Kiyumba HCIV (2023/24 30/31 staff); 2) Nyendo HCIII (2023/24 12/13 staff); and 3) Mpugwe HCIII (2023/24 14/14).</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>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>	<p>The CLG had 11 health Centers. The Officers In Charge were appraised on the following dates, by Dr. Kasendwa Patricia City Health Officer;</p> <p>1. Namugera Gaude, Nursing Officer (Kyabakuza HC) - 31st July 2023; 2. Namusoke Jane, Nursing Officer (Katabaazi HC) - 31st July 2023; 3. Kiyimba Harriet, Nursing Officer (Kirumba HC) - 31st July 2023; 4. Nakabiito Catherine, Clinical Officer (Nyendo HC) - 24th August 2023; 5. Nakitto Agnes, Enrolled Nurse (Masaka Clinic) - 31st July 2023; 6 . Nassazi Pauline, Enrolled Nurse (Butenda HC) - 31st July 2023; 7. Naggirinya Rose, Assistant Nursing Officer (Bugabiriri HC) - 22nd August 2023; 8. Namirembe Barbara, Senior Clinical Officer (Matulagu HC) - 31st July 2023; 9. Nakayiki Maria Gonzaga, Registered Nurse (Kyamulibwa HC) - 31st August 2023; 10. Ssetuba Deo, Senior Clinical Officer (Mpugwe HC) - 31st July 2023; and 11. Zziwa Birungi Godfrey, Medical Officer (Kiyumba HC) - 1st August 2023</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>All were appraised outside the prescribed time period</p>	

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>Appraisal reports of Health Workers were not presented 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>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The City Health Officer did not take any corrective action based on the performance appraisal reports</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the training reports for the previous FY were implemented.</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>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the training activities for the previous FY were documented in the training data base.</p>	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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 Town Clerk had notified the MoH in writing of status of health facilities whether correct or wrong. The letter "Submission of Health Facilities" data for validation consolidation and generation of LG IPFs for 2023/24 dated 30/09/23 (REF CR/353/1) was received at the Ministry of Health Registry on 10/10/22.</p>	0	
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the city had allocated UGX 43,696,000 (40%) for health monitoring activities out the PHC NWR Grant budget of UGX 109,953,000 for the City Health Office (Pg.30 of the Approved Budget) ie more than 15%</p>	2	
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the city made timely warranting of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget</p> <p>Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-06 was prepared on 08/08/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-13 was prepared on 17/10/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-21 was prepared on 24/01/2023 (beyond 5 working days); and</p> <p>Q4 cash limits were received on 06/04/2023 and Warrant No. 607AW-2023-29 was prepared on 11/05/2023 (beyond 5 working days)</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>					

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2023, communicated and disbursed to HFs on 25/08/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2023 and had been published and disbursed to HFs on 03/11/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2023 and disbursed and communicated to HFs on 03/02/2023 (beyond 5 working days); and</p> <p>Q4 cash limits were received on 06/04/2023, had been published on 20/07/2023 and invoiced to HFs on 11/05/2023 (beyond 5 working days)</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>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 city had 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</p> <p>Q1 cash limits were received on 08/07/2023, communicated and disbursed to HFs on 25/08/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q2 cash limits were received on 30/09/2023 and had been published and disbursed to HFs on 03/11/2022 (beyond 5 working days);</p> <p>Q3 cash limits were received on 29/12/2023 and disbursed and communicated to HFs on 03/02/2023 (beyond 5 working days); and</p> <p>Q4 cash limits were received on 06/04/2023, had been published on 20/07/2023 and invoiced to HFs on 11/05/2023 (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>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Masaka City Health Department had implemented actions recommended by the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review meeting. The quarterly performance review meetings were held on the following dates for each quarter: Q1: missing; Q2: 01/11/22 Q3: 07/02/23; Q4: 27/06/23. There was no evidence that the actions raised in the meetings that had been held were implemented.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	There was no evidence that the quarterly performance review meetings were attended by all health facility in-charges (public and PNFP), implementing partners, and other departments as shown in the attendance lists for the meetings by quarter.	0
	Maximum 7 points on this performance measure		Q1: Missing; Q2: Missing; Q3: Missing; Q4: Health facility in-charges (15/15); Implementing Partners (Living Goods, BAMA), CHT (9/10); Other departments (None).	
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	Masaka City LG has one HCIV – Kiyumba HCIV. There was evidence that the LG had supervised the HCIV during each quarter in the previous FY. as follows: Q1 23rd-30th September 2022; Q2 12th-16th December 2022; Q3 14th-30th March 2023; and Q4 13th-26th June 2023.	1
	Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	If not applicable, provide the score		
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.	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	Masaka City has two HSDs – 1) Nyendo Mukungwe with one HCIV – Kiyumba HCIV and 2) Kimanya Kabonera with no HCIV or general hospital. Both HSDs are under the mandate of Kiyumba HCIV. The supervision dates for the sampled health facilities by the HSD were as follows:	0
	Maximum 7 points on this performance measure	• If not applicable, provide the score	<p>1) Nyendo HCIII: Q1 Report dated 28/09/22, Q2 No report, Q3 Report dated 30/03/23 & Q4 – Report dated 26/06/23</p> <p>2) Mpugwe HCIII: Q1 Report dated 28/09/22, Q2 Report dated 21/12/2023; Q3 Report dated 30/03/23 Q4 Report dated 26/06/23</p> <p>3) Bukoto HCIII: Q1 No report, Q2 Report dated 21/12/2023, Q3 Report dated 30/03/23 & Q4 No report</p>	

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 in the facility support supervision books that all three sampled health facilities had received recommendations health department and implemented them as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mpugwe HCIII: In Q1 (27/07/22) the DHT had recommended that all newly diagnosed HIV patients needed to have the CD4 done at baseline. A random review of three patient files established that the recommendation had been adopted. 2. Kiyumba HCIV: In Q1 on 16/08/22 the DMMS had recommended that the products in the store needed to be organized and have updated stock cards next to them. It was observed that the store was well organized and all products had updated stock cards. 3. Nyendo HCIII: In Q1 (18/07/22) the IPC focal point had recommended that the staff should avoid dumping sharps and plastics in the placenta pit. The onsite visit confirmed that the non-decomposable waste was not in the placenta pit. 	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 evidence that guidance was provided to GoU health facility in-charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies during 2022/23 for only 5/11 health facilities. The following health facilities did not receive any visits - 1) Bugabira HCII 2) Kyamuyimbwa HCII 3) Ssenya HCII 4) Bukoto HCIII 5) Mpugwe HCIII and Kiyumba HCIV. The number of facilities per quarter that were guided were as follows: Q1 5/11; Q2 4/11; Q3 4/11; and Q4 1/11.</p>	0
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG allocated at least 30% of the City Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities. On Pg.30 of the approved budget, the City had allocated UGX 62,228,000 (57%) to health promotional activities out of the PHC-NW Grant of UGX 109,953,000 (more than 30%)</p>	2

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 City Health Team had implemented health promotion, disease prevention, and social mobilization activities in the previous FY. The topics reported on in the quarterly report by quarter are as follows:	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		<p>Q1: Report dated 21/10/22 – training of teachers and students in malaria prevention skills,</p> <p>Q2: missing</p> <p>Q3: missing.</p> <p>Q4: Report dated 26/05/23 – conducted medical examination of food handlers in Kimaanya-Kabonera City Division</p>	

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 follow-up actions were taken on health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization aspects.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

Investment Management

12	Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.	a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the Assets register details health facilities and equipment in the LG relative to the medical equipment list and service standards. The file contained all individual registers for the 11 GoU health facilities for both the physical infrastructure (HMIS 101) and equipment (HMIS 102). The names of the health facilities in the asset register were: 1 Bugabira HCII, 2 Katwe Butego Kirumba HCII, 3 Katwe Butego Kitabaazi HCII, 4 Kimaanya Kyabakuza HCII, 5 Kyamuyimbwa HCII, 6 Masaka Municipal Clinic HCII, 7 Ssenya HCII, 8 Bukoto HCIII, 9 Mpugwe HCIII, 10 Nyendo Senyange HCIII, 11 Kiyumba HCIV.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

12	<p>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); (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG));</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that any desk appraisals were conducted for the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY. The City Planner did not provide any copies of appraisal forms or reports for verification. The following infrastructure projects had been implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upgrade of Kyabakuzza H/C-II to H/C-III at UGX 205,000,000 2. Procurement and installation of 40" Storage Container at UGX 23,702,000 <p>These were:</p> <p>(i) derived from Pg.166 of the LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under the PHC sector guidelines and funding source</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (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 no evidence that the city had conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions. The City Planner did not provide any copies of appraisal forms or reports for verification.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Masaka City LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all health projects implemented the previous FY. There were two Health projects. Screening was done by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Renovation of Bukoto Health centre II Office block and Pit latrine. Screening was done on 17/08/2022; and 2) Construction of Kyabakuzza Health Centre II. Screening was done on 24/07/2020. This has been an ongoing project. 	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health submitted its Procurement workplan on April 14, 2023</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Health department submitted its Procurement requisition on November 3, 2023.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of minute 10/MC/06/20-23 of the contracts committee meeting which sat on January 24, 2023 and approved the procurement of the health sector infrastructure projects.</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 no evidence of the appointment of a PIT as prescribed. There was only a letter referenced CR/214/14, dated April 14, 2023 appointing Eng. Augustus Tiribarungi as a contract manager.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0	The LG did not have a project for HC IIs being upgraded to HCIIIs.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	There was no evidence of Clerk of Works maintains daily record as this was reportedly a requirement for C IIs being upgraded to HCIIIs.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines	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	There was no evidence of monthly site meetings by project site committee, chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), since the LG did not have a project for HC IIs being upgraded to HC III.	1
	Maximum 10 points on this performance measure	If there is no project, provide the score		

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 of participation of the Environment Officer and CDO during the execution of the LG health sector projects.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 CMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), The city implemented the following two infrastructure projects:</p> <p>1. VN 6411575 of 27/06/2023 being payment of UGX 190,573,419 to M/S Kaleeta Construction Ltd against Certificate No.1 for the upgrade of Kyabakuza H/C II to H/C III</p> <p>The payment certificate was only signed by the Engineer on 19/06/2023</p> <p>2. VN 6371972 of 26/06/2023 being payment of UGX 21,620,000 to M/S Matsazan Company Ltd against Certificate No.1 for supply and installation of 40ft container at the City Health Dept.</p> <p>There was no payment certificate attached to the voucher</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 a complete procurement file for the only Health sector project with record as required. The project file was: MASA857/WRKS/2022-23/00006 Construction works for the upgrade of Kyabakuza HC II to HC IV phase II, whose requisition was made on December 28, 2022, advert was made on February 1, 2023, evaluation was completed on March 10, 2023 and contract signed on April 11, 2023 at an award price of Ugx199,672,638;</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 GRM advertised on the Health Noticeboard.</p> <p>The department used the Main Grievance book kept at the office of the Focal Person to record Health grievances and no Log Book was specifically kept for Health Department.</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 such dissemination carried out. The Guidelines themselves were not in place. The Health Officer in charge of Environmental Health said he had requested the Guidelines from Headquarters long ago but had not received any yet.</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>A letter Ref: CR/358/1 dated 13th April 2023 written by Mugisha B. Richard the Town Clerk was presented. It introduced a company called YAMAC, a solid waste company that was authorized to collect and dispose refuse on a pilot project. There was however, no binding agreement signed between the company and the City LG.</p> <p>Another Agency - Metro Waste Solutions - was given access to sort medical waste in the City. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was drafted and was signed by the Agency, Metro. But Masaka City had not yet signed the MoU, sighting need for further consultation before they can sign. So there was no binding agreement or MoU between the City authorities and the Service provider even though a letter dated 14th Feb. 2023 signed by Mugisha Emmanuel Gacharo to all in-charges and Health providers in Masaka City required them to cooperate with this agency in disposing off of medical waste.</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>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 evidence that Masaka City LG conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management. The Officer in charge at the Health department mentioned that the trainings were done but all hard copies were distributed and there was nothing left for evidence.</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>Whereas there was evidence that Masaka City LG had costed ESMPs, there was no evidence that these were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for Health infrastructure projects of the previous FY. Costing was done by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer on 20th /9/2022 20/09/2022 for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Renovation of Bukoto Health centre II Office block and Pit latrine; and 2) Construction of Kyabakuza Health Centre II. <p>It was not possible to confirm whether the above costing was included in the BoQs or not. The BoQs could not be availed</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that Masaka DLG had proof of documentation on land status for the two Health projects implemented the previous FY. Land status for Health projects implemented the previous FY was as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) For Bukoto Health centre II, it was located on Buganda land and there was no Land Title for it; and 2) Kyabakuza Health Centre II had a Land Title. It was located on Plot 422, Block 369, Buddu, Masaka District (Now City). 	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 no evidence that Masaka City LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of Health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs and provided monthly reports. There was no evidence presented to this effect.</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects. There was no evidence presented for such certification for Bukoto Health centre II and Kyabakuza Health Centre II, Health projects that were implemented the previous FY.

**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>This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.</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>This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2 o If 80-99%: Score 1 o If below 80 %: Score 0 	<p>This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.</p>	0

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

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

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

Human Resource Management and Development

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

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff	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	This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.	0
	<i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>			
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.	a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3	This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.	0
	<i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>			
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.	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	This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.	0
	<i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>			

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.	<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 	This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.	0
	<i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>			

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

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

Investment Management

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

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

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

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

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

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.</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>.</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>This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.</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>.</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>This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.</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>.</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>This indicator is not applicable for Masaka City.</p>	0

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

Environment and Social Requirements

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

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

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	N/A	0
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	N/A	0
2	<p>N23 Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	Not Applicable for the LG.	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	N/A	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	Not Applicable for the LG.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	N/A	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0	N/A	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure • If 100% score 2 • If 75 - 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0	The CLG had 8 Approved positions of extension workers. They were all filled. The filled positions of extension workers therefore, constituted 100% of the total establishment	2
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	N/A	0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	N/A	0
---	---	---	-----	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	The CLG had 8 filled positions of extension workers. Kimanya - Kabonero Division; 1. Senior Agriculture Officer, Kato George; 2. Fisheries Officer, Ddamulira Gonzaga; 3. Veterinary Officer, Wakukira Stephen Lubega; and 4. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Sserwanyiri Henry Nyendo-Mukungwe Divisions; 5. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Ssenabulya Simon Peter; 6. Senior Agriculture Officer Akello Sheila Mary; 7. Senior Fisheries Officer, Luyinda Davis; and 8. Assistant Veterinary Officer, Nambalirwa Pauline, The HR Division did not submit the staff list for comparison	0
5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	N/A	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	N/A	0

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	Information on the budget provision for extension workers was not presented for review	0
	Maximum score 6			
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	<p>The CLG had 8 Approved positions of extension workers. They were all filled, as follows;</p> <p>Kimanya - Kabonero Division;</p> <p>Senior Agriculture Officer, Kato George</p> <p>Fisheries Officer, Ddamulira Gonzaga</p> <p>Veterinary Officer, Wakukira Stephen Lubega</p> <p>Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Sserwanyiri Henry</p> <p>Nyendo-Mukungwe Divisions;</p> <p>Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Ssenabulya Simon Peter</p> <p>Senior Agriculture Officer Akello Sheila Mary</p> <p>Senior Fisheries Officer, Luyinda Davis</p> <p>Assistant Veterinary Officer, Nambalirwa Pauline</p>	1
	Maximum score 6			

Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0

Extension workers were working in the sampled LLGs of Nyendo-Mukungwe and Kimaanya-Kabonero Divisions. They presented their activity report for review as follows;

Nyendo-Mukungwe Division;

Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Ssenabulya Simon Peter and Assistant Veterinary Officer, Nambalirwa Pauline's reports were dated 30th September 2022 and 30th June 2023; and Senior Fisheries Officer, Luyinda Davis' reports were dated 18th October 2022, 12th January 2023, 28th March 2023 and 14th July 2023

Kimaanya - Kabonero Division;

Fisheries Officer, Ddamulira Gonzaga's reports were dated 5th December 2022, 11th January 2023, 12th May 2023 and 14th July 2023. Veterinary Officer, Wakukira Lubega Stephen's reports were dated 29th September 2022, 30th December 2022, 3rd March 2023 and 30th June 2023. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Sserwanyiri Henry's reports were dated 30th September 2022, 30th December 2022, 3rd March 2023 and 30th June 2023

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, disseminated to LLGs and their telephone contacts displayed on the notice boards, as follows;

Kimaanya - Kabonero Division;

Senior Agriculture Officer, Kato George - 0758 922 199; Fisheries Officer, Ddamulira Gonzaga - 0751 701 215; Veterinary Officer, Wakukira Stephen Lubega - 0701 126 169; and Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Sserwanyiri Henry - 0706 936 679

Nyendo-Mukungwe Divisions;

Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Ssenabulya Simon Peter - 0702 637 840; Senior Agriculture Officer Akello Sheila Mary - 0757 420 464; Senior Fisheries Officer, Luyinda Davis - 0758 544 150; and Assistant Veterinary Officer, Nambalirwa Pauline - 0751 919 616

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 CLG had 8 filled positions of extension workers. They were appraised by the Production Coordinator, Akello Sheila Mary</p> <p>1. Senior Fisheries Officer, Luyinda Davis (Nyendo- Mukungwe Division) - 1st July 2023; 2. Senior Agriculture Officer, Kato George (Kimaanya - Kabonero Division) - 1st July 2023; 3. Fisheries Officer, Ddamulira Gonzaga (Kimanya - Kabonero Division) - 30th June 2023; 4. Veterinary Officer, Wakukira Stephen Lubega (Kimanya - Kabonero Division) 30th June 2023; 5. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Sserwanyiri Henry (Kimanya - Kabonero Division) 30th June 2023; 6. Nambalirwa Pauline, Assistant Veterinary Officer - Nyendo- Mukungwe Division) - 30th June 2023;</p> <p>7. Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Ssenabulya Simon Peter; and 8. Senior Agriculture Officer Akello Sheila Mary, were not appraised. Two extension workers' appraisal reports were not availed for reviewed and two were appraised outside the prescribed time period</p>	0
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>The Production Coordinator did not take any corrective action based on the performance appraisal reports</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>Information on training activities conducted was not availed for review</p>	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Information on the documentation of training activities was not availed for review	0
---	--	--	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

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

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	N/A	0
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	N/A	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
Investment Management				
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0	N/A	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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	Not applicable to Masaka CLG	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.	Not Applicable for the LG.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable for the LG.	0

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	Not Applicable for the LG.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	Not Applicable for the LG.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	Not Applicable for the LG.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f)Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	N/A	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	N/A	0

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

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

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

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	Indicator Not Applicable to LG	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Indicator Not Applicable to LG	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Indicator Not Applicable to LG	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Indicator Not Applicable to LG	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Indicator Not Applicable to LG	0

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	The Chief Finance Officer, Namuleme Sauda, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter dated 27th October 2010, DSC Min. no. 24 / OCTOBER / 2010	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 Senior Planner, Mayiito Ponsiano, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter dated 13th April 2023, DSC Min. no. 20 / Jan / 23 (90)	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 Principal Engineer, Turibarungi August, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter dated 20th May 2008, DSC Min. no. 120/ MAY / 2008	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.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	The Senior Environment Officer, Nabadda Pauline, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter Dated 13th December 2011, DSC Min. n0. 16 / NOVEMBER / 2011	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	The Senior Veterinary Officer 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.	f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	The Principal Community Development Officer, Ssenyomo Eddie, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter Dated 13th April 2023, DSC Min. no. 16 / Jan / 23 (4)	3

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	The Principal Commercial Officer, Mugerwa Joseph Ronald was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter dated 17th August, 2011. DSC Min no. DSC/MIN 80/AUGUST/2011.	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.	i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.	The Senior Procurement Officer, Ssebyala Rashid, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter dated 13th April 2023, DSC Min. no. 06 / JAN / 23 (7)	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Procurement Officer 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.	i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0	The Principal Human Resource Office, Namutebi Josephine, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter dated 10th July 2023, DSC Min. no. 33 / JUNE / 23	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 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.	k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0	The 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.	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Accountant, Kizito Anwah, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter dated 13th April 2023, DSC Min. no. 16 / JAN / 2023 (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.	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	The Senior Internal Auditor, Kafeero Harriet, was substantively appointed, as per the appointment letter dated 13th April 2023. CSC Min. no.04/OCTOBER/2022 (48).	2
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	The Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) position was not provided for on the staff Staff structure	0
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure).	1. The Senior Assistant Town Clerk - Kimaanya Kabonero Division, was not substantively appointed. Duties were performed by the Assistant TC, Mutebi Ibrahim as per his appointment letter dated 21st October 2016, DSC Min. no. 22 / OCT / 20 1C; and 2. The Senior Assistant Town Clerk - Nyendo Mukungwe Division- appointment details were not availed for review	0
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	The Senior CDO positions at Kimaanya – Kabonero and Nyendo - Mukungwe divisions were not filled	0
2	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG Maximum score is 15	c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.	The appointment details of Accounts Assistants for: Kimaanya – Kabonero Division: Najuma Jameo appointment letter dated 13th April, 2023. CSC/MIN.05/OCTOBER/2022(58) Nyendo Mukungwe Division: Mugerwa Mary Cleopatra appointment letter dated 13th April,2023. CSC/MIN.05/OCTOBER/2022 (57).	5

Environment and Social Requirements

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	There was evidence that LG had released only 31% of funds allocated in the previous FY to the Natural Resources Department	0
Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	From Pg.16 of the annual Financial Statements: "Statement of Appropriations "	The budget for Natural Resources was UGX 365,626,047 and only UGX 114,719,241 had been disbursed to the department (representing 31% budget performance). Local Revenue component of UGX 250,906,806 was not realized	
3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	The LG had released only 95% of funds allocated in the previous FY to Community-Based Services Department	0
Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	From Pg.16 of the annual Financial Statement: "Statement of Appropriations"	The budget for Community Based Services was UGX 118,758,721 out of which only UGX 112,336,326 had been disbursed to the department representing 95% budget performance.	
			The district did not receive local revenue component of UGX 6,422,395	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 4 or else 0	There was evidence that Masaka City LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG). There was only one DDEG project namely:	4
Maximum score is 12			1) Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kimwanyi Primary School and installation of a water tank	
			Screening was done by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer on 7/9/2000.	

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Screening results indicated no need for ESIA.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>
4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>Costing for the Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kimwanyi Primary School and installation of a water tank was done by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer on 20th /9/2022.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>

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, Masaka City (Vote No. 607) received a clean (un-qualified) audit opinion for the year.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">10</p>
---	--	--	--

6	Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).	If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),	There was no 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 FY 2021/22 at all	0
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.	Instead, CR/251/1 Status of Implementation of Internal Auditor Generals Findings for FY 2022/23 dated 03/11/2023 (submitted on 13/11/2023) was available. The statement included actions taken against all previous findings and recommendations.	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poor state of waste management in the city 2. Poor state of sanitary facilities in the city 3. Poor revenue performance at 62%, The Local Revenue shortfall was UGX 1,769,964,759 (38%) Out of a budget of UGX 4,625,256,101 only UGX 2,855,291,342 (62%) had been realised 4. Irregular payment of salaries of UGX 33,135,560 	
7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,	There was evidence that the LG had submitted an annual Performance Contract and Procurement Plan for 2023/2024 through the PBS within the time limit on 17/07/2023; A physical copy was verified.	4
	Maximum Score 4	score 4 or else 0.		
8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,	There was evidence that The LG submitted the Annual Performance Report for the year 2022/2023 to the PSST through the PBS on 23/08/2023 (before August 31, 2023)	4
	maximum score 4 or else 0	score 4 or else 0.		

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

Maximum score is 4

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

score 4 or else 0.

There was evidence that the LG had submitted all the Annual Performance Reports for the year 2022/2023 to PSST before August 31, 2023 as follows:

Q1 report was submitted through the PBS Tool on 28/11/2022;

Q2 was submitted through the PBS Tool on 17/02/2023;

Q3 was submitted through the PBS on 29/05/2023; and

Q4 was submitted through the PBS on 23/08/2023 (before 31st Aug. 2022)

**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.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	The City Education Officer, Kafeero Stephen was substantively appointed as per the appointment letter dated 13th April 2023, DSC Min. no. 25/January / 23 (iii)	30
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
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.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The City Inspector of Schools position was vacant	0
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	<p>There was evidence that Masaka City LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening. There were six projects implemented under Education and were screened by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer as follows:</p> <p>1) Completion of Mirembe Roman Catholic Staff house. Screening was done on 17/08/2022;</p> <p>2) Construction of pit latrine at Mpugwe Primary School. Screening was done on 7/09/2022;</p> <p>3) Construction of pit latrine at Kiziba Primary School. Screening was done on 17/08/2022;</p> <p>4) Completion of Ssenya Primary School. Screening was done on 7/09/2022;</p> <p>5) Renovation of one classroom at Kadugula Primary School. Screening was done on 7/09/2022; and</p> <p>6) Construction of a kitchen at Mirembe Roman Catholic Primary School. Screening was done on 7/09/2022.</p>	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

2

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

If the LG carried out:
b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) ,
score 15 or else 0.

Screening results indicated no need for ESIA.

15

The Maximum score is 30

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

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

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	The City Health Officer, Kasendwa Patrick, was substantively appointed as letter dated 13th April 2023, DSC Min. no. 16 / Jan / 2023 (100)	30
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.	The Senior Health Inspector , Nankumba Modesta, was Substantively appointed as per the appointment letter dated 13th April 2023, DSC Min. no. 23 / Jan / 2023 (102)	20
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0	The Health Educator position was vacant	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 Masaka City LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all health projects implemented the previous FY. There were two Health projects. Screening was done by Kizza Wilson the Senior Community Development Officer and Nabadda Pauline the Environment Officer as follows:</p> <p>1) Renovation of Bukoto Health centre II Office block and Pit latrine. Screening was done on 17/08/2022; and</p> <p>2) Construction of Kyabakuza Health Centre II. Screening was done on 24/07/2020. This has been an ongoing project.</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 ESIA.</p>	15

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

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

**Water & Environment Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	The Civil Engineer (Water) 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>	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 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>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Natural Resources Officer position was vacant	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Environment Officer position was vacant	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	The Forestry Officer position was not provided for on the staff structure	0

Environment and Social Requirements

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