



LGMSD 2022/23

Mbale city

(Vote Code: 856)

| Assessment | Scores |
|---|---------------|
| Crosscutting Minimum Conditions | 77% |
| Education Minimum Conditions | 70% |
| Health Minimum Conditions | 65% |
| Water & Environment Minimum Conditions | 0% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions | 0% |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures | 49% |
| Educational Performance Measures | 54% |
| Health Performance Measures | 54% |
| Water & Environment Performance Measures | 0% |
| Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures | 0% |

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|--|---|---|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): If so: Score 4 or else 0 | <p>There two infrastructure projects implemented using USMID namely; rehabilitation of Naboia road (0.662 Km) and rehabilitation of Cathedral road (0.835 Km). Both infrastructure projects were found to be functional and were being utilized as per the intended purpose.</p> | 4 |
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By more than 5%, score 3 1 to 5% increase, score 2 If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p> | <p>The average LLG performance assessment score for 2023 was 99%. There were however no verified LLG assessment results for 2022 as the City LG did not upload them into the system. The Planner gave the reason that the reason for failure to upload was due to the limited timeframe given by OPM to upload.</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>According to page 53 of the Budget Performance Report for 2022/2023, the two USMID projects, Cathedral and Naboia Roads, were completed before the end of the Financial Year.</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. | The City budgeted and received UGX 9,293,158,365 as USMID funding which was broken down as follows; UGX 9,084,830,385 as MDG for infrastructure development and UGX 208,327,980 as ISG for complementary services. The City spent UGX 9,084,830,385 for infrastructure development on the two road projects; rehabilitation of Naboia Road and Cathedral Road, and UGX 208,327,980 on complimentary services. All the USMID grant for 2022/2023 was utilized on eligible expenditures. | 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 | The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the USMID project was as follows: Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineer's Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate) MBAL760/USMID/wrks/20-21/00001. Construction works for 0.3km Central Road, 0.43Km of Manafwa and Market Place Roads, 0.4Km North Road, 0.47Km Nkokonjeru terrace, 2.12Km Bishop Wasikhe and Palisa roads This project was budgeted at UGX 23,264,000,000/= actual contract price was UGX 25,582,058,361/= with a variation of UGX -2,318,058,361/= represented by - 9.96% In conclusion, The variation was within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual. | 2 |

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate.</p> <p>The City had two divisions Industrial and North Division.</p> <p>Industrial Division the HRM staff list had Wabonga Kasim as Ag. Town Clerk, Mwanja Baker a Senior Community Development Officer and Wamembo Joseph as the Principal Treasurer and the staff list and attendance book at the LLG displayed the same information.</p> <p>Northern Division the HRM staff list had Olawo Emmanuel as the Town Clerk. Kibonge Babra as the Senior Community Development Officer and Malom Micheal as the Principal Treasurer and LLG staff list and attendance book had the same information</p> | 2 |
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that infrastructure constructed under USMID was in place as per the reports produced by the LG. The two USMID infrastructure investments namely Naboa and Cathedral roads were reflected on page 53 of 4th Quarter Budget Performance Report for the Financial Year 2022/2023</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>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p> | <p>The 2 divisions in Mbale City had assessment results as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Industrial Division scored 98% based on the assessment conducted by Mbale City and 74% based on IVA. The deviation between the two was 24%. 2. And Northern Division scored 100% based on the assessment conducted by Mbale City and 87% based on IVA. The deviation was 13%. <p>All the Divisions had their deviations outside the allowed +/-10% hence not credible.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results. Score: 2 or else score 0 | There was no evidence that the City had developed a performance improvement plan for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for Financial Year 2022/2023. | 0 |
| 5 | N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0 | There was no evidence that the City had implemented the PIP for the 30% lowest performing LLGs in the Financial Year 2022/2023. | 0 |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 6 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0 | There was no evidence that the City had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for financial year 2023/2024 to the MoPs | 0 |
| 7 | Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0 | There was no evidence that the City had conducted a tracking analysis of staff attendance. | 0 |
| 7 | Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure | i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0 | There was no evidence to show that the Heads of Departments had been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS in the Financial Year 2022/2023. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|----------|
| 7 | <p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The City administrative rewards and sanction committee was duly established and functional and had considered cases as follows;</p> <p>Jerry Otieno Kitsewa Education Assistant II (Namanyonyi P/S) had been sanctioned under Minute No. 5 /RASC 8 /2023 to be cautioned against acts of administrative corporal punishments. There were photos of the pupils that had sustained injuries from the beatings and medical reports for treatment for some that had gone to hospital. Mr Kitsewa requested to be pardoned and promised never to do it again.</p> <p>The committee recommended Jerry Otieno to be subjected to a medical examination by a government medical doctor to rule out any mental disorders.</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>There was no evidence to show that the City had established a consultative Committee for staff grievances.</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 District did not recruit anyone in the financial year 2022/2023 because the government had put a ban on recruitments.</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.

Not all people who retired in the financial year 2022/2023 accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retiring.

Those who retired and did not access pension on time were;

1. Jackson Robert Wangwe head teacher retired on 18th May, 2023 and accessed pension payroll in October, 2023.
2. Junike Katami Nursing Assistant retired on 14th May, 2023 and accessed pension payroll in October, 2023.
3. Sawiya Logose Education Assistant retired on 29th September, 2022 and accessed pension payroll in December 2023.
4. Oliver Nejesa Education Assistant retired on 27th May, 2023 and accessed pension payroll in October, 2023.
5. Grace Sanyu Deputy Head teacher retired on 25th December, 2022 and accessed pension payroll in October, 2023.
6. Lorna Meme Kataike Office attendant retired on 29th September, 2022 and accessed in October 2023.

Those who accessed in time were;

1. Nuria Nagudi Education Assistant retired on 3rd October, 2023 and accessed in October 2023 extra.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10

N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery

Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 2 or else score 0

The City LG made direct Transfers to the City Divisions in 2022/2023 accordance with the requirement of the budget as follows:

1. Quarter Two, A total of UGX 174,332,242 was transferred on 12th September 2022 against a budget of UGX 174,332,242.
2. Quarter Three, A total of UGX 348,664,484 was transferred on 12th April 2023 against a budget of UGX 348,664,484.

2

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 10 | N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure | 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). Score: 2 or else score 0 | For quarter two, cash limit date was 6th October 2022, amount was 174,332,242, and warranting date was 10th October 2022. This was done within two working days. For quarter three, cash limit date was 4th January 2023, amount was UGX 348,664,484, and warranting date was 5th January 2023. This was done in one working day. All dates of warranting for DDEG releases was done within 5 working days. | 2 |
| 10 | N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure | 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: Score 2 or else score 0 | The LG had invoiced and communicated quarter 2 on 13th October 2022 and North Division received the communications on 31st October, 2022, Industrial Division on 27th October, 2022. Quarter 3 was communicated on 12th January, 2023 North Division received the communications on 23rd January,2023, Industrial Division on 19th Jan,2023. All the DDEG transfers for the Financial Year 2022/2023 were communicated after 5 working days. | 0 |
| 11 | Routine oversight and monitoring Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0 | There was evidence that the City had Supervised/mentored the City Divisions on a quarterly basis in 2022/2023. In place were reports which were dated as follows; 13th October 2022 for quarter 1, 10th January 2023 for quarter 2, 28th April 2023 for quarter 3 and 18th August 2023 for quarter 4. | 2 |
| 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 | The City Technical Planning Committee discussed the quarter 1 supervision and monitoring report on 4th November 2022, quarter 2 report on 19th February 2023, quarter 3 report on 1st May 2023 and quarter 4 report on 28th September 2023. | 2 |

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p> | <p>The City maintained an Assets Register covering details on Buildings, Land, Motor Vehicles and General Assets as per Accounting manual page 167-169;</p> <p>It was updated with assets acquired in 2022/2023 Financial Year which included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A laptop computer for the Finance Department acquired at UGX 2,657,469. 2. A laser jet printed acquired for the Finance Department at UGX 5,000,000. 3. And Mazda double cabin pick up acquired at UGX 173,004,465 among others | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>The Board of Survey Report undated for FY 2021/2022 was in place, dated 30th August 2022. Among the recommendation in it on assets were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All city furniture to be engraved for easy tracing. 2. Furniture and equipment in the former Town Clerk's Residence to be boarded off 3. And the City Engineer to avail his laptop among others. <p>No evidence was provided to show that any of the above recommendations had been implemented.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p> | <p>The Physical Planning Committee submitted minutes of meetings as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minutes of PPC meeting held on 15th July 2022 were submitted to MLHUD on 8th June 2023. 2. Minutes of PPC meeting held on 11th November 2023 were submitted on 8th June 2023 3. Minutes of PPC meeting held on 12th January 2023 were submitted on 8th June 2023. 4. And minutes of PPC meeting held on 31st May 2023 were submitted on 8th June 2023. | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>No evidence was provided to show that desk appraisal of USMID projects had been conducted.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>No evidence was provided to show that field appraisal of USMID projects had been conducted.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>The TPC discussed the project profiles for the FY 2022/2023 on 22nd October 2022 under Min. 06/10/22.</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 were no planned projects under USMID for the current FY 2023/2024 as observed from the approved procurement plans for Mbale City.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan Score 1 or else score 0 | The city had no USMID infrastructure projects incorporated in the approved procurement plan. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure | b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0 | No Contracts Committee sat since the city had no funds for USMID for infrastructure projects in the FY 2023/24. | 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 | The City of Mbale had a project implementation team established as per CAO letter of appointment of team members dated 24th Mar 2021 though it was not properly constituted according to the guidelines in the Manual. The team members included; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gimui Johnson (superintendent of works) • Naumbe Agatha (DCDO) • Nyaribi Rhoda (SEO) | 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 | There was evidence to show that the infrastructure project implemented using USMID followed the standard technical design; From the road reviews; Construction works for 0.3km Central Road, 0.43Km of Manafwa and Market Place Roads, 0.4Km North Road, 0.47Km Nkokonjeru terrace, 2.12Km Bishop Wasikhe and Palisa roads The sidewalk width was 2m as per the consultant's design. The centreline and the side solid lines were properly marked, the roads had Zebra crossings and Parking areas as per the designs. | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>From the reviewed site supervision reports sampled below provided evidence of joint technical supervision of USMID road infrastructure project;</p> <p>Site Inspection and supervision meeting minutes on the Construction works for 0.3km Central Road, 0.43Km of Manafwa and Market Place Roads, 0.4Km North Road, 0.47Km Nkokonjeru terrace, 2.12Km Bishop Wasikhe and Palisa roads dated 27th July 2023, 30th June 2023, 02nd June 2023, 12th May 2023, 29th April 2023, 1st March 2023, 31st Jan 2023 etc. were found in the project management files.</p> <p>All the relevant technical personnel; The CDO, Engineer and Environmental officer in attendance.</p> | 2 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The LG had evidence of Certified works and payments initiated within timeframes.</p> <p>Construction works for 0.3km Central Road, 0.43Km of Manafwa and Market Place Roads, 0.4Km North Road, 0.47Km Nkokonjeru terrace, 2.12Km Bishop Wasikhe and Palisa roads.</p> <p>Dott Services was the Contractor; payment request made by the contractor on 13th Oct 2022 and approved and certified by the DE on 13th Oct 2022 and subsequent payment of 1,761,554,162 was initiated and timely paid on 19th Oct 2022 under Voucher No. 1576979</p> <p>Another payment request made by the contractor on 30th March 2023, approved and certified by the DE on 04th April 2023 and subsequent payment of 1,773,697,920/= was initiated and timely paid on 18th April 2023 under Voucher No. 4768573.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was evidence to show that the LG had a complete procurement file with all records as per PPDA.</p> <p>MBAL760/USMID/wrks/20-21/00001. Construction works for 0.3km Central Road, 0.43Km of Manafwa and Market Place Roads, 0.4Km North Road, 0.47Km Nkokonjeru terrace, 2.12Km Bishop Wasikhe and Pallisa roads, Dott Services Ltd was the contractor, approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 23rd Dec 2020 Under minute number MIN: MC/CC/24/2020-21 and Contract signing was done on 28th Jan 2021.</p> | 1 |

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

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 of Appointment letter for the Grievance Focal Person Ms. Namono Beatrice (Examiner of Accounts) from the Town Clerk Mr. Batanda Paul dated 8/01/2018 with tasks highlighted in the appointment letter.

There was evidence of a circular appointing Grievance Redress Committee members.

-Mr. Kutosi James (Public Relations Officer) Chairperson

-Ms. Namono Beatrice (Examiner of Accounts) Secretary

-Ms. Walwema Eve (HRO)

-Ms. Naumbe Angella (CDO)

-Mr. Nasimiyu Linus (Education Officer)

The above were appointed by Town clerk Mr. Batanda Paul on 8/01/2018

-Mr. Gimui Johnson W. (Superintendent of Works)

-Nyaribi Rhoda (City Environment Officer)

-Mr. Mungoyi Moses (CHO)

-Mr. Wetaka David (Chairperson CDF)

The above 4 members were appointed by Ag. Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen on 3/10/2022

There was evidence of Grievance Redress Committee meeting minutes for meetings held on 7/7/2023 at Mayor's Parlour, 5/04/2023 held at Mayor's Parlour, 13/01/2023 held at Mayor's Palour and 11/10/2022 held at City Chambers.

2

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

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.

If so: Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence of the centralised grievance log availed during the Assessment.

There was no evidence of the Complaints Referral Display system in place by assessment time.

0

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 14 | Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure | c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0 | There was no Grievance Redress Mechanism Displayed on the City Public notice boards. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0 | Information was not provided at the time of assessment | 0 |
| 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 | Information was not provided at the time of assessment | 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 | There was Evidence of the Screening report, Terms of reference, ESIA and costed ESMPs for the USIMD Road project. The Environmental and Social issues in the developed costed ESMP were incorporated in the BoQs/contract documents. ESMP for the Pallisa and Bishop Wasike road costed at UGX. 102,000,000/= ESMP for North Road costed at UGX. 92,000,000/= ESMP for Central road costed at UGX. 57,000,000/= ESMP for Manafwa and market place road costed at UGX. 95,000,000/= ESMP for Nkokonjeru Terrace costed at UGX. 94,000,000/= | 3 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0 | There was no costing of additional impact from Climate change in the USMID road project (5 roads) Bill of Quantities/ contract documents | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0 | There was evidence of filed land consent forms obtained before the USMID roads construction. some of the land consent forms were; - Land consent letter to the road reserve and right of way along Manafwa road (Igoye Sylvia 0787546522) - Land consent letter to the road reserve and right of way along Manafwa South central road (Musenze William 0772302795) | 1 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0 | There was no evidence of any supervision monitoring report availed for the USMID roads construction. The City Environment officer claimed that the monitoring reports file was not at the City Headquarters That the Auditor had taken it. However, it was not availed until the end of the Assessment. | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure | g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0 | There was no evidence of any Environmental and Social certificate availed for the construction of USMID road project.. | 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>The City carried out reconciliations of the following bank accounts up to 30th September 2023.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General fund account 0800169475 at Housing Finance Bank - Mbale Branch 2. Revenue collection account 0168000001 at Bank of Uganda <p>It also reconciled the UWEP Recovery account no 0800169485, Housing Finance Bank - Mbale Branch, up to 30th June 2023.</p> <p>Note that at the time of assessment (16-17th November 2023), reconciliation was supposed to have been done up to October 2023 but the City had only reconciled up-to 30th June 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>The LG produced Internal Audit Reports for all the four quarters of 2022/2023 and these were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter 1 internal audit report was dated 31st October 2022 2. Quarter 2 report dated 30th January 2023 3. Quarter 3 report dated 30th April 2023 4. And quarter 4 report dated 27th July 2023 | 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>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>No evidence was provided to show that the City Town Clerk had provided information to the City PAC on the status of implementation of the quarterly Internal Audit Findings</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>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>The Internal Audit Reports were submitted to the City PAC and the City Town Clerk on 31st October 2022 for the 1st quarter report, 30th January 2023 for the 2nd quarter report, 30th April for the 3rd quarter report and 27th July 2023 for the 4th quarter report.</p> <p>However, no evidence was provided to show that the City PAC had reviewed any of the four quarterly Internal Audit reports for 2022/2023.</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>Local revenue collection FY 2022/23 was UGX 1,888,454,735 as the Draft Financial Accounts for 2022/2023 (no page number)</p> <p>Budgeted local revenue was UGX 4,984,891,000 as per the City Budget for 2022/2023 (page 1)</p> <p>Budget realisation was $(1,888,454,735/4,984,891,000)*100 = 37.9\%$</p> <p>This resulted in a deficit of 62.1%, which was not within +/-10% ceiling.</p> | 0 |
| 19 | <p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. | <p>The Local Revenue collected in 2022/2023 was UGX 1,888,454,735 as per the Draft Final Accounts for 2022/2023.</p> <p>The details of local revenue collected for 2021/2022 were not availed, at the time of assessment, to determine if there was an increment between the two financial years.</p> | 0 |
| 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>Mbale City shared UGX 645,911,512 with Industrial Division against a revenue of UGX 1,055,797,106, amounting to 61.2%</p> <p>It also shared UGX 327,420,414 with Northern Division against a revenue of UGX 524,100,464, amounting to 62.5%.</p> <p>This was in line with the law which required that at least 50% of the sharable revenue be shared with the Divisions.</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>The procurement Unit awarded contracts and amounts for FY 2021/2022 were available, endorsed by CAO and Senior Procurement Officer, published on the procurement Notice Board at the District Headquarters. Sampled contracts included;</p> <p>Construction of a Maternity ward at Busamaga HCIII- was awarded to African Construction Technicians and Constructors Ltd as the contractor at a contract price of 256,160,350/= and BEB date was on 11th Oct 2022.</p> <p>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Lwasso Primary School was awarded to Bamwise Stationers and General Suppliers Ltd as the contractor at a contract price of 92,000,000/= and BEB date was on 11th Oct 2022.</p> <p>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Nanyunza Primary School was awarded to Nami Hardware Ltd as the contractor at a contract price of 84,839,876/= and BEB date was on 11th Oct 2022.</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>No evidence of display of USMID assessment results and their implications on the City notice boards nor on the website.</p> | 0 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The city conducted a Baraza/meeting on 20th April 2023 in the Mayor's Garden during which, the City briefed the public on the status of implementation of activities under Min. 6/Baraza/April/2023 during presentations from the Commercial Officer, Principal Finance Officer, and Education Officer among others.</p> | 1 |
| 21 | <p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that information of tax rates, collection procedures and appeal procedures had been publicized on the city notice boards nor website.</p> | 0 |

Reporting to IGG
Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

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

In a letter to the IGG with subject matters "REFUND OF PUBLIC FUNDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE IGG PUBLIC NOTICE MADE IN NEW VISION OF FRIDAY 31ST MARCH 2023" dated 21st June 2023, the City Town Clerk informed the IGG on the actions taken on the query raised by the IGG on misappropriation of public funds by a number of public officials. In the letter, the said officers were said that some of the officials had refunded the misappropriated funds whereas others that had not, had committed to have their salaries subjected to monthly deductions until the misappropriated funds were fully recovered.

**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>In 2020, 3,384 pupils sat PLE of whom 2,967 passed in Divisions 1, 2 and 3. This represented a pass rate of 88%.</p> <p>In 2022, 7,735 pupils sat PLE and 5,896 passed in Divisions 1, 2, 3 which represented a pass rate of 76%.</p> <p>There was a decline of 12 percentage points between 2020 and 2022 .</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>In 2020, 3,065 students sat UCE examinations of whom 1,333 passed in Divisions 1, 2 and 3. This represented a pass rate of 43%.</p> <p>In 2022, 2,046 students sat UCE examinations and 774 passed in Divisions 1, 2, 3. This represented a 38% pass rate.</p> <p>There was a decline of 5 percentage points, which was more than 5%</p> | 0 |
| 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>The average score for Education in LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 100% (10/10). There were however no assessment results for 2022 for comparison.</p> | 0 |

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

The education development
grant for 2022/2023 was
UGX422,362,439. This was
utilized as follows;

1. Construction of a two class
room block at Lwasso Primary
School at UGX 95,206,530
2. Construction of a classroom
block at Nanyunza Primary
School at UGX 104,310,993
3. Supply of 90 desks to
Nanyunza and Lwasso Primary
Schools at UGX 16,126,197
4. Monitoring of works at UGX
21,118,122
5. Appraisal of works at UGX
5,600,599
6. Procurement of a light
vehicle at UGX 180,000,000

According to the education
guidelines, the education grant
was supposed to be used on
education infrastructure
projects, supply of furniture
and complementary activities
in support of the above.

Mbale City, on its part,
procured a vehicle for the
department using the
development grant which was
not in line with the guidelines.
This was however done with
the permission from the
Permanent Secretary Ministry
of Education and Sports on
15th August 2022 following
request from the Town Clerk.

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

The City Environment Officer,
Principal Environment Officer,
and City Community
Development Officer all
certified education
construction projects before
payment as follows;

1. On the payment certificate
of UGX 84,839,875, for
construction of a classroom
block at Nanyunza P/S dated
8th February 2023. The CEO
signed on the 15th April 2023,
and the Principal Environment
Office and CDO both signed on
23rd April 2023.

2. On the payment certificate
of UGX 87,399,664 for
construction of a classroom
block at Lwasso P/S. The CEO,
Principal Environment Office
and City Community
Development Officer all signed
on the 26th April 2023.

The above officers signed on
the certificates before
payment had been made to
the Contractors.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 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 | The variations in the contract price and Engineer's estimates of the sampled projects were as follows: | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineer's Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate) | |
| | | | MBAL680/wrks/22-23/00003 Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Lwasso Primary School was budgeted at UGX 95,206,530/=, actual contract price was UGX 92,000,000/= with a variation of UGX 3,206,530/= represented by 3.4%, | |
| | | | MBAL680/wrks/22-23/00004 Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Nanyunza Primary School was budgeted at UGX 88,819,190/=, actual contract price was UGX 84,839,876/= with a variation of UGX 3,979,314/= represented by 4.48%. | |
| | | | In conclusion, | |
| | | | The variations were within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual. | |
| 3 | Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines | d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY | There was No seed school project. | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 | | |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards | a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines | There was evidence that the City had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines. | 2 |
| | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 | The City had a ceiling of 1275 teachers and filled was 1037, that is , $1037/1275 * 100 = 81.3\%$ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 | <p>The LG had 59 primary schools and 5 secondary schools for a total of 64 government schools. All those schools met the basic requirement and minimum standards as set in the DES guidelines according to the inspection report for term 3 2022, dated 4th October 2022. This amounted to 100%</p> | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>Namakwekwe Primary School had 28 teachers on their deployment list obtained from the Education Department. Of these, 13 were male and 15 were female. All were present in the school evidenced by the school attendance register.</p> <p>Namanyonyi Primary School had 21 teachers on their deployment list including 10 male teachers and 11 female teachers. On visiting the school, all were present evidence by their attendance register.</p> <p>Mbale Police Primary School had 33 teachers of whom 9 were male and 24 were female. All were present at the school based on the attendance register.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 | <p>The Education department had an asset register which reported on all the infrastructure in all the registered primary schools. In the sampled school;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Namakwekwe primary school, the asset register had 19 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, and 330 desks. 2. For Namanyonyi Primary School, the asset register had 13 classrooms, 15 latrine stances, 311 desks, and 1 teacher's house among others. 3. For Mbale Police Primary School, the asset register had 15 classrooms, 12 latrine stances, and 417 desks among others. <p>All these facilities were found present in the sampled schools during the field visits.</p> | 2 |
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a) The LG has ensured that all registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports (signed by the head teacher and chair of the SMC) to the DEO by January 30. Reports should include among others, i) highlights of school performance, ii) a reconciled cash flow statement, iii) an annual budget and expenditure report, and iv) an asset register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 - 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 | <p>All registered primary schools submitted their annual reports and budgets to the Education Department, complete with signatures of the Head teachers and SMC chair persons.</p> <p>However, the dates of submission of these reports and budgets were not recorded at the City Education Department, to determine whether these had been submitted 30th January 2023.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 | <p>No evidence was provided to show that the Education Department had supported UPE schools in preparation of SIPs, much as all of the sampled schools had prepared their respective SIPs.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | School compliance and performance improvement: Maximum 12 points on this performance measure | c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year: • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 - 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 | There was evidence that the City collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all the registered Primary Schools in the Financial Year 2023/2024. Collection and compiling was made for all the 59 primary schools and 5 secondary schools, representing 100% | 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 Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | 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: Score 4 or else, score: 0 | The LG had a wage budget of UGX 8,859,875,000 as per the Approved Budget Estimates for 2023/2024. This was to cater for 59 Head teachers and 1,048 Classroom teachers. | 4 |
|---|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 7 | Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, Score 3 else score: 0 | From the staffing list obtained from the Education Department, it was observed that teachers had been deployed as per the staffing guidelines which required that each school had a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers for schools going up to P7. From the sample schools; 1. Namakwekwe Primary School, which was up to P7, had a head teacher and 27 classroom teachers. 2. Mbale Police Primary School, also up to P7, had a head teacher and 32 classroom teachers. 3. And finally Namanyonyi Primary School, also going up to P7, had a head teacher and 20 classroom teachers. | 3 |
|---|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> | <p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p> | <p>In the sampled schools, which were Namanyonyi Primary School, Mbale Police Primary School and Namakwekwe Primary School had the staff lists displayed in the head teacher's offices.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> | <p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copt to DEO/MEO Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that primary school head teachers had been appraised in the financial year 2022/2023.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> | <p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that secondary school head teachers had been appraised in the financial year 2022/2023.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|----------|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the staff in the City Education department had been appraised in the financial year 2022/2023.</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 Education Department prepared a training plan for 2022/2023 address staff capacity gaps which included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Human Resource Management in schools, targeting all new head teachers. 2. Financial management towards the City Education Officer, Senior Education Officer, City Inspector of Schools and all Head teachers. 3. And Conflict resolution in schools targeting the City Education Officer, Senior Education Officer, City Inspector of Schools and all Head teachers among others. | 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>According to the City Education Officer, the list of schools, their enrolment and budget allocation were submitted by the City Town Clerk via electronic means. The details of when the submissions were made were not availed as the City Town Clerk was away on Official Duties at the time of assessment.</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>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines. If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>According to the Approved budget estimates FY 2022/2023, the Education department received UGX 40,300,000 as an inspection grant. Of this UGX 9,000,000 was allocated to the CEO's office and UGX 20,000,000 to the inspectorate and Sports activities 11,000,000.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | <p>This was in line with the sector guidelines, which call for a minimum allocation of UGX 4 million per LG, plus UGX 336,000 (6 inspections at UGX 56,000) per school for the 3 terms.</p> | |
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p> | <p>For quarter 1, cash limit date was 15th July 2022, amount was UGX 169,616,880, warrant date was 2nd August 2022. This was within 12 working days.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | <p>For quarter 2, cash limit date was 6th October 2022, amount was UGX 169,616,880, warrant date was 10th October 2022. This was within 2 working days.</p> | |
| | | | <p>For quarter 3, cash limit date was 4th January 2023, amount was UGX 359,233,759, warrant date was 5th January 2023. This was within 1 working day.</p> | |
| | | | <p>For quarter 4, cash limit date was 7th April 2023, amount was UGX 339,233,759, warrant date was 18th April 2023. This was within 7 working days.</p> | |
| | | | <p>Not all warrants were prepared within the required five working days</p> | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 9 | <p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> | <p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p> | <p>According to the City Education Officer, communication of UPE grants for 2022/2023 was done via the WhatsApp messaging platform and during head teachers meetings. However, the details of when these communications were not availed for assessment.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | | <p>The City Education Officer also displayed the details of the termly released on the City notice boards, which too were not dated.</p> | |
| | | | <p>It was therefore not possible to determine whether the dates of communication/publication were within the required timelines, that is, within 3 working days from the time of release.</p> | |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 | <p>The inspection plans were not provided for assessment. Also the details of when the department sat to plan for school inspections were not provided for assessment.</p> | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 | <p>According to the inspection report for term 1 and that of term 2 of 2023 dated 6th June 2022, all the 59 schools were inspected and monitored representing 100%.</p> <p>However, the inspection plan for term 3 of 2022 was not availed to determine the percentage of schools monitored and inspected.</p> | 0 |
| 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>The inspection reports were discussed at the departmental level on 1st March 2023 for term 1 2023 under Min. 2/2/3/2023, and on 14th May 2023 for term 2 2023 under Min. 04/Educ/1/5/2023.</p> <p>No evidence was provided to show that the inspection findings for term 3 of 2022</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0 | No evidence was provided to show that the inspection reports had been submitted to DES. | 0 |
| 10 | Routine oversight and monitoring <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0 | The committee responsible for Education sat on 23rd January 2023 and under Min. GPC.14/23/01/2023, it discussed issues relating to education service delivery as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Pupils in the annexed Schools by the City were not in a position to pay Urban Fees 2. There was a need to lobby for a Seed Secondary School in Industrial City Division 3. P1,P2,P3,and P4 at Umar and Yumbe Primary Schools , the Classrooms had been curved off by Land grabbers | 2 |
| 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> | The Senior Education Officer held a radio talk show on Radio Maria Mbale as was reported on 15th August 2023. The topic of discussion included sensitizing parents on their role towards helping their children to succeed in education. | 2 |

Investment Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|----------|
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>The Education department had an updated asset register which reported on all the infrastructure in all the registered primary schools. In the sampled school;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Namakwekwe primary school, the asset register had 19 classrooms, 10 latrine stances, and 330 desks. 2. For Namanyonyi Primary School, the asset register had 13 classrooms, 15 latrine stances, 311 desks, and 1 teacher's house among others. 3. For Mbale Police Primary School, the asset register had 15 classrooms, 12 latrine stances, and 417 desks among others. <p>All these facilities were found present in the sampled schools during the field visits.</p> | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p> | <p>No evidence was provided to show that desk appraisal of Education Department projects had been conducted.</p> | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, <i>score 1 else score: 0</i></p> | <p>No evidence was provided to show that field appraisal of Education Department projects had been conducted</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, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p> | <p>N/A</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | No Education infrastructure project required clearance from the Solicitor general because all were below 200m. | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i> | There was no project implementation team which was appointed for school construction projects. They had just appointed Wanasolo Anthony the Senior Engineering assistant officer as the Contract supervisor. | 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> | N/A | 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> | N/A | 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 evidence of Reports on the planned sector infrastructure projects in the FY 2022/2023 by the joint technical teams involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs. Report and site meeting Minutes on the Construction of a 2-classroom block at Lwasso Primary School dated 12th Dec 2022, 27th Jan 2023 etc. Reports and minutes of meetings dated 23rd Dec 2022, 28th Feb 2023, 28th Mar 2023 and 26th April 2023 on the Construction of a 2-classroom block at Nanyunza Primary School. | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, score: 1, else score: 0 | Payment vouchers for projects in the education department were not availed for assessment as these had been taken by the Office of the Auditor General for Audit. | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, score: 1, else, score: 0 | The LG Education department submitted its procurement plan on 25th April 2022 in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the Procurement Unit | 1 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i> | i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0 | N/A | 1 |

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework. <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i> | Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0 | There was a grievance log in place There was no grievance reported from implementation of Education projects for the previous FY 2022/2023 | 3 |
| 15 | Safeguards for service delivery. <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i> | 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 <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i> | At the Education Department was a circular, to all Head Teachers, on guidelines on environment and climate change management dated 15th September 2022. However in the sampled schools, there was no evidence that these guidelines had been reached. | 0 |
| 16 | Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i> | a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, score: 2, else score: 0 | There was evidence that the costed ESMPs for Education projects were incorporated in their respective BOQs | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i></p> | <p>There was no evidence of any land ownership documents for Lwaso Primary School and Nanyunza 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>c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence that the City Environment Officer and CDO conducted monthly supervision and monitoring of Education projects implemented in previous FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Monitoring reports for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Nanyunza Primary School dated 26/04/2023, 28/02/2023 and 28/03/2023</p> <p>Monitoring reports for the construction of a 2 class room block at Lwaso Primary School dated 11/01/2023 and 14/02/2023.</p> | 2 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>d) If the E&S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p> | <p>There was evidence of Environment and Social compliance certificates for the Education projects completed and signed by the City Environment Officer and CDO.</p> <p>Environmental and Social compliance certificate for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Nanyunza Primary School dated 24/04/2023.</p> <p>Environmental and Social compliance certificate for the construction of a 2 class room block at Lwaso Primary School dated 14/02/2023.</p> | 1 |

**Health
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--|--------------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 | <p>The City did not register a higher population accessing health care services.</p> <p>The sampled health facilities had the following deliveries;</p> <p>FY 2021-2022</p> <p>Namatala HCIV - 2235</p> <p>Namakwekwe HCIII 343</p> <p>Maluku HCIII 777</p> <p>TOTAL 3355</p> <p>FY 2022-2023</p> <p>Namatala HCIV - 1982</p> <p>Namakwekwe HCIII 407</p> <p>Maluku HCIII - 539</p> <p>TOTAL 2928</p> <p>%age change = (2928 - 3355)/2928 *100%</p> <p>= - 15%</p> | 0 |
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 | <p>The average score for Health in LLG performance assessment for 2023 was 100% (10/10). There were however no assessment results for 2022 for comparison.</p> | 0 |
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 | <p>There was a change in MOH framework to mainstream RBF into PHC so this indicator is not applicable for this year's assessment</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. | The City budgeted for UGX 257,000,000 as its health development grant. All of it was spent on construction of the maternity ward and toilet at Busamaga Health Centre III. | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | All the grant was utilized on eligible expenditures. | |
| 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 | On certificate no. 2 dated 14th April 2023, of UGX 26,754,951 for construction of maternity ward and 2 stance latrine at Bufumbo Health Centre IV , the City Health Officer, the Environmental Officer and CDO all signed on 14th April 2023, and payment was made on 22nd June 2023 on voucher number 5971066 | 2 |
| | Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | | On certificate no. 1 dated 31st March 2023, of UGX 97,259,740 for construction of maternity ward and 2 stance waterborne toilet at Busamaga Health Centre III , the City Health Officer, the Environmental Officer and CDO all signed on 14th April 2023, and payment was made on 27th June 2023 on voucher no. 5133229 | |
| | | | On certificate no. 2 dated 7th June 2023, of UGX 91,920,654 for construction of maternity ward and 2 stance waterborne toilet at Busamaga Health Centre III , the City Health Officer, the Environmental Officer and CDO all signed on 13th June 2023, and payment was made on 27th June 2023 on voucher no. 6411665. | |
| | | | The City Health Officer, Environmental Office and CDO all signed before payment of the contractors. | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| 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 | The variation in the contract price and Engineer's estimate was; Variation = 100% ((Contract Price - Engineer's Estimate)/Engineer's Estimate)) MBAL680/wrks/22-23/00001. Construction of a maternity ward at Busamaga HCIII was Budgeted at 269,495,126/= actual contract price was UGX 257,160,350/= with a variation of 12,334,776/= represented by 4.5 % In conclusion, The variation was within the range of +/- 20% provided in the manual. | 2 |
| 3 | Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines. | d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 | There was no new HCIII or HCII that was upgraded to HCIII | 2 |
| 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 • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 | The City had recruited staff for all HCIII's and HCIV as per staffing structure. HCII's had a ceiling of 418 and filled were 244, HC IV had 154 and filled were 95, that is, $418 + 154 = 572, 244+95 =339$ $339/572*100= 59.6 \%$ | 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. • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 | There was no new HCIII or HCII that was upgraded to HCIII | 2 |
| Maximum 8 points on this performance measure | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | | |

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>As per health staff lists obtained from CHOs office, the information was accurate for the sampled health facilities as detailed below.</p> <p>Maluku HCIII had 22 staff on the CHO's deployment; this was similar to the facility list.</p> <p>Namakwekwe HC III had 23 staff on the deployment list and at the facility it also had the same number of staff displayed.</p> <p>Namatala HCIV had 43 staff on the deployment list and the same staff were found on the facility list which was pinned on the notice board.</p> | 2 |
| 5 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no facility upgraded or constructed in the FY22/23.</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>The health facilities submitted Annual work plans of FY 2023/24 to the DHO timely as stated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Namatala HCIV submitted on 28/3/2023 • Namakwekwe HCIII submitted on 28/3/2023 • Maluku HCIII submitted on 28/3/2023 | 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 Performance Improvement support.</p> | <p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> | <p>This evidence was not provided</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 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>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> | <p>This evidence was not provided</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 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>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> | <p>Health facilities submitted monthly HMIS 105 and quarterly 106 reports timely within 7 days as follows;</p> <p>105 Monthly Reports</p> <p>July 2022</p> <p>Namatala HC IV - 5/8/2022</p> <p>Namakwekwe HCIII - 7/8/2022</p> <p>Maluku HCII - 4/8/2022</p> <p>August 2022</p> <p>Namatala HCIV - 5/9/2022</p> <p>Namakwekwe HCIII - 6/9/2022</p> <p>Maluku HCII - 4/9/2022</p> <p>September 2022</p> <p>Namatala HCIV - 5/10/2022</p> <p>Namakwekwe HCIII - 4/10/2022</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 | | |

Maluku HCII - 4/10/2022
October 2022
Namatala HCIV - 5/11/2022
Namakwekwe HCIII - 4/11/2022
Maluku HCII - 3/11/2022
November 2022
Namatala HCIV - 5/12/2022
Namakwekwe HCIII - 6/12/2022
Maluku HCII - 4/12/2022
December 2022
Namatala HCIV - 5/1/2023
Namakwekwe HCIII - 6/1/2023
Maluku HCII - 4/1/2023
January 2023
Namatala HCIV - 3/2/2023
Namakwekwe HCIII - 7/2/2023
Maluku HCII - 6/2/2023
February 2023
Namatala HCIV - 3/3/2023
Namakwekwe HCIII - 7/3/2023
Maluku HCII - 3/3/2023
March 2023
Namatala HCIV - 3/4/2023
Namakwekwe HCIII - 6/4/2023
Maluku HCII - 4/4/2023
April 2023
Namatala HCIV - 3/5/2023
Namakwekwe HCIII - 5/5/2023
Maluku HCII - 4/5/2023
May 2023
Namatala HCIV - 3/6/2023
Namakwekwe HCIII - 4/6/2023
Maluku HCII - 5/6/2023
June 2023
Namatala HCIV - 3/8/2023
Namakwekwe HCIII - 4/7/2023
Maluku HCII - 3/7/2023

106 Quarterly Reports
 July-Sept 2022
 Namatala HCIV - 5/10/2022
 Namakwekwe HCIII - 4/10/2022
 Maluku HCII - 4/10/2022
 Oct-Dec 2022
 Namatala HCIV - 5/1/2023
 Namakwekwe HCIII - 6/1/2023
 Maluku HCII - 4/1/2023
 Jan-March 2023
 Namatala HCIV - 3/4/2023
 Namakwekwe HCIII - 6/4/2023
 Maluku HCII - 4/4/2023
 April- June 2023
 Namatala HCIV - 3/8/2023
 Namakwekwe HCIII - 4/7/2023
 Maluku HCII - 3/7/2023

6

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

There was a change in MOH framework to mainstream RBF into PHC so this indicator is not applicable for this year's assessment

0

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was a change in MOH framework to mainstream RBF into PHC so this indicator is not applicable for this year's assessment</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>The City submitted health budget performance reports as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter one report was submitted on 15th May 2023 2. Quarter two report on 24th May 2023 3. Quarter three report on 17th May 2023 4. And quarter four report on 23rd August 2023 <p>The submissions were not made timely as was required.</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0 | <p>This evidence was not provided</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>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>This evidence was not provided</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>The city budgeted 6,271,575,000/= in FY 2023/24 for 273 staff as detailed in the annual budget on page 23 of the PBS annual budget for FY 2023/24</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|--|----------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 7 | <p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>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>According to the deployment staff lists, the staffing level was at 94%. 346 staff positions were filled out of the required 368.</p> | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|----------|

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

Health workers were working where they were deployed as detailed below for the 3 sampled health facilities

Maluku HCIII had 22 staff on the DHO's deployment list and 17 staff could be found on the facility attendance register. 3 staff were on study leave and 2 staff were on sick leave.

Namakwekwe HCIII had 23 staff on the DHO's deployment list and 18 staff could be found on the facility attendance register. 2 staff were on study leave, 1 staff was on sick leave and 1 staff was on maternity leave.

Namatala HCIV had 43 staff on the DHO's deployment list and 35 staff could be found on the facility attendance register. 3 staff were on study leave, 2 staff were on sick leave, 3 staff were on annual leave.

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The Local Government Publicised health workers on the facility notice boards.

From the 3 sampled health facilities

Maluku HCIII had 22 staff on the CHO's deployment list and this was publicised at the facility notice board.

Namakwekwe HC III had 23 staff on the deployment list and at the facility it also had the same number of staff displayed.

Namatala HCIV had 43 staff on the deployment list and the same staff were found on the facility list which was pinned on the notice board.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 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>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>Health facility in charges had been appraised by the City Health Officer against the agreed performance plans in the financial year 2022/2023 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kusasire Loyce, a Senior Nursing Officer was appraised by Dr. Kadidi Merab on 18th July, 2023. 2. Mutoo Peter, a Senior Nursing Officer was appraised by Dr. Naizali Ketty, a Senior Medical Officer on 30th June, 2023. 3. Wanyama Geoffrey, a Medical Officer was appraised by Dr. Ketty Naizuli, a Senior Medical Officer on 30th June, 2023. 4. Kalyebi Albert, a Senior Clinical Officer was appraised by Dr. Wanero Peter a Senior Medical Officer on 29th June, 2023. 5. Watiti Khamiri Paul, a Clinical Officer was appraised by Nekesa Bridget a Medical Officer. 6. Mutoo Peter, a Senior Clinical Officer was appraised by Dr. Naizuli Ketty on 30th June, 2023 | 1 |
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. 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>There was no evidence to show that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all workers against the agreed performance plan.</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>According to the appraisals no corrective actions were taken based on the appraisal report</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>The LG conducted training as per the district training plan for FY 2022/23 dated 21/7/2022.</p> <p>A report for health worker training on 19/12/22 on EMOC and GBV conducted in accordance with the training plan was in place.</p> | 1 |
|---|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 8 | <p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was a digital MS Access training database in place and a training on EMOC by ACCORD was detailed done in November 2022</p> | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was a letter detailing health facilities receiving Non-wage PHC grant signed by DHO and Town clerk however this was not dated and did not show any evidence that it was received by MOH.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 9 | <p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>No evidence provided at the time of assessment.</p> | 0 |
|---|--|---|--|---|

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

For quarter 1, cash limit date was 15th July 2022, amount was UGX 72,157,166, warrant date was 2nd August 2022. This was within 12 working days.

For quarter 2, cash limit date was 6th October 2022, amount was UGX 130,943,752, warrant date was 10th October 2022. This was within 2 working days.

For quarter 3, cash limit date was 4th January 2023, amount was UGX 87,295,834, warrant date was 5th January 2023. This was within 1 working day.

For quarter 4, cash limit date was 7th April 2023, amount was UGX 87,295,834, warrant date was 18th April 2023. This was within 7 working days.

Warranting was not done within the required 5 working days

0

9

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

For quarter 1, UGX 72,157,166 was released on 12th September 2022 and communication to the health facilities was made on 12th September 2022. This was within 1 working day.

For quarter 2, UGX 130,943,752 was released on 13th October 2022, and communication was made on 13th October 2022. This was within 1 working day.

For quarter 3, UGX 87,295,834 was released on 12th January 2023 and communication was made on 12th January 2023.

For quarter 4, UGX 87,295,834 was released on 11th May 2023 and communication was made on 11th May 2023.

Communication was made within 5 working days from the date of release of funds.

2

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 9 | <p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG publicised quarterly releases of PHC on the notice boards.</p> <p>Q1 FY22/23 file copy had PHC release letter on 4/8/23 however cash limit dates were not provided by the CFO to establish timeliness</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG health department implemented recommendations from CHMT as detailed below;</p> <p>In a DHT meeting held on 7/4/2023 detailed an issue of no support supervision being done by the CHT to the HSD. The recommendation made was to have the CHT do the required support supervision and this was evidenced as having been done in the next meeting minutes held on 14/5/2023 under the section of review of previous action points.</p> | 2 |
| | <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> | <p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence provided</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> | <p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence provided</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>If not applicable, provide the score</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>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not applicable, provide the score | There was no evidence provided | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p> | There was no evidence provided | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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> | There was no evidence provided | 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> | No evidence provided at the time of assessment | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 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 | The CHT led health promotion and prevention activities and the detailed below report to the CHO by the CHE Zagudi Zowena detailed a sensitization drive for immunisation done between 24th-27th/10/2022. This report was received by the CHO on 28/10/22. | 1 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--------------------------------|----------|
| 11 | Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities | c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0 | There was no evidence provided | 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 | The LG had an updated Asset register at the CHO's office. Facilities sampled had the equipment needed as per the basic standards | 1 |
| | Maximum 4 points on this performance measure | | <p>Namakwekwe HCIII- Asset register dated 14/7/23 had a weighing scale, Drip stand and delivery bed.</p> <p>Namatala HC IV - Asset register dated 15/7/23 had a BP machine, microscope, Autoclave and weighing scale.</p> <p>Maluku HCIII - Asset register dated 30/6/23 had a weighing scale, BP machine and Delivery set.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|----------|
| 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>No evidence was provided to show that desk appraisal of Health Department projects had been conducted.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>score 1 or else score 0</p> | | |
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>No evidence was provided to show that desk appraisal of Health Department projects had been conducted.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |
| 12 | <p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of Environmental and Social screening report and costed ESMP for the Health project to be implemented in the current FY 2023/2024.</p> <p>Screening report for Environmental and Social risks/impacts for the construction of City Medical store at Busamaga HC III dated 9/02/2023 and costed ESMP at UGX. 300,000/= signed the City Environment Officer and CDO</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence that the LG Health department timely submitted all its infrastructure requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan,</p> <p>As per a copy of the health sector procurement plan for current FY prepared by the DHO, date of submission to PDU 30th Jan 2023 which was before 30th April as required by PPDA laws.</p> <p>Construction of City Medical Store.</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>The health department submitted their PP1 Forms to PDU by 1st Quarter of the Current year on 16th Aug 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>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 that the contracts committee sat on 10th Oct 2022 and approved the health infrastructure project named Construction of a Maternity ward at Busamaga HCIII under Minute Min:MC/CC/035/2022-23(a) and the project was cleared by the Solicitor General on 16th Nov 2022.</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>The city did not appoint a project implementation team as stipulated in the guidelines.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>There was no new HCIII or HCII that was upgraded to HCIII</p> | 1 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>The Construction of a Maternity ward at Busmaga HC III had no reports from the Clerk of works that were consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO.</p> | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p> | <p>There was no new HCIII or HCII that was upgraded to HCIII</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>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 evidence that showed that the city carried out technical supervision as evidenced in the site meeting minutes dated 10th Jan 2023, 10th Feb 2023, 4th April 2023, 30th May 2023 and a completion report where all supervised date 19th June 2023.</p> | 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines | 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>Payments were effected in the Health Department in the Financial Year 2022/2023 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher no. 6411665 of UGX 86,405,415 for construction of Busamaga Health Centre, the contractor requested for payment on 7th June 2023 and the City Health Officer verified payments on 13th June 2023. This was within 6 days. 2. Voucher no. 5133229 of UGX 91,612,156 for Maternity Ward and 2 stance latrine at Busamaga Health Centre III, the contractor requested for payment on 15th March 2023, and the City Health Officer verified works on 14th April 2023. This was within 30 days. 3. Voucher no. 5971066 of UGX 26,754,951 for Construction of Maternity Ward and 2 stance lined Pit Latrine at Bufumbo Health Centre IV, the contractor request for payment on 13th March 2023, and the City Health Officer verified payments on 14th April 2023. This was within 32 days. <p>Not all payments were within the time frame.</p> | 0 |
| | Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | | | |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines | 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>There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law. The project was;</p> <p>MBAL680/wrks/22-23/00001. Construction of a Maternity ward at Busmaga HCIII; African Construction technicians and Constructors Ltd was the contractor, approval of the Evaluation Report was done on 10th Oct 2022 Under minute number MIN: MC/CC/035/22-23(a) and Contract signing was done on 25th Nov 2022.</p> | 1 |
| | Maximum 10 points on this performance measure | | | |

Environment and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|----------|
| 14 | <p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was a grievance log in place. No complaint/ grievances were reported from implementation of the Maternity ward at Busamaga HC III.</p> | 2 |
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of guidelines availed by the ADHO Environment Health after a long denial that they had never received the guidelines.</p> <p>There was no evidence of dissemination of Guidelines on Medical waste management. When the DHO was asked for the evidence, he just printed a letter, listed all health facilities and then he signed at the bottom. More so, he was not also aware of the existence of the guidelines.</p> <p>There no evidence of any follow up on the implementation of the guidelines.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | <p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no budget specific or dedicated to medical waste management. The current FY 2023/2024 City Annual Budget was not availed with claims that it was still under development.</p> <p>There was no contracted registered waste handler by the time of assessment. Initially, Green Label Services Ltd was managing waste for the higher health facilities however, according to the DHO and the District Health Team, the City halted the services of Green Label Services Ltd One and half years ago with reasons that it was not effective, not sustainable and expensive.</p> <p>Only Namakwekwe HCIII had an incinerator by assessment time and other health facilities were practising waste burning in open pits.</p> <p>The DHO by word of mouth informed the assessment team that they were in plans of constructing incinerators at health facilities since Green Label Services Ltd was expensive and could even pick waste from all health facilities.</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 of a training report on waste management availed by the DHO's office.</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>The costed ESMP at UGX. 500,000/= signed by the City Environment Officer and CDO for the construction of Maternity ward at Busamaga HC III was incorporated in its BoQ.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p> | <p>There was proof of land ownership of Busamaga HCIII.</p> <p>The land title for 1.1320 hectares of land, Mbale Municipality, Mbale, Block (Road) Bufumbo road, Plot 36 at Bufumbo Cell dated 1/08/2018 was availed.</p> | 2 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p> | <p>There was evidence of monthly Supervision and Monitoring reports for the construction of the Maternity ward at Busamaga HCIII dated 30/03/2023, 27/04/2023, 30/05/2023 and 19/06/2023.</p> | 2 |
| 16 | <p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>There was evidence of the Environmental and Social compliance certificate for the construction of Maternity ward at Busamaga HCIII dated 11/04/2023 signed by Environment Officer and CDO</p> | 2 |

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|-------|
| Local Government Service Delivery Results | | | | |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | Not applicable to a City | 0 |
| 1 | <p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 | Not applicable to a City | 0 |
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 | Not applicable to a City | 0 |
| 2 | <p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p> | <p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2 o If 80-99%: Score 1 o If below 80 %: Score 0 | Not applicable to a City | 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>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If within +/-20% score 2 o If not score 0 | <p>Not applicable to a 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>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 | <p>Not applicable to a City</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. | <p>Not applicable to a City</p> | 0 |
| 3 | <p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | <p>Not applicable to a City</p> | 0 |
| Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement | | | | |
| 4 | <p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p> | <p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p> | <p>Not applicable to a City</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| 5 | Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i> | a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2 | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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> | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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>Not applicable to a 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>Not applicable to a 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>Not applicable to a 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>Not applicable to a 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>Not applicable to a 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. | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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 (LGDP III) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible: Score 4 or else score 0. | Not applicable to a City | 0 |
|----|---|---|--------------------------|---|

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

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

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

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

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--------------------------|---|
| 12 | Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i> | e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2 | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a 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 | Not applicable to a City | 0 |
| 14 | Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i> | Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0 | Not applicable to a City | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--------------------------|----------|
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0 | Not applicable to a City | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0 | Not applicable to a City | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0 | Not applicable to a City | 0 |
| 15 | Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i> | d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0 | Not applicable to a City | 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 | N/A | 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 | 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 | 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 | N/A | 0 |
| 4 | Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 | 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 | N/A | 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 | 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 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|----------|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|----------|
| 6 | Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans | ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

Human Resource Management and Development

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines | a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| | Maximum score 6 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|---|
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 7 | Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6 | c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4 | a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|---|
| 8 | Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4 | b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | 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 | c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0 | N/A | 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> | N/A | 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> | N/A | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p> | N/A | 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> | N/A | 0 |
| 10 | <p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p> | 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 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 0 |
| 12 | <p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p> | <p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p> | N/A | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 0 |
| 13 | <p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p> | <p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p> | N/A | 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 | N/A | 0 |
| 13 | Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18 | e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 | N/A | 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 City had substantively appointed Mr. Mabala Richard Micheal as the City Finance Officer on 9th December, 2022 as directed by the DSC Minute No.001/2002(e), signed by the CAO Ambrose Ocen Ag. City Town Clerk. | 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 | This position was vacant at the time of assessment. However the CLG had requested clearance to recruit and fill vacant posts on 18th Sept, 2023 through Letter reference CR/156/01, endorsed by Victor Bauleku. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0 | This position was vacant at the time of assessment. However the City had requested clearance to recruit and fill the vacant post on 18th Sept, 2023 through letter reference CR/156/01, endorsed by Victor Bau Leku. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0 | This position was vacant at the time of assessment. However the City had requested clearance to recruit and fill the vacant post on 18th Sept, 2023 through letter reference CR/156/01, endorsed by Victor Bau Leku. | 0 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0 | The City did not have a substantively appointed City Production Officer but Namubiru Halima a Principal Agriculture Officer was appointed in acting capacity as City Production Officer on 20th January, 2023 through letter reference CR/156/2, signed by the Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen. | 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 | Ms. Namwese Annet was substantively appointed as a City Community Development Officer on 9th December, 2022 as directed by the CSC Minute No. 001/ 2022(t), signed by Mr. Ambrose Ocen Ag. Town Clerk. | 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 City had substantively appointed Ms. Kharonu Lornah Milly as a City Commercial Officer on 9th December, 2022, as directed the CSC Minute No. 001/2022(r), signed by Mr. Ambrose Ocen. | 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. | Mr. Wodero Ali was substantively appointed a Senior Procurement Officer on 9th December,2022 (c) as directed by the CSC Minute No. 001/2022(c), signed by the Ag. Town Clerk Ambrose Ocen.. | 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 | According to the approved structure of Mbale City as per 26th July, 2022 instead of a Procurement Officer they had a Principal Procurement Officer. Mr. Stuma Fredricks was substantively appointed as a Principal Procurement Officer on 9th December, 2022 as directed the DSC Minute No. 001/2022 (c), signed by the Ag. Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen | 2 |
| 1 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37. | i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0 | The District did not have a substantively appointed Principal Human Resource Officer. However, Ms. Nandudu Annet, a Senior Assistant Secretary, was assigned duties of a Principal Human Resource Officer on 3rd August, 2023 through letter reference, CR. 161.1 signed by the Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen. | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>According to the approved structure of Mbale City as per 26th July, 2022, they have a Principal Environmental Officer.</p> <p>Ms. Nyaribi Rhoda was substantively appointed a Principal Environmental Officer on 9th December, 2022 as directed by the CSC Minute No. 001/2022 (I), signed by the Ag. Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>This position was vacant at the time of assessment, however the City had requested clearance to recruit and fill vacant posts in Mbale City on 18th September, 2023, through letter reference CR/156/01 endorsed by Victor Bau Leku.</p> | 0 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Mr. Nakhaima Robert was substantively appointed as a Senior Accountant on 17th March, 2008 as directed the CSC Minute No. 18(b) 2008, signed by Christopher Daniel Kawesi the Town Clerk.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Ms. Khwaka Agnes was substantively appointed as a Principal Internal Auditor on 9th December, 2022 as directed the CSC Minute No. 001/2022(e), signed by the Ag. Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen.</p> | 2 |
| 1 | <p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p> | <p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>Ms. Nabifo Sauda was substantively appointed as Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary CSC) on 30th June, 2022 as directed the DSC Minute No. 002/2022, signed by Kyasaku David Ag. Town Clerk.</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG | a. Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0 (Consider the customized structure). | The City had two Divisions and appointed only one substantive Town Clerk. 1. Waboga Kasim substantively a Principal Town Clerk appointed on 9th Dec, 2022 under Minute No. 001/2022 was assigned duties of a Town Clerk but the letter assigning him duties was not availed. Only one personal file was availed for assessment | 0 |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG | b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0. | The city had substantively appointed Mr. Mwanja Baker as the Senior Community Development Officer on 9th December,2022 as directed the CSC Minute No.001/2022 (u), signed by Ambrose Ocen Ag. Town Clerk. 2.Ms. Kibone Babra was substantively appointed as a Senior Community Development Officer on 9th December, 2022 as directed the CSC Minute No. 001/2022 (u), signed by the Ag. Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen . | 5 |
| 2 | New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG | c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0. | The City had two Divisions and appointed in all substantive Principal Treasurer. 1. Mr. Malomo Micheal was substantively appointed a Principal Treasurer on 9th, December, 2022 as directed the CSC Minute No.001/2022 (f), signed by Ambrose Ocen Ag. Town Clerk. 2.Mr. Wamembo Joseph M was substantively appointed as a Principal Treasurer on 9th December 2022, as was directed by CSC Minute No. 001/2022 (e), signed by the Ag. Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen. | 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: | The City did not released 100% of allocated Funds to Natural Resources department as follows; | 0 |
| | Maximum score is 4 | a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0 | Budgeted was UGX 766,193,280, warranted amount was UGX 629,712,639 and Actual Released was UGX 424,045,770. Percentage released was $(424,045,770/629,712,639) * 100\% = 67\%$ | |
| 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 City released 100% of allocated Funds to Community Based Services department as follows; | 2 |
| | Maximum score is 4 | b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0. | Budgeted was UGX 678,148,889, warranted was UGX 579,676261, and actual released was UGX 579,676261. Percentage amount released was $(579,676261 /579,676261)*100\% = 100\%$ | |
| 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 of the screening report for the USIMID road project availed by the City Environment Officer (CEO) and Principal CDO. Project: Construction of Infrastructure Sub-Projects in Mbale City, Tororo and Busia Municipal Councils under USMID-AF Cluster 3, Batch-2 infrastructure Investment Programme. | 4 |
| | Maximum score is 12 | | Screening report for the construction of Infrastructure (roads) projects in Mbale City (Central road 0.300km, Manafwa and Market place 0.430km, North road 0.400km, Nkokonjeru Terrace 0.440km and; Pallisa road and Bishop Wasike road 2.12km) signed by the CEO and PCDO on 21/02/2022. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of the full Environmental and Social Impact Statement (ESIS) developed after conducting an Environmental and Social Impact Statement.</p> <p>There was evidence of Terms of Reference (ToRs) as seen in the ESIS. Terms of Reference Report is always developed before the ESIA report which acts as the Environment and Social Project Brief and Submitted to NEMA for review and Approval by the Authority.</p> <p>The ToRs were submitted to NEMA and approved on 29/07/2020 by Ms. Namara Harriet (Senior Environment Assessment Officer) on behalf of the Executive Director.</p> <p>Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) report for the proposed Re-construction of Priority roads in Male City/Municipality (Contract no. MLHUD/SRVCS/USMID-AF/18-19/00461/3) developed and submitted to NEMA for review and Approval. There was evidence of the NEMA Environment and Social Certificate of Approval (No. 15520) signed by the Executive Director Dr. Tom Okurut dated 25/08/2021 with stated project cost UGX. 23,837,070,277/= .</p> | 4 |
|---|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p> | <p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p> | <p>There was evidence of costed ESMPs for the various roads in the USMID infrastructure project signed by the City Environment Officer and the PCDO.</p> <p>ESMP for the Pallisa and Bishop Wasike road costed at UGX. 102,000,000/=</p> <p>ESMP for North Road costed at UGX. 92,000,000/=</p> <p>ESMP for Central road costed at UGX. 57,000,000/=</p> <p>ESMP for Manafwa and market place road costed at UGX. 95,000,000/=</p> <p>ESMP for Nkokonjeru Terrace costed at UGX. 94,000,000/=</p> | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Financial management and reporting

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------|
| 5 | <p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p> | <p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p> | <p>Mbale City had an unqualified audit opinion in the FY 2022/2023</p> | 10 |
| 6 | <p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p> | <p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p> | <p>The City LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the Status of implementation of Internal Auditor General's findings FY 2021/2022 on 11th February 2023 as per acknowledgement Stamp.</p> <p>The City LG had provided information to the PS/ST on the Status of implementation of Auditor General's findings FY 2021/2022 on 1st February 2023 as per acknowledgement Stamp</p> | 10 |
| 7 | <p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p> | <p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p> | <p>Mbale City submitted its Annual Performance Contract on 5th July 2023 via online channels. This was within the timeline of 31st August 2023.</p> | 4 |
| 8 | <p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p> | <p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p> | <p>Mbale City submitted its Annual Performance Report for 2022/2023 on 23rd August 2023 via online channels. This was within the timeline of 31st August 2023.</p> | 4 |

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.

Mbale City submitted its quarterly Budget Performance Reports as follows;

1. Quarter one report was submitted on 15th May 2023
2. Quarter two report on 24th May 2023
3. Quarter three report on 17th May 2023
4. And quarter four report on 23rd August 2023

All the four quarterly reports were submitted via online channels and were within the timeline of 31st August 2023.

**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 | There was no evidence that the City had recruited the City Education Officer. | 0 |
| <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 had substantively appointed Mr. Mugoya Mohamed as an Inspector of Schools on 9th December, 2022 as directed by CSC Minute No. 001/2022(i) , signed by Mr Ambrose Ocen the Ag. Town Clerk | 40 |
| <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 of Environmental and Social Screening report for the education projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023</p> <p>Screening report for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Nanyunza Primary School dated 23/02/2021 and Environment and Social Impact Report dated 3/4/2022 signed by the City Environment Officer and CDO was in place.</p> <p>Screening report for the construction of a 2 class room block at Lwaso Primary School dated 23/02/2021 and Environment and Social Impact report dated 3/4/2022 signed by the City Environment Officer and CDO was in place.</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.

There was evidence of costed ESMPs for the education projects implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023

ESMP for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Nanyunza Primary School dated 03/04/2022 costed at UGX. 500,000/= and signed by the City Environment Officer and CDO was in place.

ESMP for the construction of a 2 class room block at Lwaso Primary School dated 03/04/2022 costed at UGX. 500,000/= signed by the City Environment Officer and CDO was in place.

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 had substantively appointed Mugonyi Moses as the City Health Officer on 9th December, 2022 as directed by the CSC Minute No. 001/2022 (v), signed by the Ag. Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen. | 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. | According to the approved structure of Mbale City as per 20th April, 2022 it has a Senior Health Inspector. Mr. Madoi Ayub was substantively appointed a Senior Health Inspector on 9th December, 2022 as directed by the CSC Minute No. 001/2022(w), signed by the Ag.Town Clerk Mr. Ambrose Ocen. | 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 | This position was not provided for in the approved structure of Mbale City as per 20th April, 2023. | 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 only one Health infrastructural project implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>There was evidence of Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening report for the Construction of a maternity ward at Busamaga HCIII dated 3/4/2022 signed by the City Environment Officer and the CDO.</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>The construction of Maternity ward at Busamaga HCIII required preparation of an Environmental and Social Project Brief since it lies under projects listed under Part 1 of Schedule 4 of the National Environment Act No. 5 of 2019.</p> <p>However, the ESIA report was not prepared and submitted to NEMA for review and approval.</p> <p>Only the ESMP was prepared and costed at UGX. 500,000/= signed by the City Environment Officer and CDO.</p> | 0 |

**Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum
Conditions**

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

Water & Environment Minimum Conditions

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

2

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

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

Not applicable to a City

0