



## **LGMSD 2022/23**

Mitooma District

(Vote Code: 601)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	100%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	100%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	90%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	100%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	76%
Educational Performance Measures	71%
Health Performance Measures	70%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	71%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	67%

**Crosscutting  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s):</li> <li>If so: Score 4 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Mitooma DLG did have five (05) DDEG funded investments including two (02) infrastructural projects in its FY2022/2023 annual workplan and budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of district fence UGX30,000,000</li> <li>Payment of retention for main Admin block construction UGX41,099,000</li> </ul> <p>The two projects were site visited and the works carried out confirmed.</p> <p>Both projects – the construction of the district fence and the Admin block construction were in place and the stages completed were functional.</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"> <li>By more than 5%, score 3</li> <li>1 to 5% increase, score 2</li> <li>If no increase, score 0</li> </ul> <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>Overall, the performance of MDLG in its LLG assessment was 69% in FY2021/2022 and 69% in FY2022/2023, meaning was no increase, or 0% increase.</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"> <li>• If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3</li> <li>• If 80-99%: Score 2</li> <li>• If below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>Mitooma DLG implemented five (05) DDEG investment projects in FY2022/2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>🏗️ Construction of district fence UGX30,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Payment of retention for main Admin block construction UGX41,099,000</li> <li>🏗️ Capacity building for staff UGX10,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Procurement of 3 laptop computers UGX10,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ LLG assessment and DDEG projects monitoring UGX10,000,000</li> </ul> <p>Admin Building construction was ongoing at time of assessment. For the fence, there was a phase II practical completion certificate dated 26/06/2023. The payment for the four laptops and one desktop computer was availed and seen. The amount for capacity building was spent on orientation of both HLG and LLG staff and a completion report on this was availed.</p> <p>The LG's 4th quarter Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 shows that DDEG was spent 100% by the end of the year. The total amount budgeted (including disbursements to LLGs) was UGX270,582,000 and what was released as per the reports was UGX270,582,000 which made 100%.</p>	3
---	---	---	---	---

3	<p>Investment Performance</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Mitooma DLG implemented the following DDEG funded projects in FY2022/2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>🏗️ Construction of district fence UGX30,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Payment of retention for main Admin block construction UGX41,099,000</li> <li>🏗️ Capacity building for staff UGX10,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Procurement of 3 laptop computers UGX10,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ LLG assessment and DDEG projects monitoring UGX10,000,000</li> </ul> <p>The LG's 4th Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 shows that DDEG was spent 100% by the end of the year. The total amount budgeted was UGX101,099,000 and what was received as per the reports was UGX101,099,000 which made 100%.</p> <p>The projects were all eligible under DDEG guidelines (Table 7 – Positive List/Investment Menu, page 7 and 8).</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

Investment Performance  
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,

score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineer's estimates. The Annual Work Plan and Budget for the FY 2022/23 indicated a number of projects funded under the DDEG and of those, the implemented infrastructure projects had contract amounts according to contract documents as follows:

1. **Construction of a Fence at the District Headquarters-** MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00011. The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 29,452,092/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 29,429,294/=. The Variation was at 0.07%  $\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\}$ .
2. **Construction of a Main District Administration Block Phase 4-** MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00001. The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 459,230,713/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 456,547,949/=. The Variation was at 0.58%  $\{[(A - B)/A] * 100\}$ .

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of reported information  
Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate,

score 2 or else score 0

**The staffing was not in place** as per minimum standards and staff list - obtained from HRM Division (attendance registers, appraisal reports, TPC minutes)

In Mitooma District, there was inadequate staffing in place as per minimum standards and staff list at LLGs as per the three sampled LLGs of Katenga Sub County, Rurehe Sub County, and Mitooma Town Council.

At Katenga Sub County with staff strength of 09 out of a staff establishment ceiling of 19, the staff included:

1. Musiime Dianah, Senior Assistant Secretary
2. Atwine Caroline, Agricultural Officer
3. Ashaba Nathan, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer
4. Ariho Stephen, Senior Assistant Accountant
5. Nyangoma Patience, Community Development Officer
6. Mugyema Amosphone, Parish Chief
7. Kamugisha Bosco, Parish Chief
8. Ninsiima Ritah, Parish Chief
9. Tindyebwa Elasmus, Parish Chief

Some of the staff that were substantively deployed at Rurehe Sub County, with a staff strength of 10 against a staff establishment ceiling of 19, were:

1. Tayebwa Patrick, Senior Assistant Secretary
2. Kamusiime Gloria, Senior Accounts Assistant
3. Turyakira Yona, Community Development Officer
4. Muhebwa Bruce, Agricultural Officer
5. Mwebesa Robert, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer
6. Nayebare Dickens, Parish Chief

7. Tumwekwase Felix, Parish Chief
8. Tumwesigye Francis, Parish Chief
9. Tindyebwa Elasmus, Pariah Chief
10. Kweteisa Barnabas, Parish Chief

At Mitooma Town Council, with a staff strength of 17 out of a staff establishment of 52, some of the staff substantively deployed were:

1. Bucuurezi Priver, Principal Township Officer
2. Natukunda Olivia, Human Resource Officer
3. Mugabe Nelson, Senior Community Development Officer
4. Katushabe Praise, Senior Accounts Assistant
5. Atwijukire Judith, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer
6. Ainembabazi Cleophas, Office Attendant
7. Ekyarikunda Safra, Pool Stenographer
8. Kyarisiima Peace, Town Agent
9. Tmushabe Ludovika, Internal Auditor
10. Kiconco Emily, Economist
11. Tibayungwa Fred, Town Agent
12. Mucunguzi Alex, Town Agent
13. Agaba Aubry, Physical Planner
14. Byaruhanga David, Town Treasurer
15. Mugizi Peter, Agricultural Officer
16. Katusiime Hope, Town Agent
17. Tumubweine Eric, Town Agent

4

Accuracy of reported information

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:

• If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0.

**Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0**

Mitooma DLG did have five (05) DDEG funded investments including two (02) infrastructural projects in its FY2022/2023 annual workplan and budget.

🏗️ Construction of district fence UGX30,000,000

🏗️ Payment of retention for main Admin block construction UGX41,099,000

According to the verification done on the site visits, the actual level of completion as verified during site visit to the two sites was found to be consistent with what was in the reports (Mitooma DLG FY2022/2023 Fourth Quarter Performance Report).

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>There <b>was evidence that the Mitooma DLG</b> conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise. The assessment team sampled four LLGs and found that the Mitooma LG undertook credible assessment. All four sampled Local Level Governments (LLGs) exhibited a deviation within the recommended range of +/-10%, as outlined below.</p>	4
		<p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Mitooma TC:</b> The district internal assessment awarded a perfect score of 77%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 87%. This indicates a deviation of +10%</li> <li>2. <b>Kabira SC:</b> The district internal assessment awarded a perfect score of 90%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 82%. This indicates a deviation of -8%.</li> <li>3. <b>Mutara SC:</b> The district internal assessment awarded a perfect score of 78%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 75%. This indicates a deviation of -3%.</li> <li>4. <b>Mitooma SC:</b> The district internal assessment awarded a perfect score of 70%, while the national assessment team awarded a slightly lower score of 70%. This indicates no deviation.</li> </ol>	
		<p>score 4 or else 0</p>		
		<p><b>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</b></p>		
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that the LG had developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the previous FY.</p>	0
		<p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>		
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that the LG had implemented PIP for the 30% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY.</p>	0
		<p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>		

**Human Resource Management and Development**

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that the LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the Ministry of Public Service by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development.</p> <p>A copy of the submission made, that was presented at the time of assessment, from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Public Service was dated September 30, 2023 ref.: CR. 166/1, titled "Submission of Wage Proposals on Wage, Pension, and Gratuity for 2024/2025 FY" and was acknowledged received at the <b>Ministry of Public Service by Harriet on October 03, 2023, which was out of the stipulated timelines.</b></p>	0
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the LG had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance. Tracking was done using a Daily Attendance Register and summaries were made monthly showing details of days attended and percentage. For example in the report for the month of October 2023, Katushabe Praise, Senior Accounts Assistant from Mitooma Town Council attended for 20 days out of 21, computing to 95%. Muhebwa Bruce, an Agricultural Officer from Rurehe Sub County attended for 11 days out of 21, computing to 52%. These reports were then submitted to the Chief Administrative Officer for action.</p>	2

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** that HODs had been appraised as per guidelines issued by Ministry of Public Service during the previous FY. Many officers **were not appraised** and most of the appraisals were done **outside the stipulated timelines**. Some of the files reviewed included the following:

1. The Chief Finance Officer, Tumuhame Juliet Olive was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on June 30, 2023.
2. The District Planner, Agaba Onesmus **was not appraised.**
3. The District Engineer, Mwebaze John Baptist was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on **August 07, 2023.**
4. The District Natural Resources Officer, Baguma Naboth **was not appraised.**
5. The District Production Officer, Monday Swaibuh Lwanga was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on **July 11, 2023.**
6. The District Community Development Officer, Atuzalirwe Allen was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans , Principal Assistant Secretary on **July 22, 2023.**
7. The District Commercial Officer, Ahimbisibwe Gervase Kabaterine **was not appraised.**
8. The Senior Procurement Officer, Kyomukama Florence was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans , Principal Assistant Secretary on **August 24, 2023.**
9. The Procurement Officer, Tushemereirwe Mackline was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans , Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023 for confirmation..
10. The Principal Human Resource Officer (Administration), Nahurira Anne was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on June 23, 2023.
11. The Senior Environment Officer, Kagumire Godwin was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans , Principal Assistant Secretary on **July 25, 2023.**
12. The Senior Land Management Officer, Muhwezi Anthony was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans , Principal Assistant Secretary on **July 26, 2023.**
13. The Senior Accountant, Tumwesigye Seriano was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans , Principal Assistant Secretary on **July 15, 2023.**
14. The Principal Internal Auditor , Akankwasa Israel was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans , Principal Assistant Secretary on **August 08, 2023.**
15. The Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), Natukunda Olivia was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on **July 01, 2023.**



Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:

Score 1 or else 0

**There was evidence** that the LG had implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time.

The Rewards and Sanctions Committee was constituted in a letter of appointment by the Ag. Chief Administrative Officer, Turyasirwa Edith, to Chairperson and Members dated January 04, 2023 ref.: CR/214/30 titled "Appointment as Member of Rewards and Sanctions Committee"

The Committee was comprised of the following:

1. Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary as Chairperson
2. Nahurira Annah, Principal Human Resource Officer as Secretary
3. Dr. Taremwa Julius, Medical Officer as Member
4. Nshemerirwe Betty Kotz, Labour Officer as Member
5. Tushabe Jane, Senior Inspector of Schools as Member
6. Baguma Naboth, District Natural Resources Officer as Member

In the minutes of a meeting held on June 21, 2023 the Committee under Minute No. 5 Presentation of Cases by the Secretary, the Committee considered among others the case of abscondment of Aharizira Steward, a Parish Chief accused of non-attendance to duty for over 30 days and resolved that the Accounting Officer should suspend his salary and be written to provide reasons for non-attendance to duty.

Another case handled was Mbyemire Obadia, an Education Assistant II accused of non-attendance to duty and drunkenness. The Committee resolved that he be resubmitted to district Service Commission, since he had earlier been submitted and didn't appear, for Retirement in Public Interest.

Performance management

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure

iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.

Score 1 or else 0

**There was evidence** that the LG had established a Consultative Committee to handle staff grievances.

The Committee was constituted through a letter from the Chief Administrative Officer appointing Chairperson and Members, dated April 16, 2022 ref.: ADMN/210/1 titled "Appointment to District Consultative Committee for Grievance Management" and was comprised of the following:

1. Baguma Naboth, District Natural Resources Officer as Chairperson
2. Nahurira Annah, Principal Human Resource Officer as Secretary
3. Nuwagaba Sylvia, Senior Records Officer as Member
4. Musiimenta Pamella, Assistant Nursing Officer - Psychiatry as Member
5. Byarugaba Johnson, Head teacher as Member and UNATU Representative
6. Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary as Member and UGAWU Representative
7. Kiconco Emily, Economist as Member
8. Nshemerirwe Betty Kotz, Labour Officer as Member
9. Tushabe Jane, Senior Inspector of Schools as Member

Payroll management  
Maximum 1 point on  
this Performance  
Measure or else score 0

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

Score 1.

**There was evidence that 100%** of the staff recruited during the previous FY had accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. From a list titled "List of new Recruited Staff for 2022/2023 FY" obtained from HRM, Mitooma District LG recruited 23 staff. Details of salary payroll access for some files reviewed are as follows:

1. Sabiiti Victor, Enrolled Nurse assumed duty on 11/25/2022 and accessed the salary payroll on 1/25/2023, **60 days later.**
2. Amusiimire Wilber, Enrolled Nurse assumed duty on 11/25/2022 and accessed the salary payroll on 1/25/2023, **60 days later.**
3. Twikirize Provia, Office Attendant assumed duty on 1/4/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 1/25/2023, **21 days later.**
4. Ndyamusimanta Zebia, Office Attendant assumed duty on 1/4/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 1/25/2023, **21 days later.**
5. Ainembabazi Cleophas, Office Attendant assumed duty on 1/6/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 1/25/2023, **19 days later.**
6. Akankwatsa Jethro, Education Assistant II assumed duty on 5/29/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/16/2023, **17 days later.**
7. Asimwe Emilly Aloice, Principal Agricultural Officer assumed duty on 5/2/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/16/2023, 44 days later.
8. Atwine Celia, Human Resources Officer assumed duty on 5/15/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/16/2023, 31 days later.
9. Byamukama Modern, Porter assumed duty on 5/29/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/16/2023, **17 days later.**
10. Tushemereirwe Mackline, Procurement Officer assumed duty on 5/2/2023 and accessed the salary payroll on 6/16/2023, **44 days later.**

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.

**There was no evidence** adduced that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY had accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement. Pension payrolls were not presented for review at the time of assessment to enable the team ascertain that all the staff who were retired in FY 2022/2023 accessed the pension payroll not later than two months from date of retirement.

## Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:	Mitooma District FY2022/2023 DDEG annual budget for LLGs was UGX169,483,000. What was transferred to 13 sub counties and 5 town councils during the FY according to the financial report was UGX174,650,596, composed as follows:	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	<p>Quarter one 0</p> <p>Quarter two on 20/10/2022 UGX56.494,233</p> <p>Quarter three on 21/01/2023 UGX118,156,363</p> <p>Total UGX174,650,596</p>	
			This was 103% and means all the budgeted funds were transferred to the LLGs.	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED).	<p>For MDLG, the DDEG funds were warranted and transferred during FY2022/2023 to LLGs as follows:</p> <p>For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th July 2022, the CAO warranted on 10th August 2022 and the funds were transferred on 15th August 2022 (28 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the CAO warranted on 18th October and the funds were sent on 20th October 2022 (18 days).</p> <p>For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The CAO warranted 19th January 2022 and the disbursements made on 19th January 2023 (21 days).</p>	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	In all the three quarters, the warranting/verification of DDEG grants was effected beyond the 5 days' time limit. This was besides the first quarter disbursement not being sent in time.	

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:	<b>There was evidence</b> that the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter.	2
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	The DDEG was released in the second quarter and third quarter. The second quarter release was warranted on <b>October 18, 2022</b> and disbursement communicated to Katenga Sub County on <b>October 24, 2022</b> , 5 days later.	
			The third quarter release was warranted on <b>January 19, 2023</b> and disbursement communicated to Katenga Sub County on <b>January 23, 2023</b> , 3 days later.	
			Second quarter release warranted on <b>October 18, 2022</b> and disbursement communicated to Rurehe Sub County on <b>October 24, 2022</b> , 5 days later.	
			Third quarter release was warranted on <b>January 19, 2023</b> and disbursement communicated to Rurehe Sub County on <b>January 23, 2023</b> , 3 days later.	
			Second quarter release was warranted on <b>October 18, 2022</b> and disbursement communicated to Mitooma Town Council on <b>October 24, 2022</b> , 5 days later.	
			Third quarter release was warranted on <b>January 19, 2023</b> and disbursement communicated to Mitooma Town Council on <b>January 23, 2023</b> , 3 days later.	
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:	Four (04) reports were provided as evidence of MDLG supervision and mentoring activities in LLGs during FY2022/2023.	2
		Score 2 or else score 0	A monitoring and mentoring report dated 05/08/2022 titled - DDEG MONITORING REPORT QUARTER ONE, FY2022/2023. Quarter one monitoring was carried by the Planner in the sub counties of Mayanga, Mutara, Kiyanga, Bitereko, Katenga, Mitooma, Mitooma T/C, Kanyabwanga S/C, Kashenhero T/C, Rurehe S/C, Kashenshero S/C and Kabira S/C. The goal was to ascertain value for money in projects, check progress of works, find out the function of PMCs and check compliance with various social safeguards. Projects monitored included construction of 2 stance latrine at Kakyera and Rucururu P/Ss, supply of 3 seater twin desks to schools, installation crest water tank at Rwemirama P/S, renovation of staff house at Kanyabwanga HCIII and construction of 5 stance latrine with urinal at Butembe P/S.	
			A monitoring and mentoring report dated 01/12/2022 titled - DDEG MONITORING REPORT QUARTER TWO, FY2022/2023. Quarter two monitoring as carried by the Planner in the sub counties of Mayanga, Mutara, Kiyanga, Bitereko, Katenga, Mitooma, Mitooma T/C, Kanyabwanga S/C, Kashenhero T/C, Rurehe S/C, Kashenshero S/C and Kabira S/C. The goal was to ascertain value for money in projects, check progress of works, find	

out the function of PMCs and check compliance with various social safeguards. The same projects were monitored as in quarter one, and the goal was to ascertain the progress made. A number had just taken off, some were still at procurement and for those that had progressed the construction sites were being cleared.

A monitoring and mentoring report dated 11/03/2023 titled - DDEG MONITORING REPORT QUARTER THREE, FY2022/2023. Quarter three monitoring as carried by the Planner in the sub counties of Mayanga, Mutara, Kiyanga, Bitereko, Katenga, Mitooma, Mitooma T/C, Kanyabwanga S/C, Kashenhero T/C, Rurehe S/C, Kashenshero S/C and Kabira S/C. A number of projects had progressed e.g. purchase of office furniture at Rutsiro P/S. Construction of staff house at Kanyabwanga HCIII was ongoing. Supply of 20 twin seater desks at Kamuyanga and Kanyabuhanga P/Ss was completed.

A monitoring and mentoring report dated 11/07/2023 titled - DDEG MONITORING REPORT QUARTER FOUR, FY2022/2023. Quarter four monitoring as carried by the Planner in the sub counties of Mayanga, Mutara, Kiyanga, Bitereko, Katenga, Mitooma, Mitooma T/C, Kanyabwanga S/C, Kashenhero T/C, Rurehe S/C, Kashenshero S/C and Kabira S/C. The goal was to ascertain the level of completion of projects as the year was coming to a close. Kiyanga subcounty offices had been renovated to completion. Construction of 2 stance latrine at Katooma P/S was completed. Procurement of 10,000ltr water tank for Rurehe S/C was completed. Construction of immunization hall at Nyakizinga S/C was still in progress by the close of the FY.

Overall, MDLG reports were found satisfactory to meet the requirement of mentoring/ monitoring/supervision for LLGs during FY2022/2023.

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

Four sets of minutes were provided as evidence of presentation of monitoring /supervision reports for the four quarters to, and their discussion in TPC. In addition, attendance registers of these meetings were provided and reviewed.

TPC minutes for a meeting which sat on 26/10/2022 discussed quarter one monitoring and supervision report (Minute No. MIN.86/TPC/2022 - PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF 1ST QUARTER DDEG MONITORING REPORT FOR FY2022/2023). Monitoring findings were presented by the District Planner. In the meeting the members required the Planner to always share the projects and their costing on the platform before construction is started and to always ensure environmental screening is done beforehand.

TPC minutes for a meeting which sat on 16/02/2023 discussed quarter two monitoring and supervision report (Minute No. MIN.100/TPC/2022 - PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF 2ND QUARTER DDEG MONITORING REPORT FOR FY2022/2023). Monitoring findings were presented by the IT Officer. It was realised that contractors are delaying the progress of projects by not starting the works on sites in time. This situation the Procurement Officer said was mostly caused by late submission of BoQs by SASs.

TPC minutes for a meeting which sat on 26/04/2023 discussed quarter three monitoring and supervision report (Minute No. MIN.86/TPC/2022 - PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF 3RD QUARTER DDEG MONITORING REPORT FOR FY2022/2023). Monitoring findings were presented by the District Planner. Senior Assistant Secretaries should follow up on labeling of desks that have been supplied in different schools and some suppliers should not be given payment certificates unless they have completed the labeling.

TPC minutes for a meeting which sat on 16/06/2023 discussed quarter four monitoring and supervision report (Minute No. MIN.86/TPC/2022 - PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF 4TH QUARTER DDEG MONITORING REPORT FOR FY2022/2023). Monitoring findings were presented by the District Planner. There was a balance on the funds for the renovation of Nyakazinga and the SAS was required to avail a detailed report on the construction and payments to the CAO's office.

The LG did supervise and mentor the activities of LLGs and the results of the monitoring and mentoring were discussed in the TPC and appropriate actions taken.

Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:

Score 2 or else score 0

***Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0***

The LG had an Excel based electronic assets register, formatted as required by the LG Accounting Manual. A printed copy was also availed for this assessment.

A number of assets were sampled during this assessment including land and buildings, computers, furniture, motor vehicles and road equipment to check for the completeness and up datedness of the register. The DLG is in the process of migration of the Assets Register to the new format and partly as a result the records of a number of assets were incomplete. This was besides the fact that a number of assets tested were not engraved. Fifteen (15) assets were sampled and a big proportion (about 50%) of them was not found the register, including important assets such as DLG land and buildings.

**The LG did not comply with the requirement on maintaining an assets register that is updated and formatted as required in the accounting manual.**



Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure

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

Score 1 or else 0

The Board of Survey report for FY2021/2022 was provided and it had the following recommendations:

1. Motor vehicle parking yard should be constructed to create a clean and healthy environment at the Health Centre
2. Make effort to have all government land registered and allocate money for this purpose
3. Develop a site layout plan for Mitooma HCIV
4. Regularly servicing of fire extinguishers
5. Install lightning conductors on buildings to guard against lightning strikes
6. Complete fencing of the DLG premises
7. For Mitooma HCIV
  - a) General renovation of the buildings especially staff quarters
  - b) Remove obsolete radio call mast and other equipment at the health centre
  - c) Carry out environmental audit at the incinerator
  - d) Engrave all assets of the health centre

As on the date of this assessment on 07/12/2023, a number of steps had been taken in addressing these recommendations. They included:

1. On land registration, the DLG acquired one land title during FY2022/2023 for Plot 73 Block 24 at Sanga in Rutokye T/C and another in the current FY2023/2024 on Plot 1049 Block 43 at Kazira on 13/09/20 in Rukararwe Parish. Other land titles possessed by the DLG are about 18 in number, acquired earlier than the previous FY.
2. Fire extinguishers were serviced
3. Fencing of DLG premises started and the process will continue in FY2023/2024
4. The implementation of the Board of Survey recommendations on Mitooma HCIV was affected by the decision to upgrade the health centre to a hospital, and the work was already in progress at the time of this assessment.
5. The parking yard was not constructed and is in the DLG's current FY plan.

**The LG has made effort to address the recommendations of the Board of Survey report and did comply with the requirement.**

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>Mitooma DLG has a 12 member Physical Planning Committee. According to the minutes seen, during the year ended 2022/2023 the Physical Planning Committee met on the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1 meeting on 08/08/2022 and minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 04/10/2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting on 07/12/2022 and minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 17/01/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting on 20/03/2023 and minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 13/04/2023.</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting on 04/05/2023 and minutes submitted to MoLHUD on 01/12/2023.</p> <p>The requirement of quarterly physical planning committee meetings and submission of four (04) sets of minutes of the year to MoLHUD was satisfied.</p>
----	---	--	--

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>Mitooma DLG did have five (05) DDEG funded investment projects including two (02) infrastructural in its FY2022/2023 annual workplan and budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>📌 Construction of district fence UGX30,000,000</li> <li>📌 Construction of DLG main Admin block (Retention payment) UGX41,099,000</li> </ul> <p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Derived from the LG Development Plan</li> <li>-Consistent with sector guidelines &amp; DDEG objectives</li> <li>-Financially feasible</li> <li>-Having costed project profiles.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of desk appraisal for the MDLG DDEG project for the two (02) FY2022/2023 MDLG DDEG projects was availed/seen.</p>	2
----	---	---	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Mitooma DLG did have five (05) DDEG funded investment projects including two (02) infrastructural in its FY2022/2023 annual workplan and budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>📌 Construction of district fence UGX30,000,000</li> <li>📌 Construction of DLG main Admin block (Retention payment) UGX41,099,000</li> </ul> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Technical feasibility</li> <li>-Environmental and social acceptability requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of field appraisal for the MDLG DDEG project for the two (02) FY2022/2023 MDLG DDEG projects was availed/ seen.</p>
----	---	--	---

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>Mitooma DLG has a 5 year Development Plan 2020/2021-2024/2025 containing project profiles for the projects of the DLG. The profiles cover different aspects of the DLG including Production, Health, Water, Works, Irrigation, Education and Administration for the 5 years. The DLG's project profiles are in a separate appendix companion to the 5 year development plan.</p> <p>MDLG FY2023/2024 Project profiles (costed) were presented and discussed in the TPC meeting which sat on 16/05/2022, Minute No. 106/TPC/2022 – PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF PROJECT PROFILES. The profiles were presented departmentally – Education, Health, Water, Administration etc.</p> <p>Both the DTPC minutes and the costed profiles were availed for the assessment and seen/reviewed and the accompanying attendance register for the meeting were also provided/seen.</p> <p>Project profiles with costing were developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for FY2023/2024.</p>
----	---	---	--

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 <b>was evidence</b> that the LG had screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Screening for environmental and social risks construction/rehabilitation of Rugarama springs tanks were carried out on 7/723, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, desk and field-based appraisals were provided for review dated 15/6/23</li> <li>2. Screening for environmental and social risks rehabilitation of Mahwizi and Esshaka springs tanks were carried out on 5/723, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, desk and field-based appraisals were provided for review dated 15/6/23</li> <li>3. Screening for environmental and social risks construction of 2 stance latrine at Rwentookye P/s were carried out on 7/723, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, desk and field-based appraisals were provided for review dated 9/6/23</li> </ol>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no infrastructure projects for the current FY (2023/24) to be implemented using the DDEG funds thus not being included in the Mitooma DLG approved procurement plan. Therefore the requirement of the indicator could not be assessed. Hence, the LG earns the maximum score.</p> <p><b>NB:</b> Only DDEG infrastructure projects at District level were considered.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no infrastructure projects for the previous FY (2022/23) to be implemented using the DDEG funds thus not being included in the Mitooma DLG approved procurement plan and therefore there were no projects approved by the Contracts Committee. The requirement of the indicator could not be assessed. Hence, the LG earns the maximum score.</p> <p><b>NB:</b> Only DDEG infrastructure projects at District level were considered.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:  Score 1 or else 0	There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the PIT for the school construction projects constructed within the last FY (2022/23) as per guidelines.  A copy of joint appointment by the CAO of the members of the PIT (i.e. Contract Manager/DEO, District Environment Officer, DCDO and Labour Officer) for Construction Works under Education Department dated 15/8/2022 was present; Another appointment letter dated 24/6/2022 for the Clerk of Works (COW) by the CAO to specifically supervise Kitojo Seed Secondary School was present. Another copy of joint appointment by the CAO of the members of the PIT (i.e. PCDO, Environment Officer and Labour Officer) for construction works at Kitojo Seed Secondary School was present. However, no COW and Project Manager were assigned to other school construction projects. The following Projects were considered.	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 is evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the Mitooma DLG Engineer:  The following projects were sampled:  1. <b>Construction of a Fence at the Mitooma District Headquarters-</b> The fence construction comprised of: Substructure works (i.e. excavation works, foundation concrete casting and construction of the plinth wall) and superstructure walling. The wall fence was found to be in good structural condition and still intact. There were no cracks found on the wall.  2. <b>Construction of a main District Administration Block Phase 4-</b> The scope of works comprised of: Structural concrete casting (i.e. columns, beams and 1st floor slab), external walling on ground floor, construction of external toilet and construction of entrance gate. All items were found to be in good structural condition and still intact with no cracks on the constructed structures. The project was found to be in defects liability period during the time of assessment.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to	There was evidence that Mitooma DLG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers for infrastructure projects prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY (2022/23).  A Project Implementation Team was specifically set up for each project and it comprised of several technical officers that jointly inspected the	2

verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0

infrastructure prior to its verification and certification.

The following projects among others were sampled:

1. **Construction of a Fence at the Mitooma District Headquarters-** The contractor's 1st claim dated 4/5/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DE. An inspection was done by the DE on 9/5/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 1st interim payment certificate was prepared by the DE on 9/5/2023 and certified by the District Environment Officer and DCDO on 9/5/2023 and approved by the CAO on 25/4/2023. The contractor's 2nd claim dated 12/6/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DE. An inspection was done by the DE on 12/6/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 2nd interim payment certificate was prepared by the DE on 12/6/2023, certified by the District Environment Officer and DCDO and approved by the CAO. A practical completion certificate was prepared and signed on 26/6/2023 by the DE. An Environment and Social compliance certificate was also signed by the District Environment Officer and DCDO on 3/5/2023.
2. **Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Katerera P/S, Kanyabwanga S/C-** The contractor's 1st claim dated 31/5/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DEO. An inspection was done by the Superintendent of Works on 5/6/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 1st interim payment certificate was prepared by the Superintendent of Works on 5/6/2023 and certified by the DEO, District Environment Officer, District Labour Officer and DCDO and approved by the CAO. The contractor's 2nd claim dated 21/6/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DEO. An inspection was done by the DE on 22/6/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 2nd interim payment certificate was prepared by the Superintendent of Works on 22/6/2023, certified by the DEO, District Environment Officer and DCDO, DLO and approved by the CAO. A certificate of practical completion was prepared and signed by the superintendent of works on 22/6/2023.
3. **Construction of 2 in 1 Staff House at Mayanga HC II-** The contractor's 1st claim dated 17/3/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, DHO and DE. An inspection was done by the Superintendent of Works on 17/3/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 1st interim payment certificate was prepared by the Superintendent of Works on 17/3/2023 and certified by the DHO, District Environment Officer, District Labour Officer and DCDO and approved by the CAO. The contractor's 2nd claim dated 6/6/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DHO. An inspection was done by the superintendent of works and a supervision report prepared. The 2nd interim payment certificate was prepared by the

Superintendent of Works on 9/6/2023, certified by the DHO, District Environment Officer and DCDO, DLO and approved by the CAO. A certificate of practical completion was prepared and signed by the superintendent of works on 9/6/2023. A Certificate for Environmental, Social and Climate Change Mitigation Was signed by the District Environment Officer and the DCDO on 12/6/2023.

13

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure

f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):

Score 1 or else score 0

There was evidence that Mitooma DLG verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors timely.

The following projects among others were sampled:

1. **Construction of a Fence at the Mitooma District Headquarters-** The contractor's 1st claim dated 4/5/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DE. An inspection was done by the DE on 9/5/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 1st interim payment certificate was prepared by the DE on 9/5/2023 and certified by the District Environment Officer and DCDO on 9/5/2023 and approved by the CAO on 25/4/2023. The contractor's 2nd claim dated 12/6/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DE. An inspection was done by the DE on 12/6/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 2nd interim payment certificate was prepared by the DE on 12/6/2023, certified by the District Environment Officer and DCDO and approved by the CAO. A practical completion certificate was prepared and signed on 26/6/2023 by the DE. An Environment and Social compliance certificate was also signed by the District Environment Officer and DCDO on 3/5/2023.
2. **Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Katerera P/S, Kanyabwanga S/C-** The contractor's 1st claim dated 31/5/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DEO. An inspection was done by the Superintendent of Works on 5/6/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 1st interim payment certificate was prepared by the Superintendent of Works on 5/6/2023 and certified by the DEO, District Environment Officer, District Labour Officer and DCDO and approved by the CAO. The contractor's 2nd claim dated 21/6/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DEO. An inspection was done by the DE on 22/6/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 2nd interim payment certificate was prepared by the Superintendent of Works on 22/6/2023, certified by the DEO, District Environment Officer and DCDO, DLO and approved by the CAO. A certificate of practical completion was prepared and signed by the superintendent of works on 22/6/2023.
3. **Construction of 2 in 1 Staff House at Mayanga HC II-** The contractor's 1st claim dated 17/3/2023 was certified for payment by

1

the CAO, DHO and DE. An inspection was done by the Superintendent of Works on 17/3/2023 and a supervision report prepared. The 1st interim payment certificate was prepared by the Superintendent of Works on 17/3/2023 and certified by the DHO, District Environment Officer, District Labour Officer and DCDO and approved by the CAO. The contractor's 2nd claim dated 6/6/2023 was certified for payment by the CAO, CFO and DHO. An inspection was done by the superintendent of works and a supervision report prepared. The 2nd interim payment certificate was prepared by the Superintendent of Works on 9/6/2023, certified by the DHO, District Environment Officer and DCDO, DLO and approved by the CAO. A certificate of practical completion was prepared and signed by the superintendent of works on 9/6/2023. A Certificate for Environmental, Social and Climate Change Mitigation Was signed by the District Environment Officer and the DCDO on 12/6/2023.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:  Score 1 or else 0	<p>There was evidence of complete procurement files in place for the all projects/contracts; including the contract documents, approved evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals and/or minutes.</p> <p>The sampled projects are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Construction of a Fence at the Mitooma District Headquarters-</b> MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00011; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 043/CC/2022/23 in a meeting held on 28/11/2022 after evaluation. The evaluation report was approved by Contracts Committee. The contract document was signed on 10/3/2022.</li> <li>2. <b>Construction of a main District Administration Block Phase 4-</b> MITO893/WRKS/2021-22/00001; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 100/CC/2021/22 in a meeting held on 4/5/2022 after evaluation. The evaluation report was approved by Contracts Committee. The contract document was signed on 25/11/2021.</li> <li>3. <b>Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Katerera P/S, Kanyabwanga S/C-</b> MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00007; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 035/CC/2022/23 in a meeting held on 28/11/2022 after evaluation. The evaluation report was approved by Contracts Committee. The contract document was signed on 19/12/2022.</li> </ol>	1
----	--	---	--	---



14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the District/Municipality had i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant</p> <p>In a letter dated 17/1/2018 of Ref No CR.153/1, the CAO Mr. Ogwang Barnard appointed Ms. Sylvia Nuwagaba as the focal person officer for grievance committee, copied to RDC, Ag. district chairperson and DCAO. In another letter dated 20/10/2019 of Ref No ADMN/160/2, the CAO Mr. Akileng Simon Peter appointed the following members on the centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC);</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Twinamatsiko Evans PAS Chairperson</li> <li>2. Mrs. Atuzarirwe Allen DCDO member</li> <li>3. Miss. Nahurira Annah Ag. HRO member</li> <li>4. Mr. Baguma Naboth DNRO Member</li> <li>5. Miss. Nuwagaba Sylvia SRO Focal person</li> <li>6. Mr. Tumwebaze Johnbaptist DE member</li> <li>7. Mr. Byamugisha Sadic DHO member</li> <li>8. Tushabe Jane Inspector of schools member</li> </ol>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG had specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices</p> <p>A log book was in place with columns detailing on how complaints were captured including the date, mode of receipt, name of compliant, contact, description of the complaint, status of investigation and feedback to the complaint, complaints were recorded in the log book and <b>a public display information was displayed on the LG notice board dated 20/10/2012.</b></p>	2
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the district had publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>On the main notice board of the LG, a display of Ref CR/160/2 was reviewed dated 20/10/19, showing the avenues to address grievances, names and contacts of the people responsible to record grievances , i.e. at the district Miss. Nuwagaba Sylvia the focal person, contact 0788135431, is responsible for recording grievances at the district</p>	1

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Mitooma DLG Development Plan III and Annual Workplan and budget 2023/2024 encompass aspects of environment, social and climate change interventions as most are cross cutting and embedded throughout the plans. Specific examples of the sections where environment, social and climate change interventions are highlighted include:</p> <p>In the MDLG DDP, there are interventions incorporated on different pages.</p> <p>Pages 49-54 of the plan cover Environment and Natural Resources</p> <p>Pages 15-18: Social economic infrastructure</p> <p>Page 122 - Costing for the program for Water, Climate Change, Environment and Natural Resources Management</p> <p>Approved budget FY2023/2024</p> <p>Natural Resources and environment approved budget – sub budget (page 47-48)</p> <p>Community Based Services budget (Pages 49-50)</p> <p>Program 06 – Natural resources, environment, climate change, land and water</p> <p>Environmental, social and climate change interventions were integrated into MDLG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management</p> <p>score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided/seen to confirm that the LG disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management.</p> <p>The Guidelines were said to have been shared on WhatsApp and this could neither be verified nor form strong basis of evidence.</p> <p>The LG did not comply on this requirement.</p>	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 <b>was evidence</b> that the 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,  1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 120 perimeter wall at the district headquarters was carried out on 22/7/22, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO. After screening the project didn't qualify for a detailed study, therefore a costed ESMP was prepared on 7/7/22 at cost of ugx 330,000, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO. A costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMP) were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents under preliminaries for environmental and social change at tune of Ugx 350,000  2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of the administration block phase 4 was carried out on 22/7/22, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO. After screening the project didn't qualify for a detailed study, therefore a costed ESMP was prepared on 22/7/22 at cost of ugx 49,000,000, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO. A costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMP) were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents under preliminaries for environmental and social change at tune of Ugx 2,780,000.	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 <b>was no evidence</b> for examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change	0
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:  Score 1 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that all DDEG projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances  1. Certificate of title for Mitooma district headquarters on block 36, plot 1049 at Mitooma Ruhinda dated 25/6/2014, signed and stamped by registrar land on 25/6/2014	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 <b>was evidence</b> that environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports  1. Support supervision and monitoring for the construction for the administration block at Mitooma district headquarters was carried out on 2/10/2022, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 2/10/22, 2/11/22, 15/12/22, 27/1/23, 27/2/23 and 12/4/23, the project started on 4/8/22 and ended 8/6/23.  2. Support supervision and monitoring for the construction of district headquarters perimeter wall at Mitooma district headquarters was carried out on 25/3/2023, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 25/3/23, 29/4/23 and 3/5/23, the project started on 19/3/23 and ended 17/6/23.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.  Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:  Score 1 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that E&S compliance Certification forms were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects  1. E&S compliance certification for the construction of district headquarters perimeter wall at Mitooma district headquarters was completed and approved on 3/5/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, payments were made on 27/6/23	1

**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>According to MDLG FY2022/2023 financial report, the LG runs the following bank accounts:</p> <p>Treasury single account</p> <p>General Fund account</p> <p>Mitooma Revenue collection account</p> <p>Mitooma UWEP recovery account</p> <p>Mitooma Youth livelihood recovery account</p> <p>Mitooma Imprest account</p> <p>The responsibility of reconciliation of the TSA is said to have been taken back to MoFPED.</p> <p>As on date of the assessment 08/12/2023, all the other bank accounts were reconciled to 30/11/2023.</p> <p><b>The DLG's bank accounts were reconciled up to date as required under the manual.</b></p>	<b>2</b>
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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 four quarterly reports of FY 2022/2023 were produced by the MDLG Internal Audit department.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report was dated 26/10/2022, Quarter 2 dated 27/01/2023, Quarter 3 dated 28/04/2023 and Quarter 4 dated 31/07/2023.</p> <p>There was evidence that the reports were submitted to the Speaker, CAO, LGPAC, Internal Auditor General and the LCV Chair through dated acknowledgement signatures of the recipients in the audit delivery book.</p>	<b>2</b>

17

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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.

Score 1 or else score 0

MDLG quarterly internal audit reports for FY2022/2023 did contain a section in Q3 report for follow-up on the status of implementation of prior audit findings/ recommendations.

However, the recommendations captured in Q3 report are those of the current and not the previous year. In the end the follow up done on previous audit findings remains insufficient and some of the issues get lost.

Although MDLG internal audit reports were evidently submitted to the Speaker, CAO, LGPAC, RDC, Internal Auditor General and the LCV Chair - Quarter one submitted on 26/10/2022, Quarter two on 28/01/2023, Quarter three on 30/04/2023 and Quarter four on 30/07/2023, PAC minutes and reports don't show evidence of sufficient follow-up on previous findings.

We conclude that the LG did not have a sufficient process to follow-up previous internal audit findings as required.

1

17

LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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:

Score 1 or else score 0

MDLG records show that the four quarterly internal audit reports were received by CAO, Council and DPAC through witness of the acknowledgement signatures of the recipients in the audit submission book. The reports were submitted as follows: Quarter one submitted on 26/10/2022, Quarter two on 28/01/2023, Quarter three on 30/04/2023 and Quarter four on 30/07/2023.

According to the PAC report dated 11/05/2023 Ref: CR: 109/1, Quarter two Internal Audit report was handled by the PAC.

According to the PAC report dated 28/06/2023 Ref: CR: 109/1, Quarter one and Quarter three Internal Audit reports were handled by the PAC.

According to the PAC report dated 26/09/2023 Ref: CR: 109/1, Quarter four Internal Audit report was handled by the PAC.

The LGPAC reports had several recommendations and there was evidence CAO was taking action in follow-up the recommendations including writing to affected persons demanding for action.

FY2022/2023 internal audit reports of MDLG were presented to the LGPAC and PAC sufficiently discussed and took actions on them.

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>Mitooma DLG OSR budget for FY 2022/2023 was UGX418,580,000. What was realised according to the financial report was UGX418,486,660. This was 99.97% of what was budgeted and this fell within the +/-10% range.</p>	2
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>According to the financial reports, Mitooma DLG OSR performance for FY 2021/2022 was UGX269,679,336. Performance for FY 2022/2023 was UGX418,486,660.</p> <p>The actual increase in OSR was therefore UGX148,807,324 in revenue, which was i.e. 55.2%.</p> <p>The increase was &gt;10%.</p>	2
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>During the year ended 2022/2023, what was collected as by MDLG OSR was UGX418,486,660. Of this total, UGX137,214,185 was non-sharable income with respect to Education funds UGX113,960,850 (sports, IDs and co-curricular activities) and 23,253,335 (from tender fees), leaving a balance of UGX281,272,475.</p> <p>What was remitted to the 13 sub counties and 5 town councils during the FY was UGX181,828,390, composed as follows:</p> <p>08/09/2022 UGX43,163,047</p> <p>06/11/2022 UGX60,077,142</p> <p>14/02/2023 UGX30,259,140</p> <p>16/03/2023 UGX14,635,848</p> <p>20/05/2023 UGX33,693,213</p> <p>TOTAL UGX181,828,390</p> <p>This made 64.6% which approximates to 65%, which met the 65% threshold.</p> <p>The DLG did comply with the 65% OSR remittance requirement to LLGs.</p>	2

## Transparency and Accountability

21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence that the Procurement Plan and the awarded contracts were duly published/displayed on the Mitooma DLG Procurement Notice board for Public View.  The sampled projects are listed below:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Proc. Ref. No- MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00007:</b> Twin Technical &amp; Building Construction Co. Ltd; for the Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Katerera P/S in Kanyabwanga S/C, Mitooma District; with an amount of - UGX 81,309,670/=; Display date was 29/11/2022 and Removal date was 5/12/2022.</li><li>2. <b>Proc. Ref. No- MoES/UGIFT/WORKS/2021-2022/0002/LOT 15:</b> SAGM Technical Services Limited; for the Construction of Three (3) Seed Secondary Schools at Nyabihoko in Ntungamo, Kitojo in Mitooma and Nyakishenyi in Rukungiri-under UGIFT-Lot 15; with an amount of - UGX 8,951,188,463/=; Display date was 20/4/2022 and Removal date was 5/5/2022.</li><li>3. <b>Proc. Ref. No- MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00001:</b> Bitereko Hardware &amp; Building Construction; for the Construction of a Two in One Staff House at Mayanga H/C II, Mitooma District; with an amount of - UGX 164,122,660/=; Display date was 29/11/2022 and Removal date was 5/12/2022.</li></ol>	2
21	LG shares information with citizens  Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0	The LG's performance assessment results for FY2021/2022 were disseminated by displaying them on the DLG noticeboard.  During this assessment, the results were found on the DLG noticeboard which could be easily accessed by the staff and the general public.  The results were also disseminated on the LG website and this was confirmed during this assessment.  The website was also checked during this assessment and the results were confirmed to have been shared there.  There was evidence that the DLG duly disseminated the assessment results of the previous year.	2



21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided/seen that during the previous FY2022/2023 MDLG conducted discussions e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc. with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Information on MDLG i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal (called Charging Policy) was publicised by displaying it on the notice board.</p> <p>On the date of this assessment on 07/12/2023, the notice board was checked and displayed on it were schedules on MDLG approved revenue rates for the different categories of activities, the procedures for collection and the procedures for appeal in case any individual is dissatisfied with the process.</p> <p>In addition, the charging policy was published by sharing it with LLGs and during the assessment a sheet was seen dated 30/06/2023, distributed to LLGs on 03/07/2023.</p> <p>The LG did comply with the requirement on publicising tax rates, collection procedures and procedures for appeal.</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG (CAO) did prepare a report on actions taken on IGG recommendations of the assessment year FY2022/2023 and the report was presented in the Council meeting which sat on 27/09/2022. The Chairman presented the report on IGG issues in his presentation in the Council meeting.</p> <p>Specifically, he highlighted an issue of "Alleged delay of payroll assignment and failure to provide Alex Naturinda former Headteacher Mahungye S.S with records to enable him access payroll at Agago DLG"</p> <p>The DLG did have an IGG file and it was availed for review during this assessment.</p> <p>The LG did meet the requirement of the performance measure.</p>	1

**Educational  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
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"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 4</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the PLE results for 2020 and 2022 and calculated the percentage improvement in performance as indicated below:</p> <p>☞ 3,738 out of 3,991 (93.6%) pupils who sat PLE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3 (Div1:984, Div2:2,328 &amp; Div3:426=3,738. This excludes absentees (4,048-57=3,991).</p> <p>☞ 4,331 out 4,609 (93.9%) pupils who sat PLE in 2022 passed between grade 1 and 3 (Div1:1,428, Div2:2,415 &amp; Div3:488=4,331. This excludes absentees (4,704-95=4,609)</p> <p>Thus, a performance improvement between years of 0.3% (No improvement), the score is 0.</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"> <li>• If improvement by more than 5% score 3</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5% score 2</li> <li>• No improvement score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the UCE results for 2020 and 2022 for USE schools and calculated the percentage improvement in performance as indicated below.</p> <p>☞ 828 out of 1,351 (61.2%) students who sat UCE in 2020 passed between grade 1 and 3 (Div1:120, Div2:309 &amp; Div3:399=828. This excludes absentees (0)</p> <p>☞ 869 out of 1,326 (65.5%) students who sat UCE in 2022 passed between grade 1 and 3 (Div1:158, Div2:332 &amp; Div3:379=869. This excludes absentees (1,339-13=1,326)</p> <p>Thus, a performance improvement of 4.3%, between the years (improvement between 1 and 5 %), the score is 2.</p>	2

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>The performance of MDLG in its LLG Education assessment was 93% in FY2021/2022 and 72% in FY2022/2023, meaning a decrease of 21%.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5%, score 2</li> <li>• Between 1 and 5%, score 1</li> <li>• No Improvement, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This was a decrease, in the range 'no improvement'.</p>	
		<p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>		
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the education development grant was used on eligible capital investment activities as per the planning, budgeting and implementation guidelines for LGs for the education sector FY 2023-2024 ( ) page (17).</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>The review of the 2022-2023_LG Approved budget estimates: Vote_893_Mitooma district, indicated that the total budget for development grant was Ugx.6,239,810,000. The total expenditure on capital investments was Ugx.6,019,957,000 against Ugx.6,239,810,000 representing 96.4% of the annual development budget.</p>	
			<p>Specific details below;</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom construction at Kyeibaare PS at Ugx.68,586,000</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom construction at Katerera PS at Ugx.68,586,000</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toilet construction at Igambiro PS at Ugx.23,000,000</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement of furniture for Bwera PS at Ugx.5,000,000</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seed school construction at Kitojo at Ugx.855,091,000</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bwoburunga Seed school at Ugx.1,500,000,000</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction f skilling centre at Bitereko S/C at Ugx.3,500,000,000</li> </ul>	
			<p>The expenditure on capital investments of 96.4% of the annual development budget was compliant with sector guidelines. The score is 2.</p>	

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

Five (05) MDLG Education infrastructural projects of FY2022/2023 were sampled to check certification before payment.

Payment to Twin Technical and Building Construction Co. Ltd for Construction of 2 classroom block at Katerera P/S in Kanyabwanga S/C (UGX68,406,263) – Requisition dated 06/06/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 05/06/2023 and payment on 15/06/2023.

Payment to Be-Camel Uganda Ltd for construction of two (02) 5 stance lined latrines at Kanyabwanga P/S (UGX44,991,880) – Requisition dated 09/05/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 16/03/2023 and payment on 26/05/2023.

Payment to Twin Technical and Building Construction Co. Ltd for Construction of 2 classroom block at Kyeibare P/S in Mutara S/C (UGX69,693,596) – Requisition dated 06/06/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 06/06/2023 and payment on 15/06/2023.

Payment to Twin Technical and Building Construction Co. Ltd for Construction of 2 classroom block and 5 stance latrine at Kibungo P/S in Kanyabwanga S/C (UGX4,493,729) – Requisition dated 17/01/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 17/01/2023 and payment on 27/02/2023.

Payment to SAGM Technical Services Ltd for construction of Kitojo Seed S.S (UGX546,773,166) – Requisition dated 06/06/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 02/06/2023 and payment on 15/06/2023.

In all the five (05) sampled projects, certification for Education infrastructural projects was done before payments were effected in accordance with the requirements.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates.

From the DE and DEO's offices, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineer's estimates (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Prices are as listed with the corresponding Variation percentages; [(A - B)/A] \*100% :

1. **Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Kyeibare P/S, Mutare S/C-** MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00006. The Engineer's Estimates (A) was UGX 84,158,190/=; the Contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 79,610,470/=. The Variation was at 5.4%.
2. **Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Katerera P/S, Kanyabwanga S/C-** MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00007. The Engineer's Estimates (A) was UGX 88,000,000/=; the Contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 88,484,778/=. The Variation was at -0.55%.
3. **Construction of a 5 Stance Lined Latrines at Igambiro P/S and Kanyabwanga P/S-** MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00008. The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 50,530,632/=; the Contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 49,897,008/=. The Variation was at 1.25%.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY

- If 100% score 2
- Between 80 - 99% score 1
- Below 80% score 0

There is evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY (2022/23).

**Kitojo Seed Secondary School** comprised of the following structures: 3 classroom blocks, 1 science laboratory, 1 multipurpose hall, 1 ICT hall/Library, 1 administration block, 3 2 in 1 staff houses, 3 2 in 1 kitchens, 3 2-stance VIP latrines, 2 5-Stance VIP latrines.

As per the work schedule, installation of all electrical conduits should be complete and internal and external external wall plastering should be complete. As per site inspection conducted during the assessment, all blocks had been plastered and rendered awaiting roofing, flooring, fixing of doors and windows and installation of electrical conduits and services. Therefore, the overall work progress is at 90%.

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100%: score 3</li> <li>• If 80 - 99%: score 2</li> <li>• If 70 - 79% score: 1</li> <li>• Below 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the LG had recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines to fill <b>87.6%</b> of the structure.</p> <p>Staff establishment registers from HRM indicated a ceiling for primary school teachers of <b>1093</b> and staffs in post were <b>958</b> computing to <b>87.6%</b>.</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If above 70% and above score: 3</li> <li>• If between 60 - 69%, score: 2</li> <li>• If between 50 - 59%, score: 1</li> <li>• Below 50 score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The education department had a consolidated schools' asset registers for 2022/2023 covering both UPE schools (109) and USE schools (13) respectively.</p> <p>The consolidated asset register for FY 2021/22 was not availed to the Assessor at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>The review of the consolidated asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that 03/ 109 UPE schools representing (2.7%) met all the basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines; requirement for permanent accommodation for at least four (4) teachers, classroom: pupil ratio of 53, Latrine stance: pupil ratio of 1:40 and desk: pupil ratio of 1:3.</p> <p>On the other hand, 3/13 (23%) USE schools met the minimum service delivery standards.</p> <p>However, we could not compute the percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines since the consolidated asset register for FY 2021/2022 was missing at the time of the assessment. The score is 0.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2</li> <li>• Else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>The primary teacher deployment list 2023 obtained from DEO's office had a total of (1,007) teachers in post covering all the (109) UPE schools in Mitooma District.</p> <p>Verification was done in the three (3) sampled UPE school and the following was established as per the deployment list from the DEO's office.</p> <p>□ The number of teachers (10) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (10) in Mushunga primary school, Mushunga S/C.</p> <p>The names of teachers verified:</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

1. Nabimanya Richard
2. Nimusiima Catherine
3. Nkwasiabwe Pathias
4. Musinguzi Clinton
5. Komujuni Evelyn
6. Tumusiime Karyaba Samuel
7. Tusingwire Knight
8. Kyohairwe Mackline
9. Natuhwera Loyce
10. Tuhairwe Christine

□ The number of teachers (16) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (16) in Ryakahimbi primary school, Mitooma TC.

The names of teachers verified:

1. Ahimbisibwe Bernard
2. Ashaba Alfred
3. Byamugisha Obed
4. Ainebyona Evan
5. Katushabe Doreen
6. Atukunda Gain
7. Mugabe Polycarp
8. Birungi Sarah
9. Basasbwaki Elly
10. Twikirize Sylvia
11. Bashabire Jastence
12. Tushemerirwe Lois
13. Natuhwera Primah
14. Natukwatsa Victor
15. Nuwe Celestine
16. Ninsiima Lovence

□ The number of teachers (14) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (14) in Bitooma Primary school, Katenga S/C

The names of teachers verified:

1. Katambara John
2. Rutatsikwa Francis

3. Nagaba Prossy
4. Kembabazi Olivia
5. Ngabirano Annet
6. Kyohairwe Jovanice
7. Twikirize David Karinda
8. Mutamba Gilvasio
9. Natukwatsa Praise
10. Komuhangi Emily
11. Asiimwe Moreen
12. Atwine Ambrose
13. Akansasiira Penninah
14. Nahabwe Mellon

It was verified that the total number of teachers as indicated on the DEO's teacher deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff lists in all the three (3) sampled UPE schools as indicated above. Therefore, the information on deployment list for teachers was 100% accurate. The score is 2.



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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence that the information on the LG education departmental consolidated schools 'asset register for FY 2022/23 and school asset registers of the sampled 03 UPE schools was in place as per the consolidated asset register. Specific details as indicted below:

□ Mushunga PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (09) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (103) desks and teacher accommodation (03), while the school asset register had (09) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (103) desks and teacher accommodation (03). Information was consistent

□ Ryakahimbi PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (12) classrooms, (23) latrine stances, (205) desks and teacher accommodation (04), while the school asset register had (12) classrooms, (23) latrine stances, (205) desks and teacher accommodation (04). Information was consistent

□ Bitooma Central PS: The education department consolidated school asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (10) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (178) desks and teacher accommodation (01), while the school asset register had (10) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (178) desks and teacher accommodation (01). Information was consistent.

Based on above, information was 100% accurate; the score is 2.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

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

There was evidence of compliance to MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines.

All the 109 (100%) UPE schools submitted annual school reports and budgets to DEO by 30 January 2023. The review of submitted annual school reports on file revealed that all reports were compiled as per the reporting formats for annual school reports and budgets provided in the sector guidelines (Budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools, pages 21-25).

A sample of annual school reports on file showed that the annual school reports and budgets were duly signed by head teachers and chairpersons of school management committees (SMCs) and submitted by 30 January 2023; Kakyeza PS-18/12/22, Itara PS-16/12/22, Nyamizinga PS-3/1/23, Rwemigango PS-5/1/23, Ikimba PS-5/1/23, Karangala PS-23/12/22, Kebiremu PS-23/12/22, Rwenshama PS-23/12/22, Kati PS-16/12/22, Kisiizi PS-14/12/22, Kirambi PS-30/12/22, Kibingo II PS-20/12/22 and Bushasha PS-2/12/22 among others

Information obtained from the three (3) sampled UPE schools confirmed that;

□ Bitooma Central PS, submitted a duly signed annual school report and budget for calendar year 2022 on 25 November 2022

□ Mushunga PS: Submitted a duly signed annual school report and budget for calendar year 2022 on 12 January 2023

□ Ryakahimbi PS: Submitted a duly signed annual school report and budget for calendar year 2022 on 18 December 2022

As indicated above, all the three sampled UPE schools had copies of duly signed annual school reports and budgets on file and compliant with the requirement of the indicator in the LGMSD manual (September 2020)

The score is 4.

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:

- If 50% score: 4
- Between 30- 49% score: 2
- Below 30% score 0

There was evidence that education department supported all the 109 (100%) UPE schools to prepare and implement the school improvement plans (SIPs) in line with inspection recommendations.

The review of school files in DEO's office revealed that all UPE schools submitted their SIPs as part of the annual school report and budget for calendar year 2022.

We noted that the development of school improvement plans (SIPs) was discussed during the head teachers' meeting for term III 2022 held at Mitooma Central primary school on 8 September 2022. Under Min.04/2022, the senior inspector of schools requested all head teachers to finalize and display updated staff lists, annual work plans, school improvement plans, classroom timetables, functional committees, pupils' enrolment and others.

Verification done in all the three (3) sampled UPE schools revealed that copies of SIPs were displayed on the school notice boards as indicated below:

- Bitooma Central PS had a SIP 2023 displayed on school notice board. The plan highlighted improving academic performance through giving home work to learners, debating, syllabus overage and support supervision among others.
- Mushunga PS: had a SIP for 2023 displayed on school notice board. Planned activities to improve academic performance included regular preparations by teachers, extra teaching and giving monthly tests to learners.
- Ryakahimbi PS: There was evidence of a SIP 2023 displayed on school notice board. Planned activities to improve academic performance included refresher trainings, lesson planning and scheming

Therefore, the submission of annual school reports with enclosed copies of SIPs stood at 100% hence the score is 4.

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 4:</li> <li>• Between 90 – 99% score 2</li> <li>• Below 90% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>We obtained and reviewed the list of schools from LG performance contract and the EMIS data of schools from MoES. We established that the list of government aided primary schools (109) captured in 2022-2023 Approved Performance contract_893_Mitooma District was consistent with the number of schools (109) in excel data sheet (EMIS) for FY 2022/23.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

**Human Resource Management and Development**

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Mitooma district budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of (7) teachers per school or a teacher per class in all the (109) Government aided primary schools as per wage provision. The 2023-2024 Approved budget estimates Vote: 893_Mitooma District had a total salary budget of UGX.5,606,113,000 for (1,007) primary teachers in all the 109 UPE schools.</p> <p>We noted that, Rwenshama PS had the lowest number of teachers (7) with total enrolment of (370) pupils. While Nkinga PS had the highest number of teachers (16) with total enrolment of 981 pupils. The score is 4.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score 3 else score: 0

The primary schools staff deployment list 2023 obtained from the DEO's office and reviewed, indicated that a total of (1,007) teachers were deployed in (109) UPE schools as per sector guidelines e.g. all the (109) UPE schools had a minimum of (7) teachers per school or a minimum of one (1) teacher per class for schools with less than P.7. This includes the (4) Cope centers.

Verification was done in 3 sampled UPE school and the following was established as per the teacher deployment list 2023 / school staff lists.

□ The number of teachers (10) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (10) in Mushunga primary school, Mushunga S/C.

□ The number of teachers (16) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (16) in Ryakahimbi primary school, Mitooma TC.

□ The number of teachers (14) on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (14) in Bitooma Primary school, Katenga S/C

We established that the number of teachers on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers on school staff lists in all the (3) sampled UPE schools. This was further confirmed by checking the teachers' attendance books. The score is 3.

1

7

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

score: 1 else, score: 0

There was evidence that teacher deployment data had been displayed on school notice boards in all the 03 sampled UPE schools as indicated below:

□ Mushunga PS (Mushunga S/C) the deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (10) teachers i.e. Male (4) and Female (6)

□ Ryakahimbi PS (Mitooma TC) the deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (16) teachers i.e. Male (8) and Female (8)

□ Bitooma Central PS (Katenga S/C) the deployment staff list displayed on the notice board had (14) teachers i.e. Male (5) and Female (9). The score is 1.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

**There was no evidence** that all primary school head teachers had been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO. Some appraisals **were not done** and others were **out side the stipulated timelines**. Some files reviewed included the following:

1. Nabasa John Baptist, the headteacher of Kikunyu Primary School in Kashenshero Sub County was appraised by Barungi Peace, District Education Officer on September 28, 2022.
2. Tuhaismwe Levi, the headteacher of Nyakatsiro Primary School in Rutokye Town Council **was not appraised**.
3. Birungi Grace, the headteacher of Kitaka Primary School in Kanyabwanga Sub County was appraised by Evidence Richard, Senior Assistant Secretary on **January 20, 2023**.
4. Kenyatta Lawrence, the headteacher of Rwentookye Primary School in Mitooma Sub County **was not appraised**.
5. Begumisa Amos, the headteacher of Kisiizi Primary School in Kiyanga Sub County was appraised by Ashabaahebwa Rachael, Senior Assistant Secretary on September 01, 2022.
6. Atukwatse Janeffer, the headteacher of Rwagashani Primary School in Katenga Sub County was appraised by Barungi Peace, District Education Officer on **February 19, 2023**.
7. Bainomukama Remigio, the headteacher of Kashongerero Primary School in Kigyende Sub County **was not appraised**.
8. Nuwamanya Richard, the headteacher of Rwenshama Primary School in Kanyabwanga Sub County was appraised by Barungi Peace, District Education Officer on **April 19, 2023**.
9. Abarishaba Jacinta, the headteacher of Kirambi Primary School in Mitooma Sub County was appraised by Ndyabahika Jacos, Senior Education Officer on October 03, 2022.
10. Ashaba Venus, the headteacher of Rwempungu Primary School in Kanyabwanga Sub County was appraised by Ndyabahika Jacos, Senior Education Officer on September 30, 2022.

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM. HRM did not have appraisal folders for secondary school headteachers.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans. Some of the files reviewed included the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The District Education Officer, Barungi Peace was not appraised.</li> <li>2. The Senior Inspector of Schools, Tushabe Jane was not appraised.</li> <li>3. The Inspector of Schools, Kyomugisha Shallon was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 07, 2023 .</li> <li>4. The Inspector of Schools, Namudu Aisha was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on March 28, 2023 .</li> <li>5. The Inspector of Schools, Atwiine Angella was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 07, 2023 .</li> <li>6. The Inspector of Schools, Baryayebwa Rughina Joshua was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 07, 2023 .</li> <li>7. The Senior Education Officer, Ndyabahika Jacos Dickens was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on April 12, 2023 .</li> <li>8. The Sports Officer, Twezirikire Amuram was not appraised.</li> </ol>	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>There was evidence of a Training Plan for Education Department FY 2022/23. The plan was signed by the District education officer (DEO) and dated 8 August 2022.</p> <p>☞ The plan highlighted the following training activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Capacity building for district based education staff on (i) education management in LGs and (ii) Roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders in the improvement of performance in schools</li> <li>☐ Training head teachers and teachers on the new curriculum in relation to assessment</li> </ul>	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>We noted from the DEO, that the education department was compliant and had no errors for correction regarding the submitted school lists and enrolment data in PBS for 2022_2023 Approved Performance Contrat_893_Mitooma District which was submitted to MoFPED.</p> <p>Therefore, there was no need of communicating corrections/ revisions of school lists and enrolment data submitted in PBS as well as adjusting the IPFs for Mitooma District.</p> <p>The score is 2</p>	2
---	---	---	--	---

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>We obtained and reviewed the LG Approved budget estimates FY 2022/23- Vote: 893- Mitooma District and established that under budget output: 000023 Inspection and monitoring; Ugx.68,274,000 was budgeted of which Ugx.63,274,000 was spent on inspection and monitoring functions in line with MoES guidelines -page 17. Monitoring, inspection and support supervision reports were on file.</p> <p>The score is 2.</p>	2
---	---	--	--	---



9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p>	<p>Mitooma DLG timeliness of warranting schools' capitation grants for the school year 2023 i.e. FY2022/2023 and FY2023/2024 was tested in the three terms as follows:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>Term1 (which was quarter 3 FY2022/2023) cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The CAO warranted 19th January 2023 and the disbursements made on 19th January 2023 (21 days).</p>	
			<p>For Term 2 (which was quarter 4 FY2022/2023), MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2023 and the CAO warranted on 19th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 24th April 2023 (13 days).</p>	
			<p>For Term 3 (which was quarter 1 FY2023/2024), the MoFPED circular is dated 6th July 2023, the CAO warranted on 20th July 2023 and the funds were transferred on 24th July 2023 (14 days).</p>	
			<p>In all the three cases, the 5 days' time limit for warranting was not met.</p>	
9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that DEO had communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED as indicated below:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>□ QTR3 Expenditure limits FY 2022/23 were communicated through MoFPED release circular dated 29 December 2022. Warranting approval and invoicing of capitation grant to schools done on 19 January 2023. The DEO communicated to all head teachers of government primary and secondary schools on 23 January 2023 (16 days). This was not compliant to the three working days of release from MoFPED.</p>	
			<p>□ QTR4 Expenditure limits FY 2022/23 were communicated through MoFPED release circular dated 6 April 2023. Warranting approval dated 19 April 2023 while invoicing of capitation grant to schools was done on 24 April 2023. The DEO communicated to all head teachers of government primary and secondary schools on 26 April 2023 (13 days). This was not compliant to the three working days of release from MoFPED.</p>	
			<p>□ QTR 1 Expenditure limits FY 2023/24 were communicated through MoFPED release circular dated 6 July 2023. The DEO communicated to all head teachers of government primary and secondary schools on 18August 2023 (30 days). This was not compliant to the three working days of release from MoFPED.</p>	

Verification done in the sampled (3) UPE schools revealed that there was evidence of display of capitation releases on school notice boards in all the 3 sampled UPE schools as indicated below:

Mushunga PS: The display contained capitation releases for;

□ Q3 of FY 2022/23 (term1 2023), Ugx.3,176,000 dated 17 March 2023

□ Q4 of FY 2022/3 (term II 2023), Ugx.3,176,000 dated 16 June 2023

□ Q1 of FY 2023/24 (term1II 2023), Ugx.3,698,800 dated 22 September 2023

Ryakahimbi PS: The display indicated UPE funds releases for;

□ Q3 FY2022/3 (term I 2023), Ugx.1,610,000 dated 22 February 2023

□ Q4 FY 2022/3 (term II 2023), Ugx.1,610,000 dated 16 June 2023

□ Q1 FY 2023/4 (term III 2023), Ugx.4,616,400 dated 22 September 2023

Bitooma PS: The display indicated UPE funds releases for;

□ Q3 FY2022/3 (term I 2023), Ugx.3,030,000 dated 22 February 2023

□ Q4 FY 2022/3 (term II 2023), Ugx.3,030,000 dated 16 June 2023

□ Q1 FY 2023/4 (term III 2023), Ugx.3,530,000 dated 22 September 2023

The DEO 's communication/publicization of capitation releases was not done within the three working days of release from MoFPED for all the three quarters as indicated above. The score is 0.

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"> <li>• If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the education department prepared the schools' annual work plan FY 2022/23. The work plan was submitted to DES on 27 September 2022.</p> <p>The annual inspection work plan highlighted the following activities: school inspection and supervision for enhancement of quality education, assess the quality of management resources and classroom environment, assess the supervision of teaching and learning, monitoring and evaluation of staff deployment and development, and monitoring the implementation of government policies and guidelines.</p> <p>Minutes of inspectors of schools preparatory meetings for term III of 2022, term I of 2023 and term II of 2023 were on file dated 5 September 2022, 5 January 2023 and 15 May 2023 respectively. Allocation of schools to inspectors was done during the meetings. The score is 2.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score: 2</li> <li>• Between 80 - 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of three (3) school inspection reports as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ School Inspection Report on Supervision of schools for Term III of 2022 dated 07 December 2022. The inspection covered 97 out of 109 UPE schools/Cope centers representing 89%.</li> <li>□ E-Primary School Inspection report for Term I of 2023, dated 9 July 2023. Conducted from May to July 2023 and covered 99 out of 109 UPE schools/Cope centers representing 91%.</li> <li>□ E-Primary school inspection report for Term II of 2023 dated 28 August 2023. A total of 93 out of 109 UPE schools/Cope centers were inspected representing 85%.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the, the percentage of UPE schools inspected stood at 88%, the score are 1.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the three inspection reports were presented and discussed during departmental staff meetings. Specific details below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Minutes of departmental meeting held on 21 February 2023. The meeting discussed the inspection findings for Term III 2022 under Min.3 (a)/EDUCA/2023. Issues highlighted included inadequate latrine stances in schools like Rukararwe PS, Nyaruzinga PS &amp; Rwempungu PS, and inadequate classrooms in some schools compared to enrolment data. It was recommended that parents be mobilized to raise funds for the renovation of classrooms and construction of latrine stances.</li> </ul>	2

□ Minutes of departmental meeting and induction of new inspectors held on 2 May 2023. The meeting discussed the inspection findings for Term I 2023 under Min.12/EDUC/2023. The meeting discussed the poor state of a temporary 2 classroom block at Rwenshama PS, and inadequate latrine stances at Rwempungu progressive PS.

□ Minutes of departmental meeting held on 1 September 2023. The meeting discussed the inspection findings for Term II 2023 under Min.31/EDUC/2023. Issues discussed included lesson planning, display of instructional materials, use of hand washing facilities, use of TELA, and financial management.

□ We noted evidenced of dissemination of inspection report findings as indicated; Term III 2022 inspection findings disseminated on 10 December 2022, term I 2023 inspection findings disseminated on 8 May 2023 and term II 2023 inspection findings disseminated on 11 September 2023. All the dissemination meetings were held at Mitooma Town council offices in the Council Hall.

Verification was done at school level through the review of inspection files in the (3) sampled UPE schools, and established that:

□ Bitooma Central PS in Katenga S/C; had evidence of (3) feedback inspection report dated 12 November 2023, 4 April 2023 and 6 October 2022. Inspection visits were conducted by the senior inspector of schools (SIS) and inspector of schools (IS).

□ Mushunga PS in Mitooma S/C; had evidence of (3) feedback inspection reports on file dated 4 April 2023, 10 July 2023 and 30 June 2023 by SIS.

□ Ryakahimbi PS in Mitooma TC; had evidence of (4) inspection feedback reports on file dated 15 October 2023, 22 June 2023, 12 April 2023 and 18 July 2022 by IS.

As above, there was evidence that all the 3 inspection reports for Term III 2022, Term I 2023 and Term II 2023 were presented and discussed at departmental level. The score is 2.

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0

There was evidence of submission of three (3) inspection reports to DES as indicated below:

- School inspection report for Term 3 of 2022 was submitted and received by DES secretary (Tooko Victoria ) on 13 December 2022 (signed & stamped)
- School inspection report for Term 1 of 2023 was submitted and received by DES Secretary (Mbabazi Eva) on 13 October 2023
- School inspection report for Term II of 2023 was submitted and received by DES Secretary (Tooko Victoria) on 20 September 2023

Verification was done through the review of inspection files in the (3) sampled UPE schools and established that copies of the inspection reports from the previous three terms were left behind as required in all the (3) sampled schools as indicated below;

□ Bitooma Central PS in Katenga S/C; had evidence of (3) feedback inspection reports on file dated 12 November 2023, 4 April 2023 and 6 October 2022. Inspection visits were conducted by the senior inspector of schools (SIS) and inspector of schools (IS).

□ Mushunga PS in Mitooma S/C; had evidence of (3) feedback inspection reports on file dated 4 April 2023, 10 July 2023 and 30 June 2023 by SIS.

□ Ryakahimbi PS in Mitooma TC; had evidence of (4) inspection feedback reports on file dated 15 October 2023, 22 June 2023, 12 April 2023 and 18 July 2022 by IS.

As above, all the (3) inspection reports were submitted to DES and the inspection reports from the previous three terms were left behind, the score is 2.

Routine oversight and monitoring

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

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

Education and Health issues at MDLG are handled by the Education and Health Sectoral Committee of Council. Here below are some examples of committee meetings where Education specific issues were presented and discussed in FY2022/2023.

Minutes of the Education and Health Sectoral Committee which sat on 16/09/2022 per minute number (MIN.17/E&HC/2022 - SPECIFIC SECTORAL CONCERNS). An independent account to be opened to handle locally generated funds in the Education sector. Need to expedite the process of replacing teachers who absconded. An increase of co-curricular and exam funds from UGX300 to UGX4,500 and UGX6,000 to UGX10,000 respectively. Identified staff due for retirement should be submitted.

Minutes of the Education and Health Sectoral Committee which sat on 08/12/2022 per minute number (MIN.26/E&HC/2022 - SPECIFIC SECTORAL CONCERNS). Nyakizinga Seed SS proposed due to long distance to access a secondary school. A technical instructors training course was proposed to replace Teachers Instructors and Education Training at Bikungu PTC.

Minutes of the Education and Health Sectoral Committee which sat on 20/04/2023 discussed Education issues as per minute (MIN.12/EDUC&HC/2023 - MATTERS ARISING FROM 3 & 4). Kyeibare and Katerera P/Ss projects were completed. A report on withheld PLE results of Mayanga P/S to be compiled and submitted. Members resolved that a refresher course be organised for headteachers in form of capacity building. Followup to be done for identified GoU aided schools Nyakateete SS and Rwoburunga Seed School.

For FY2022/2023 MDLG Education issues were handled by the Council through its Education and Health Sectoral Standing Committee.

11

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

*Maximum 2 points on this performance measure*

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, *score: 2 or else score: 0*

There was evidence that the LG Education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school as indicated below:

- PTA general meeting held on 29 June 2023 at Nyakanoni PS; under Min.6/2023, the DEO appealed to parents to look after their children by feeding them well, planting of trees and to avoid domestic violence in their homes or families.
- During the beginning of term II 2023 primary head teachers meeting held on 7 June 2023. The DEO highlighted the need for increased enrolment and retention of pupils in schools.

The score is 2.

## **Investment Management**

Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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

The information on the LG education department consolidated asset register for FY 2022/23 and school asset registers of the sampled 3 UPE schools was verified.

We noted that the education department prepared and submitted an asset register in the prescribed format (Planning, Budgeting and Implementation Guidelines for the Education and Sports Sub-Program FY 2023-2024- page 57).

The verification process carried out in the three sampled UPE schools showed that the LG had accurate and up-to date asset register as indicated below:

□ Mushunga PS: The education department consolidated school's asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (09) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (103) desks and teacher accommodation (03), while the school asset register had (09) classrooms, (10) latrine stances, (103) desks and teacher accommodation (03). Information was consistent

□ Ryakahimbi PS: The education department consolidated schools' asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (12) classrooms, (23) latrine stances, (205) desks and teacher accommodation (04), while the school asset register had (12) classrooms, (23) latrine stances, (205) desks and teacher accommodation (04). Information was consistent

□ Bitooma Central PS: The education department consolidated schools' asset register for FY 2022/23 indicated that the school had (10) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (178) desks and teacher accommodation (01), while the school asset register had (10) classrooms, (20) latrine stances, (178) desks and teacher accommodation (01). Information was consistent.

Based on the above, the asset register was up to date in all the 3 sampled UPE schools. The score is 2.



Planning and budgeting for investments

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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, *score: 1 or else, score: 0*

For FY 2022/2023, the MDLG Education department had the following infrastructural projects:

- 📌 Construction of toilet at Igambiro P/S in Igambiro S/C UGX23,000,000
- 📌 Construction of classroom block at Kyeibaare P/S Kyeibaare S/C UGX68,586,000
- 📌 Construction of classroom block at Katunda P/S Katunda S/C UGX68,586,000
- 📌 Construction of classroom block at Rubirizi P/S in Ruburuzi S/C UGX68,586,000
- 📌 Construction of classroom block at Katerera P/S Kati S/C UGX68,586,000

A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.

- Derived from the LG Development Plan
- Consistent with sector guidelines & DDEG objectives
- Financially feasible
- Having costed project profiles.

Evidence of desk appraisals for all the five (05) MDLG Education Department projects for FY2022/2023 was availed/seen.

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>For FY 2022/2023, the Education department had the following infrastructural projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>🏗️ Construction of toilet at Igambiro P/S in Igambiro S/C UGX23,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Construction of classroom block at Kyeibaare P/S Kyeibaare S/C UGX68,586,000</li> <li>🏗️ Construction of classroom block at Katunda P/S Katunda S/C UGX68,586,000</li> <li>🏗️ Construction of classroom block at Rubirizi P/S in Ruburuzi S/C UGX68,586,000</li> <li>🏗️ Construction of classroom block at Katerera P/S Kati S/C UGX68,586,000</li> </ul> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Technical feasibility</li> <li>-Environmental and social acceptability requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of field appraisals for all the five (05) MDLG Education Department projects for FY2022/2023 was availed/ seen.</p>	<b>1</b>
----	--	---	---	----------

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is evidence that Mitooma DLG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. As per the amended Approved Work Plan for FY 2023-24 dated 17/7/2023, the following projects were incorporated in the AWP and Procurement Plans for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of kitojo Seed Secondary School; Budgeted at UGX 435,640,000/=.</li> <li>2. Construction of 2 Classroom Block at Katunda P/S, Mitooma S/C; Budgeted at UGX 82,000,000/=.</li> <li>3. Construction of a 5 Stance Lined Latrines at Rubirizi &amp; Kisizi Primary Schools; Budgeted at UGX 47,000,000/=.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
----	--	--	---	----------

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There is evidence that School infrastructure Projects were approved by the Contracts Committee (C.C) before commencement of Works as listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Construction of Kitojo Seed Secondary School, Kashenshero S / C</b> - MoES/UGIFT/WRKS/2021-2022/0002. Cleared by the Solicitor General through letter dated 18/10/2022. Approved by the CC under Min. No. 065/April/2022 in a meeting held on 20/4/2022.</li> <li>2. <b>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Kyeibare P/S, Mutara S/C-MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00006.</b> Approved by the CC under Min. No. 026/CC/2022/2023 in a meeting held on 28/11/2022.</li> <li>3. <b>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Katerera P/S, Kanyabwanga S/C-MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00007.</b> Approved by the CC under Min. No. 035/CC/2022/2023 in a meeting held on 24/01/2023.</li> </ol>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the PIT for the school construction projects constructed within the last FY (2022/23) as per guidelines.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• A copy of joint appointment by the CAO of the members of the PIT (i.e. Contract Manager/DEO, District Environment Officer, DCDO and Labour Officer) for Construction Works under Education Department dated 15/8/2022 was present; Another appointment letter dated 24/6/2022 for the Clerk of Works (COW) by the CAO to specifically supervise Kitojo Seed Secondary School was present. Another copy of joint appointment by the CAO of the members of the PIT (i.e. PCDO, Environment Officer and Labour Officer) for construction works at Kitojo Seed Secondary School was present. However, no COW and Project Manager were assigned to other school construction projects. The following Projects were considered.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of Kitojo Seed Secondary School.</li> <li>2. Construction of a 2 CR Block at Kyeibare P/S, Mutara S/C</li> <li>3. Construction of a 2 CR Block at Katerera P/S, Kanyabwanga S/C</li> </ol>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Seed School Infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES,</p>	1

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

technical designs provided by the MoES

Score: 1, else, score: 0

The sampled project was: Construction of Seed Secondary School at Kitojo in Kashenshero S/C. It comprised of the following components: 3 2-CR blocks, 3 2-unit staff houses, 1 administration block, 1 unit science laboratory block, 3 2-unit teachers kitchens, 2 5-stance VIP latrines, 3 2-stance VIP latrine, 1 ICT library and 1 main purpose hall, 5000L water tanks;

1. **3 2-Classroom Blocks-** were implemented following Standard technical designs with each classroom block measuring 8800x6970mm on the exterior constructed in 230mm thick concrete block work. All structures were plastered with cement/sand mortar and awaiting roofing works
2. **1 unit science laboratory block-** comprised of 2 science rooms and 2 preparation rooms. The overall size was 8840x8780mm; constructed in 230mm thick concrete block work. The structure was plastered with cement/sand mortar and awaiting roofing works.
3. **The administration block-** overall size; 33630x11230mm; constructed in 230mm thick concrete block work. The structure was plastered with cement/sand mortar and awaiting roofing works.
4. **3 2-unit staff houses-** overall size; 13800x7100mm; constructed in 230mm thick concrete block work. The structure was plastered with cement/sand mortar awaiting roofing works.
5. **3 2-unit staff kitchen-** overall size; 7100x3120mm; constructed in 230mm thick concrete block work; The structure was plastered with cement/sand mortar awaiting roofing works.
6. **2 5-stance VIP latrine (boys and girls)-** overall size; 6650x3020mm; constructed in 230mm thick concrete block. The structure was plastered with cement/sand mortar awaiting roofing works.
7. **3 2-stance VIP latrine-** overall size; 4650x3020mm; constructed in 230mm thick concrete block work. The structure was plastered with cement/sand mortar awaiting roofing works.
8. **1 Multipurpose Hall-** overall size; 8810x7000mm; constructed in 230mm thick concrete block work. The structure was plastered with cement/sand mortar awaiting roofing works.
9. **1 Computer Laboratory/Library-** overall size; 11740x8070mm; constructed in 230mm thick concrete block work. The structure was plastered with cement/sand mortar awaiting roofing works.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was NO evidence that monthly Site Meetings were conducted for School infrastructure projects during the previous FY (2022/2023),  1. The following reports with the mentioned dates were present: 21/11/2022, 2/1/2023, 2/2/2023, 12/6/2023, 28/7/2023. However, there were no reports for the months of: December 2022, March-May 2023, and August-November 2023. 2. The following Minutes of meetings with the mentioned dates were present: 21/10/2022, 6/12/2022, 6/4/2023, 28/6/2023. however, there were no minutes of meetings for the months of: November 2022, January-March 2023, May 2023 and July-November 2023.  The sampled school is Kitojo Seed Secondary School	0
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 is 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.  Monthly joint technical supervisions of the construction of planned sector infrastructure projects were regular (with regards to critical stages) and included some key staff e.g environment officer and CDO.  The sampled projects are listed below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Construction of Kitojo Seed Secondary School-</b> with minutes of meetings dated; 21/10/2022, 6/12/2022, 6/4/2023, 28/6/2023.</li> <li>2. <b>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Kyeibare P/S, Mutara S/C-</b> with joint inspection reports dated: 24/3/2023 and 22/3/2023. And minutes of meetings dated: 5/1/2023, 31/3/2023, 26/6/2023 and 12/10/2023.</li> <li>3. <b>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Katerera P/S, Kanyabwanga S/C-</b> with minutes of meeting dated: 4/4/2023 and 27/6/2023.</li> </ol>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

*Maximum 9 points on this performance measure*

g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, *score: 1, else score: 0*

Five (05) MDLG Education projects of FY2022/2023 were sampled to check certification and timeliness of effecting payments for infrastructure projects.

Payment to Twin Technical and Building Construction Co. Ltd for Construction of 2 classroom block at Katerera P/S in Kanyabwanga S/C (UGX68,406,263) – Requisition dated 06/06/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 05/06/2023 and payment on 15/06/2023 (9 days).

Payment to Be-Camel Uganda Ltd for construction of two (02) 5 stance lined latrines at Kanyabwanga P/S (UGX44,991,880) – Requisition dated 09/05/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 16/03/2023 and payment on 26/05/2023 (17 days).

Payment to Twin Technical and Building Construction Co. Ltd for Construction of 2 classroom block at Kyeibare P/S in Mutara S/C (UGX69,693,596) – Requisition dated 06/06/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 06/06/2023 and payment on 15/06/2023 (9 days).

Payment to Twin Technical and Building Construction Co. Ltd for Construction of 2 classroom block and 5 stance latrine at Kibungo P/S in Kanyabwanga S/C (UGX4,493,729) – Requisition dated 17/01/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 17/01/2023 and payment on 27/02/2023 (40 days).

Payment to SAGM Technical Services Ltd for construction of Kitojo Seed S.S (UGX546,773,166) – Requisition dated 06/06/2023, certified by the District Engineer, District Education Officer, CDO, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CAO on 02/06/2023 and payment on 15/06/2023 (9 days).

In two (02) of the five (05) sampled projects, payments were effected beyond the 14 days' time limit.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution  <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	There is evidence that Mitooma DLG Education Department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit on 19/03/2022.  . The following projects were included among other Works/Supplies;  1. Construction of 2-Classroom Blocks at: Kyeibare P/S, Mutara T/C and Katerera P/S, Kanyabwange S/C. 2. Construction of a Seed Secondary School at Kitojo SS, Kashenshero S/C 3. Renovation of a 2 Classroom block at Ruganda P/S, Rurehe S/C	<b>1</b>
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 <i>score 1 or else score 0</i>	There is evidence that Mitooma DLG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA.  The files included: the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals. The project Files sampled included one seed school as listed below;  1. <b>Construction of Kitojo Seed Secondary School, Kashenshero S / C</b> - MoES/UGIFT/WRKS/2021-2022/0002. Approved by the CC under Min. No. 065/April/2022 in a meeting held on 20/4/2022. The Contract Document was signed on 21/10/2022. 2. <b>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Kyeibare P/S, Mutara S/C-MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00006.</b> Approved by the CC under Min. No. 026/CC/2022/2023 in a meeting held on 28/11/2022. The Contract was awarded on 9/2/2023. 3. <b>Construction of a 2 Classroom Block at Katerera P/S, Kanyabwanga S/C-MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00007.</b> Approved by the CC under Min. No. 035/CC/2022/2023 in a meeting held on 24/01/2023. The Contract was awarded on 19/12/2022.	<b>1</b>

## Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence</b> that grievances were recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework</p>	<b>0</b>
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of dissemination of environment guidelines for schools as per the signed dissemination letter dated 10 August 2022.</p> <p>The environment guidelines for schools highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Construction of school infrastructure should not be done in wetlands</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Screening of construction projects</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Proper solid management</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Social safeguards</li> </ul> <p>We noted copies of the school environment guidelines on file in all the 3 sampled UPE schools (Bitooma Central PS, Mushunga PS and Ryakahimbi PS). The score is 3.</p>	<b>3</b>



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, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG had in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A costed ESMP for the construction of 2 classroom block at Kyeibare P/s <b>Proc ref No MITO893/WRKS/22-22/00006</b> was prepared on 13/7/22, at cost of Ugx 650,000 signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, the costed ESMP was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents under element 5 for environmental restoration in item A to D at cost of Ugx 380,000</li> <li>2. A costed ESMP for the construction of Kitojo seed secondary school <b>Proc ref No MOES/UGIF/WRKS/21-22/00002/LOT 15</b> was prepared on 6/7/2022, at cost of Ugx 60,000,000 signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, the costed ESMP was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents in bill No 11 for external works and land scaping uner item A to b at tune of 15,887,500</li> <li>3. A costed ESMP for the construction of 2 classroom block at Katerera P/s <b>Proc ref No MITO893/WRKS/22-22/00002</b> was prepared on 19/7/22, at cost of Ugx 350,000 signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, the costed ESMP was incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents under element 5 for environmental restoration in item A to D at cost of Ugx 380,000</li> </ol>	2
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments  <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	There <b>was evidence</b> for proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consent allowing for the construction of a classroom block Katerera P/s was signed and stamped by Rev. Fr. Meshach K on 8/10/23.</li> </ol>	1

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 <b>was evidence</b> 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</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support supervision and monitoring construction of 2 classroom block at Kyeibare P/s was carried out on 20/1/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 20/1/23, 2/2/23, 24/3/23, 17/4/23 and 16/6/23, the project started on 23/9/22 and ended on 23/6/23.</li> <li>2. Support supervision and monitoring construction of 2 classroom block at Katerera P/s was carried out on 9/12/22, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 9/12/22, 22/1/23, 20/2/23, 27/2/23, 14/3/23, 25/5/23 and 16/6/23 the project started on 28/9/22 and ended on 22/6/23.</li> <li>3. Support supervision and monitoring the construction of Kitojo seed secondary school was carried out on 20/1/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 20/1/23, 2/2/23, 22/3/23, 17/4/23 and 16/6/23 the project started on 3/12/21 and and still on going.</li> </ol>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) If the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else score:0</i></p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the E&amp;S certifications were approved and signed by the environmental officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. E&amp;S certifications for the construction of 2 classroom block at Kyeibare P/s were prepared and approved on 16/6/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, payments were made on 29/6/23</li> <li>2. E&amp;S certifications for the construction construction of Kitojo seed secondary school were prepared and approved on 16/6/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, payments were made on 29/7/23</li> <li>3. E&amp;S certifications for the construction construction of 2 classroom block at Katerera P/s were prepared and approved on 16/6/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, payments were made on 22/6/23</li> </ol>	1

**Health  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 20% or more, score 2</li> <li>• Less than 20%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There <b>was no evidence to confirm whether</b> Mitooma DLG registered an increased utilization of healthcare services, with a specific focus on total deliveries. The computation of healthcare services utilization was guided by the instructions provided during the orientation of Health Specialists, which indicated that the computation should be based on all the HCIIIs and HCIVs.</p> <p>Mitooma DLG had six (6) HC IIIs and one (1) HC IV conducting deliveries in FY 2022/2023. The assessment team reviewed the annual reports (HMIS 107) for all HC IIIs and HC IV for FY 2021/2022 and compared them with FY 2022/2023. The findings are as follows:</p> <p>The total number of deliveries for FY 2021/2022 was <b>5,563</b> and for FY 2022/2023, it was <b>5,622</b>, representing an overall increase of 1.1% in deliveries.</p> <p>As a result, Mitooma DLG did not achieve the recommended 20% increase in the utilization of healthcare services, as required by the performance measure.</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% and above, score 2</li> <li>• 50% - 69%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 50%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The performance of MDLG in its LLG FY2022/2023 Health assessment was 76%, making the score fall in the range '70% and above'</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% and above; score 2</li> <li>• 65 - 74%; score 1</li> <li>• Below 65; score 0</li> </ul>	<p>This indicator is not applicable in this round of assessment due to changes in the management of the RBF program by the MoH.</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.	Mitooma DLG Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023 shows that UGX454,976,000 was budgeted for the health development grant. The total amount spent was UGX UGX451,768,000 (MDLG Annual Performance Report, Page 17).	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>🏗️ Construction of theatre at Bitereko HCIII GX1,031,793,148</li> <li>🏗️ Construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Mayanga HCIII UGX174,832,340</li> <li>🏗️ Upgrage of Kigyenge HCII to HCIII UGX670,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Upgrage of Mitooma HCIV to general hospital UGX1,500,000,000</li> <li>🏗️ Upgrage of Bitereko HCIII to HCIV UGX218,151,627</li> </ul>	
			These activities were all eligible under the Health Development Grant guidelines. They didn't involve purchase of land, procurement of vehicles etc. (MoH, Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments, 2020/2021)	
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	For Mitooma DLG Health two (02) infrastructural project payments in FY2022/2023 were sampled to test for certification before payments.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		Payment to Bitereko Hardware and Building Construction Ltd for construction and completion of 2 in 1 staff house at Mayanga HCII (UGX61,934,376) – Requisition dated 16/06/2023, certified by District Engineer, DHO, Environment Officer, CDO and CAO on 09/06/2023 and payment on 15/06/2023.	
			Payment to Bitereko Hardware and Building Construction Ltd for construction and completion of 2 in 1 staff house at Mayanga HCII (UGX95,711,056) – Requisition dated 17/03/2023, certified by District Engineer, DHO, Environment Officer, CDO and CAO on 17/03/2023 and payment on 05/04/2023.	
			In both (02) sampled projects, certification for Education infrastructural projects was effected in accordance with the requirements.	

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	There is evidence that the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates.	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		From the DE and DHO, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineer's estimate (Budgets) Vs. the contract price are as listed with the corresponding Variation percentages; [(A - B)/A]*100%:	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Construction of a 2 in 1 Staff House at Mayanga HC II- MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00008.</b> The Engineer's Estimate (A) was UGX 170,000,000/=; the contract Sum/Price (B) was UGX 164,122,660/=. The Variation was at 3.45%.</li> </ol>	
			•	
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY	There is evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY (2022/23) were completed as per work plan by end of the FY.	1
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100 % Score 2</li> <li>Between 80 and 99% score 1</li> <li>less than 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	According to the work plan of the previous FY 2022/23, for the Upgrade of Mayanga HC II, all construction works were to be completed, project commissioned, defects liability period completed, all payments made (including retention) and project closed. During site inspection, it was noted that the project is currently completed and the defects liability period expired. The building structure has already been occupied and is under use. However, the project has not been officially commissioned and the retention payment has not been made yet to the contractor. The project contract document was signed on 17/2/2021.	

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

There **was evidence to confirm that Mitoma DLG** recruited staffs for all the six HC IIIs and one HC IV, in accordance with the staffing structure. The staffing structure provided by the District Health Office (DHO) indicated that HC IVs were required to have 49 staff, while HC IIIs were required to have 19 health workers.

According to the approved budget for FY 2023/2024, the allocated conditional sector conditional grant for wages was **UGX 4,279,306,000**. This allocation covered the wages of 138 staff members out of the required 182, as per the staffing norms for the available HC IVs and HC IIIs. This indicates that only **75.6%** of the health worker positions for the available HC IVs and HC IIIs were filled. The breakdown of the percentage of health worker positions filled for these facilities is provided below.

1. **Mitoma HC IV:** 41 staff were deployed out of 48 required staffing norms. This represents 83.7% of filled positions.
2. **Kabira HC III:** 12 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 63.2% of filled positions.
3. **Mutara HC III:** 13 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 68.4% of filled positions.
4. **Bitereko HC III:** 15 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 78.9% of filled positions.
5. **Rwoburunga HC III:** 11 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 57.9% of filled positions.
6. **Kashenshero HC III:** 16 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 84.2% of filled positions.
7. **Kanyabwanga HC III:** 14 staff were deployed out of 19 required staffing norms. This represents 73.7% of filled positions.

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

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

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

- If 100 % score 2 or else score 0

There is evidence that Mitooma DLG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs. From the health infrastructure inventory dated 6/12/2023, there are four HC II to HC III upgraded facilities as listed below:

1. Bukuba HC
2. Nyakishojwa HC
3. Mayanga HC
4. Ryengyerero HC

- As per the health infrastructure inventory, all facility constructions are complete and functional and they conform to the approved designs. This inventory also includes a recent health facility upgrade i.e. Mayanga HC II to HC III upgrade that was physically inspected during the assessment on 7/12/2023 and was found to conform to the MoH approved designs.

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that information given by Mitooma DLG** on position of health workers filled accurate as evidenced by the findings from three (3) sampled facilities. The assessment team reviewed the staff list for FY 2023/2024 and compared it with the staff lists found at the sampled facilities. The details of the findings were as follows.

1. **Kanshenshero HC III:** 16 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the DHO. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the DHO and the list found at the facility.
2. **Mutara HC III:** 13 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the DHO. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the DHO and the list found at the facility.
3. **Mitooma HC IV:** 41 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the DHO. There was no observed deviation between the staff list obtained from the DHO and the list found at the facility.

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 <b>was evidence to confirm that information</b> provided by Mitooma DLG on health facilities constructed and functional was accurate. The list obtained from the DHO showed that the department undertook correction of the upgrade of Mayanga HC II to HCIII level &amp; construction of staff house at Mayanga HC III.</p> <p>The assessment team reviewed LGs’s quarterly PBS report (Quarter 4), which was submitted by Turyasasira Edith on 15-09-2023. It was established that the information regarding their status and functionality was accurate.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that health facilities</b> in Mitooma DLG prepared and submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets to the DHO by March 31st of the FY 2022/2023 as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector.</p> <p>The assessment team sampled three health facilities which included Mitooma HC IV, Bitereko HC III, Kashenshero HC III . Findings are detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Kashenshero HC III:</b> submitted it’s annual workplan and budget to the DHO 2nd March 2023 by Dr Nabimanya Tanazio, the health facility in charge and was endorsed by HUMC Chairperson (Katusiime Olivia Shaila).</li> <li>2. <b>Bitereko HC III:</b> Submitted its annual workplan and budget to the DHO on 22nd March 2023 by the facility in charge Aryaturinda Ananias and was endorsed by the HUMC chairperson- Mukinga Viscent.</li> <li>3. <b>Mitooma HC III:</b> Submitted it’s annual workplan and budget to the DHO on 15th March 2023 by the facility incharge; Dr Taremwa Julus.</li> </ol> <p>The assessment team noted that all the submitted Annual Workplans &amp; budgets for the three sampled health facilities were submitted timely and where in line with the recommended by the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector.</p>	2



6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There <b>was no evidence to confirm whether</b> health facilities of Mitooma DLG prepared and submitted to the DHO Annual Budget Performance Reports for the FY 2022/2023 by July 15th of the as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines. The assessment team randomly sampled three health (Mitooma HC IV, Bitereko HC III, Kashenshero HC III and established that these did not submit their Annual Budget Performance Reports for FY 2022/2023 to the DHO. By the end of day two of the assessment exercise in the district, no evidence was shared with the assessment team in this regards.</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>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score 2 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was <b>no evidence to confirm whether</b> health facilities in Mitooma DLG had developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports. The assessment team randomly sampled three (3) health facilities <b>(Mitooma HC IV, Bitereko HC III, Kashenshero HC III)</b> and established that Mitooma DLG did not report on implement the facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

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 implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

• score 2 or else score 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** health facilities in Mitooma DLG submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports in a timely manner, meeting the requirement of submission within 7 days following the end of each month and quarter. All three sampled health facilities ie. Mitooma HC IV, Bitereko HC III, Kashenshero HC III, submitted monthly HMIS reports within the stipulated 7-day timeframe. The assessment team noted that the quarterly HMIS reports for the above health facilities were submitted timely as follows:

1. **Bitereko HC III:** Submitted it's quarterly HMIS reports as follows: 7th October 2022,5th January 2023,6th April 2023 and on 6th July 2023
2. **Kashenshero HC III:** Submitted it's quarterly HMIS reports as follows: 7th October 2022,5th January 2023,4th April 2023 and on 5th July 2023
3. **Mitooma HC III:** Submitted it's quarterly HMIS reports as follows: 4th October 2022,5th January 2023,6th April 2023 and on 6th July 2023.

2

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 implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

This indicator is not applicable in this round of assessment due to changes in the management of the RBF program by the MoH.

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>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable in this round of assessment due to changes in the management of the RBF program by the MoH.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>MDLG Planning Unit did have a system for capturing dates of submission of Health department reports for integration into the overall DLG quarterly report. The submission dates were as below:</p> <p>Quarter one report submitted on 12/10/2022</p> <p>Quarter two report submitted on 13/01/2023</p> <p>Quarter three report submitted on 12/04/2022</p> <p>Quarter four report submitted on 10/07/2022</p> <p>All the four quarterly report submissions were made before the deadline of one month after end of the quarter.</p>	1
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The assessment team established that the Mitooma DLG DHMT had developed a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the weakest performing health facilities prepared on 5th April 2023. <i>This PIP received endorsement from the DHO, Byamugisha Sadic on the same day. The PIP prioritized availing midwives in the newly upgraded health facilities and improve provision of MCH services.</i></p>	1
<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>				

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 implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that** the health department of Mitooma DLG Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities. For instance, the letter dated 30th June 2023( Ref:Admn/161/1) showed that Musimenta Racheal- Enrolled midwife had been transferred from Kashenshero HC III to Mayanga HC III.

1

### Human Resource Management and Development

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the LG has:  
i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

There **was evidence to confirm that Mitooma DLG** Health Department budgeted for healthcare workers in accordance with staffing norms and guidelines. The approved staff structure, obtained from the DHO's office, indicates an approved structure of 286 healthcare workers.

A review of the approved Budget Estimates for FY 2023/2024 revealed that the allocated conditional Sector Conditional Grant (Wage) for Mitooma DLG was **UGX 4,279,306,000** intended to cover the wage of 175 healthcare workers in post out of the required 286 according to the staffing norm (**61.2%**). The assessment team also found that the second budget call circular (2nd BCC) regarding the finalization of the budget Estimates for the financial year 2023/2024, as indicated in item 43 (Page 11 of 23), stated: "Therefore, no vote will be authorized to recruit new staff except on a replacement basis, with evidence that the position(s) to be recruited have provisions in the budget for FY 2023/2024.

2

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

a) Evidence that the LG has:

ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0

There was no evidence to confirm whether the Mitooma DLG Health Department deployed healthcare workers in accordance with staffing guidelines, which require that all health facilities have at least 75% of the staff required according to the staffing norms. The assessment team reviewed the deployment lists for FY 2023/2024 and observed that some health facilities did not meet the requirement of having at least 75% of the required staff deployed in accordance with staffing norms. For instance, the evaluation team observed that some of the health facilities such as Kabira HC III (12 out of the required 19= 63.2%), Mutara Hc III (13 out of the required 19= 68.4%) among others did not have the required least 75% of the staff required according to the staffing norms.

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

The **was evidence to confirm that** health workers in Mitooma DLG were working in health facilities where they are deployed. The assessment team reviewed the deployment list for FY 2023/2024 and compared them with the logs in the attendance book at the randomly sampled health facilities and established that the two were in agreement. The assessment team sampled three health facilities (Kanshenshero HC III, Mutara HC III, and Mitooma HC IV) and established that was no variance between the deployment list obtained from DHO's and logs in the staff attendance books found at the health facilities as summarized below.

1. **Kanshenshero HC III:** 16 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the DHO. The staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the DHO.
2. **Mutara HC III:** 13 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the DHO. Staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the DHO.
3. **Mitooma HC IV:** 41 health workers deployed as per the deployment obtained from the DHO. The staff list found the health facility was Staff list was in agreement with the list obtained from the DHO.

7

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There **was evidence to confirm** that Mitooma DLG publicized the deployment of health workers through various means, including posting on facility notice boards. The assessment team visited three sampled health facilities and observed that staff lists for FY 2023/2024 were available on the notice boards at Kanshenshero HC III, Mutara HC III and Mitooma HC IV.

2

8

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:  
i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

**There was no evidence** that the DHO had 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. Most of the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines and others were not conducted. Some of the files reviewed included the following:

1. Otunga Anslem, Clinical Officer In-Charge Mutara HC III in Mutara Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 15, 2023.
2. Natukwasa Berlin, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Mayanga HC II in Mayanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 18, 2023.
3. Mutungi Brian, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Kigyende in Kanyabwanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 18, 2023.
4. Kobusingye Cleophas, Senior Clinical Officer In-Charge Kabira HC III in Kabira Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 15, 2023.
5. Akampwera Agath, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Byengerero HC II in Rurehe Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on June 15, 2023.
6. Kwijuka Frank, Clinical Officer In-Charge Rwoburunga HC III in Kiyanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 23, 2023.
7. Abaireho Lydia, Assistant Nursing Officer In-Charge Bukongoro HC II in Mutara Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
8. Nabimanya Tananzio, Senior Clinical Officer In-Charge Kashanshero HC III in Kashanshero Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 18, 2023.
9. Katugume Judith, Senior Clinical Officer In-

0

Charge Nyakishozo HC III in Mitoma Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on June 30, 2023.

10. Aryaturinda Ananias, Clinical Officer In-Charge Bitereko HC III in Bitereko Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 25, 2023.
11. Atuhaire Sannet, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Kyeibale HC II in Mutara Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 15, 2023.
12. Kyomugisha Dafroza, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Iraramira HC II in Kiyanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 14, 2023.
13. Bwitiire Justine, Enrolled Nurse In-Charge Bukuba HC II in Kashenshero Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 15, 2023.
14. Muhwezi Nelson, Assistant Nursing Officer In-Charge Kanyabwanga HC III in Kanyabwanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 05, 2023.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

**There was no evidence** that the Health Facility In-charges appraised all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO to HRO during the previous FY. Most of the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines. Some files reviewed included the following:

1. Musiimenta Rachael, Enrolled Midwife posted to Mayanga HC II in Mayanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 15, 2023.
2. Atuhaire Macline, Enrolled Midwife posted to Kanyabwanga HC III in Kanyabwanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 05, 2023.
3. Berutsya Fortunate, Enrolled Midwife posted to Mutara HC III in Mutara Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 06, 2023.
4. Komujuni Audrey, Dispenser posted to Mitooma HC IV in Mitooma Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 15, 2023.
5. Bakali Justin, Senior Clinical Officer posted to Nyakisozo HC III in Mitooma Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 07, 2023.
6. Birungi Catherine, Assistant Health Educator posted to Mitooma HC IV in Mitooma Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 14, 2023.
7. Akampurira Joseph, Clinical Officer posted to Kabira HC III in Kabira Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
8. Dr. Taremwa Julius, Medical Officer posted to Mitooma HC IV in Mitooma Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
9. Ayebazibwe Andrew, Clinical Officer posted to Mitooma HC IV in Mitooma Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 05, 2023.
10. Nuwasasiira Aggrey, Clinical Officer posted to Mitooma HC IV in Mitooma Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 04, 2023.



8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0	<b>There was evidence</b> that the District Health Officer had taken corrective action based on the appraisals. A Training Plan presented during assessment compiled by the District Health Officer, Dr. Byamugisha Sadic to the Chief Administrative Officer indicated 'Needs' identified from appraisals and interventions to mitigate them with 'Timeframe' for implementation. Topics included for example 'Malaria in Pregnancy', 'Nutrition Assessment' tailored for Midwives and Facility In-Charges; and 'Community Led Total Sanitation' tailored for Health Inspectorate staff.	2
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure				
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was <b>evidence to confirm that health workers</b> received training through Continuous Professional Development in accordance with the training plans. The assessment team noted that the department has adhered to a training plan dated July 1, 2022. Some of the training initiatives from this plan involved sessions with health workers on health waste management. The report detailing these activities was submitted to the District Health Officer (DHO) on January 17, 2023. The training sessions took place from January 9th to 13th, 2023. One of the training sessions aligned with the plan focused on Hypoxemia management and the utilization of oxygen equipment.	1
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure				
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> the health department of Mitooma DLG documented training activities in the training/CPD database. The assessment team observed that there is a record book documenting health workers trained in various areas since 2017. For example, on April 30, 2021, approximately 21 health workers underwent training in HPV. On September 28, 2022, health workers gathered to review the red categorization of Maternal and Child Health (MCH) data. This session aimed to identify service gaps and determine areas for improvement in the upcoming quarters of the fiscal year 2022/2023.	1
Maximum 6 points on this performance measure				

**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 <b>was evidence to confirm that the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) of Mitooma DLG</b> confirmed the list of health facilities (Government of Uganda and Private-Not-For-Profit) receiving Primary Health Care Non-Wage Recurrent (PHC NWR) grants and notified the Ministry of Health (MOH) in writing by September 30th if any health facility had been listed incorrectly or was omitted from the FY 2023/2024 list.</p> <p>The assessment team established that this letter was received by the MoH registry on September 12, 2023. The review of this letter revealed that it was authored by Dr Byaruganba Sadic. The assessment team also noted that the department had made submission of the same via email to Hillary Airinatwe (from MoH planning unit) on 18th September 2023.</p>	2
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>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>Mitooma DLG FY2022/2023 budget - PHC NWR grant for Lower Level Health Facilities was UGX235,193,000.</p> <p>Total allocation in the DHO's budget for management and monitoring activities in the same year was UGX48,725,000 which 20.7% of the total. This was well above the 15% minimum.</p>	2

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The disbursements of all funds to government funded institutions and facilities follow the four quarterly routine. For MDLG FY2022/2023, PHC NWR grants were warranted/verified as follows:

For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th July 2022, the CAO warranted on 10th August 2022 and the funds were transferred on 15th August 2022 (32 days).

For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the CAO warranted on 18th October and the funds were sent on 20th October 2022 (18 days).

For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The CAO warranted 19th January 2022 and the disbursements made on 19th January 2023 (21 days).

For Quarter 4, MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2022 and the CAO warranted on 19th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 20th April 2023 (13 days).

In all the four quarters, the warranting/verification of PHC NWR grants was effected beyond the 5 days deadline.

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

The disbursements of all funds to government funded institutions and facilities follow the four quarterly routine. For MDLG FY2022/2023 the invoicing and communication of transfers to health facilities followed the following routine:

For Quarter 1, the MoFPED circular is dated 8th July 2022, the CAO warranted on 10th August 2022 and the funds were transferred on 15th August 2022. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 1 was dated 18/08/2022 (40 days).

For Quarter 2, the MoFPED circular is dated 30th September 2022, the CAO warranted on 18th October and the funds were sent on 20th October 2022. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 2 was dated 24/10/2022 (24 days).

For Quarter 3, cash limits were communicated through MoFPED circular dated 29th December 2022. The CAO warranted 19th January 2022 and the disbursements made on 19th January 2023. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 3 was dated 23/01/2023 (25 days).

For Quarter 4, MoFPED circular is dated 6th April 2022 and the CAO warranted on 19th April 2023 and the funds were transferred on 20th April 2023. The communication concerning the disbursement of PHC NWR grants for quarter 4 was dated 24/04/2023 (18 days).

In all the four (04) quarters, the invoicing and communication of funds releases was done beyond the 5 working days' time limit.

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

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

There **was evidence to confirm that Mitooma DLG** LG had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g., through posting on public notice boards. This is evidenced by the details below.

1. **Quarter 1:** Display on the notice board was made on 10th July 2022; Th expenditure limits received from MoFPED 8th July 2022. This implies that publication of quarterly financial releases to all health facilities was made within 2 days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED.
2. **Quarter 2:** Display on the notice board was made on 4th October 2022; Th expenditure limits received from MoFPED on 30th September 2022. This implies that publication of quarterly financial releases to all health facilities was made within five days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED.
3. **Quarter 3:** Display on the notice board was made on 3rd January 2023; Th expenditure limits received from MoFPED on 29th December 2022. This implies that publication of quarterly financial releases to all health facilities was made within five days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED.
4. **Quarter 4:** Display on the notice board was made on 9h April 2023; The expenditure limits received from MoFPED on 6th April 2023. This implies that publication of quarterly financial releases to all health facilities was made within three days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED.

*Based on the evidence provided, it is apparent that the publicization for all the four quarters occurred within the recommended 5 working days from the date of receiving the expenditure limits from the Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development (MoFPED).*

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that the Mitooma DLG</b> Health Department implemented actions recommended by the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meetings held during FY 2022/23 on the following days; <i>10th August 2022; 21st December 2022; 5th April 2023 and 5th July 2023.</i></p> <p>In terms of actions taken during the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meetings on the mentioned dates; the following were noted. On July 5, 2023, the meeting minutes highlighted the necessity of sending a reminder message via the m-track system to prompt certain facility in-charges who had not submitted their weekly reports. The assessment team observed that a reminder message through m-track was indeed shared by the Biostatistician on July 12, 2023, directed at the in-charges of Rubare HC II, Rurama HC II, and Kirambi HC II, urging them to submit their weekly reports.</p> <p>Additionally, at the DHMT Quarterly Performance Review Meeting on December 21, 2022, it was observed that the District Health Team (DHT) had planned to conduct support supervision at TB implementing sites. The assessment revealed that the report submitted on June 5, 2023, confirmed that support supervision had been carried out at these sites.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that</b> the Mitooma DLG Health Department's quarterly performance review meetings included all health facility in-charges and implementing partners, DHMTs, and key LG departments.</p> <p>The assessment team reviewed the attendance lists for the DHMT performance review meetings held on various dates: 10th August 2022; 21st December 2022; 5th April 2023 and 5th July 2023. The assessment team noted that these meetings had representation from all health facility in-charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments, and partners. Notably, key attendees included Atuzalirwe Allen-DCDO, Tusiime Godfrey (DWO), Birungi Peace (DEO).</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that Mitooma DLG conducted</b> supervision visits to 100% of the available HC IV- Mitooma HC IV; The assessment team reviewed the support supervision reports submitted to the DHO on <i>30th September 2022, 5th January 2023, 31st March 2023 and 30th June 2023.</i> The content of the reports indicate that Mitooma HC IV health facilities were supervised by the DHT in all the quarters within FY 2022/2023.</p>	1

10

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0

- If not applicable, provide the score

There **was evidence to confirm that the Mitooma DLG** DHT ensured that Health Mitooma DLG Health Sub-District (HSD) conducted support supervision of lower-level health facilities during FY 2022/2023. The assessment team noted that Mitooma DLG had it's HSD at Mitooma HC IV. The assessment team randomly selected three health facilities, namely Bitereko HC III, Nyakishojwa HC III and Kashenshero HC III. The team reviewed the HSD support supervision reports submitted to the DHO on 14th November 2022,4th April 2023,14th June 2023 and the undated report for 3rd Quarter of FY 2022/2023. The assessment team noted that the sampled health facilities were supervised by HSD housed at Mitooma HC IV.

1

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0

There **was evidence to confirm that Mitooma DLG** used results and reports from the discussions during support supervision and monitoring visits to make recommendations for specific corrective actions, and these recommendations were followed up during the FY 2022/2023. This is demonstrated by the following instances: The assessment team reviewed the support supervision book logs at sampled health facilities and identified the following:

1. **At Mitooma HC IV:** The support supervision book records for the District Health Team (DHT) support supervision visit on September 6, 2022, recommended that the facility should make use of the standby generator. The assessment confirmed that on the day of the assessment, the standby generator was indeed in use.
2. **At Mutara HC III,** A review of the support supervision logs on February 25, 2023, revealed that the facility was advised to lobby for weighing scale pants. The assessment team observed that these were acquired by the in-charge on March 4, 2023, from the district stores. Furthermore, the supervision conducted on May 16, 2023, recommended that the in-charge display the immunization charts. The assessment team confirmed that these charts were indeed displayed in the maternity ward.
3. **At Kashenhero HC III,** During the support supervision visit on February 28, 2023, the District Health Team (DHT) recommended that the facility in-charge should request Fansider from NMS. The assessment team later confirmed that a local order for Fansider was placed to the district stores for redistribution on March 16, 2023.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There **was evidence to confirm that Mitooma District Local Government (DLG)** provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies during the FY 2022/2023. The assessment team accessed and reviewed three sets of support supervision reports dated April 12, 2023, July 10, 2022, and May 14, 2023, and found that all health facilities received support in the management of medicines and health supplies.



11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0	Mitooma DHO health office budget for FY 2022/2023 was UGX UGX48,725,000. Out of this a total of UGX8,631,683 was allocated to health promotion and prevention activities. This was a proportion of 17.7%, which did not meet the 30% minimum requirement.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that the Mitooma District Local Government (DLG)</b> DHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the FY 2022/2023. The assessment team noted that the report to the District Health Officer (DHO) on March 10, 2023, indicated that the health department had conducted health inspections of Kanshenshero weekly and daily markets in Kanshenshero Trading Centre. The Quarter 4 sanitation and hygiene report, submitted to the DHO on April 8, 2023, highlighted that the department, among other activities, conducted household sensitization on health and hygiene. Additionally, handwashing facilities were installed at the sub-county.</p> <p>Furthermore, the report submitted to the DHO on November 30, 2022, indicated that the department carried out social mobilization for the polio house-to-house campaign for round 2, utilizing the public address system.</p>	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	Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the Mitooma District Local Government (DLG) District Health Team (DHT) regarding health promotion and disease prevention issues is documented in their minutes and reports. For example, among other actions, the report addressed to the District Health Officer (DHO) on June 30, 2023, mentioned that the Kanshenshero weekly/weekly market had been temporarily closed. This closure was implemented on March 10, 2023, to facilitate the restoration of proper sanitation at the facility.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

## Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence to confirm that Mitooma DLG</b> health department had an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. A comprehensive assets register was located in the District Health Officer's (DHO) office. The register was last updated on October 20, 2023, and includes detailed information such as serial number, asset description, engraved code, user title, initial cost, location, condition, and date of purchase, among other relevant details.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were:</p> <p>(i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>For previous year FY 2022/2023, the prioritised investments under MDLG Health department were the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>📌 Construction of theatre at Bitereko HCIII Gx1,031,793,148</li> <li>📌 Construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Mayanga HCIII UGX174,832,340</li> <li>📌 Upgrage of Kigyenge HCII to HCIII UGX670,000,000</li> <li>📌 Upgrage of Mitooma HCIV to general hospital UGX1,500,000,000</li> <li>📌 Upgrage of Bitereko HCIII to HCIV UGX218,151,627</li> </ul> <p>A Desk Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Derived from the LG Development Plan</li> <li>-Consistent with sector guidelines &amp; DDEG objectives</li> <li>-Financially feasible</li> <li>-Having costed project profiles</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of desk appraisals for only two (02) of the five (05) MDLG FY2022/2023 Health department projects was provided/seen during the assessment.</p>	0

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>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>For previous year FY 2022/2023, the prioritised investments under MDLG Health department were the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>🚧 Construction of theatre at Bitereko HCIII UGX1,031,793,148</li> <li>🚧 Construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Mayanga HCIII UGX174,832,340</li> <li>🚧 Upgrade of Kigyenge HCII to HCIII UGX670,000,000</li> <li>🚧 Upgrade of Mitooma HCIV to general hospital UGX1,500,000,000</li> <li>🚧 Upgrade of Bitereko HCIII to HCIV UGX218,151,627</li> </ul>	0
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Technical feasibility</li> <li>-Environmental and social acceptability requirements</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence of field appraisals for only two (02) of the five (05) MDLG Health FY2022/2023 projects was provided/seen during the assessment.</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 <b>was evidence</b> 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</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Screening for environmental and social risks construction of 2 stance latrine with urinal at Kashenshero HC III was carried out on 7/7/22, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study therefore a costed ESMP was prepared on 18/7/22 at cost of Ugx 2,800,000.</li> <li>2. Screening for environmental and social risks construction of staff house at Mayanga HC III was carried out on 19/7/22, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study therefore a costed ESMP was prepared on 22/7/22 at cost of Ugx 8,500,000.</li> <li>3. Screening for environmental and social risks construction of maternity ward at Bitereko HC III was carried out on 05/8/22, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study therefore a costed ESMP was prepared on 5/8/22 at cost of Ugx 12,000,000.</li> </ol>	1
<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>				

13

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There is evidence that Mitooma LG health department timely submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU (as signed by the DHO and received by PDU on 26/4/2023) for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans; The following Projects were visible;

1. Construction of Maternity Ward at Mutara HC III Phase I; Estimated cost is UGX 91,139,466/=
2. Infrastructure Improvement at Mayanga HC III; Estimated cost is UGX 85,000,000/=
3. Upgrade of Mitooma HC IV to General Hospital; Estimated cost is UGX 1,500,000,000/=

•

1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that Mitooma DLG Health department submitted Procurement Requisition Forms - LG PP Forms to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY (2023/24).</p> <p>The following projects were listed:</p>	1
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>LG PP form 1 for the Construction of a Kitchen and Latrine at Mayanga HC III-</b> Estimated at UGX 83,926,447/=. The form was submitted, forwarded (Confirmation of Need) by the DHO on 12/9/2023 and confirmation of funding by CAO on 15/9/2023.</li> </ol>	
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 is evidence that the Health infrastructure Projects for the previous FY (2022/2023) were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of Works. The projects are listed below:</p>	1
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Under Min. No. 032/CC/2022/2023;</b> the Construction of a 2 in 1 Staff House at Mayanga HC II- MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00001; approved by the Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 28/11/2022.</li> <li><b>Under Min. No. 124/CC/2020-2021;</b> the Upgrade of HC II to HC III, Mitooma District- MOH/WRKS/2020-21/00009/Lot 15; approved by the Sheema DLG Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 18/1/2021. The project was cleared by the Solicitor General through memo dated 8/2/2021 since the contract sum was above the threshold i.e. 645,500,575/=.</li> </ol>	
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the PITs for the Health construction projects within the last FY (2022/23) as per guidelines as listed below in the sampled projects:</p>	0
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Construction of a 2 in 1 Staff House at Mayanga HC II-</b> Through the memo dated 28/9/2022, the CAO appointed a PIT that comprised of a: DHO/Project Manager, District Environmental Officer, DCDO and Labour Officer. However, there was no Clerk of Works and Contract Manager appointed by the CAO.</li> <li><b>Upgrade of Mayanga HC II to HC III, Mitooma District-</b> Through the memo dated 17/2/2022, the CAO appointed a PIT that comprised of a: DHO/Project Manager, District Environmental Officer, DCDO and Labor Officer. However, there was no Clerk of Works and Contract Manager appointed by the CAO.</li> </ol>	

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>There is evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH. The sampled project included the following, and were not compliant as per approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Mitooma Health Facility comprised of the following components: Maternity Ward, 4-stance VIP latrine with shower, placenta pit and medical waste pit.</p> <p>All structures were constructed as per the standard MOH technical designs and specifications. During the site visit the structural integrity of all the structures was found to be intact and the structure was found to be in good condition.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The foundation was found to be intact and in good condition.</li> <li>2. The floors were in good structural condition with no cracks.</li> <li>3. The walling had no cracks nor defects.</li> <li>4. The room sizes were as per the MOH standard technical designs.</li> <li>5. The roof structure had no leakages.</li> <li>6. The doors and windows were well installed and still in good condition.</li> </ol> <p>The structure is already functional and is generally in good condition.</p>	
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</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>There was NO evidence that the Clerk of Works maintained daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project.</p> <p>Various inspection reports with different dates were noted during the assessment, however there were no reports from the Clerk of works noted.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The following projects were sampled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Construction of a 2 in 1 Staff House at Mayanga HC II- with reports dated:</b> 17/3/2023 prepared by the DE to the CAO and 10/5/2023 prepared by the DE to the DHO, Environment Health Officer and Environment Officer.</li> <li>2. <b>Upgrade of Mayanga HC II to HC III, Mitooma District-</b> with reports dated: 4/11/2022, 12/6/2023, 14/6/2023, 31/10/2023, 20/11/2023 prepared by the DE to the CAO.</li> </ol>	

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 is NO evidence that Mitooma DLG 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:</p> <p>There were no minutes of meetings noted during the assessment in the previous FY (2022/23).</p> <p>The sampled project is listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upgrade of Mayanga HC II to HC III, Mitooma District</li> </ol>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There is NO Evidence that Mitooma DLG 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.</p> <p>The following projects were sampled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Construction of a 2 in 1 Staff House at Mayanga HC II-</b> There were joint technical inspections done by the Environment Officer and the DCDO as noted on the Environment and Social Compliance Certificate dated 12/6/2023. However, there were no joint technical supervisions of the construction of health infrastructure projects (by the Engineers team - including the Environment Officer and DCDO among other officers). There was no evidence that site instruction books were used during the course of the project. The project was already complete therefore there was no visitor's book noted.</li> <li>2. <b>Upgrade of HC II to HC III, Mitooma District-</b> There was a site instruction dated 13/10/2023. However, there were no joint technical supervisions of the construction of health infrastructure projects (by the Engineers team - including the Environment Officer and DCDO among other officers). The project was already complete therefore there was no visitor's book noted.</li> </ol>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>For Mitooma DLG Health two (02) infrastructural project payments in FY2022/2023 were sampled to test for certification and the timeliness of payments.</p> <p>Payment to Bitereko Hardware and Building Construction Ltd for construction and completion of 2 in 1 staff house at Mayanga HCII (UGX61,934,376) - Requisition dated 15/06/2023, certified by District Engineer, DHO, Environment Officer, CDO and CAO on 09/06/2023 and payment on 15/06/2023 ( 0 days).</p> <p>Payment to Bitereko Hardware and Building Construction Ltd for construction and completion of 2 in 1 staff house at Mayanga HCII (UGX95,711,056) - Requisition dated 17/03/2023, certified by District Engineer, DHO, Environment Officer, CDO and CAO on 17/03/2023 and payment on 05/04/2023 (19 days).</p> <p>In one (01) of the two (02) sampled MDLG Health infrastructural projects, payments were effected beyond the 14 days' time limit.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There is Evidence that Mitooma DLG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA. Complete Pprocurement files for the health infrastructure contracts with Evaluation Reports and Minutes of the Contract Committee, and contract agreements.</p> <p>Files for the following projects were sampled accordingly;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Construction of a 2 in 1 Staff House at Mayanga HC II-</b> MITO893/WRKS/2022-23/00001; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 032/CC/2022/2023; in the meeting held on 28/11/2022. The evaluation report was approved by the Sheema DLG Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 18/1/2021. The contract was awarded on 19/12/2022.</li> <li>2. <b>Upgrade of HC II to HC III, Mitooma District-</b> MOH/WRKS/2020-21/00009/Lot 15; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 124/CC/2020-2021; in the meeting held on 28/11/2022. The evaluation report was approved by the contracts committee on 28/11/2022. The contract was awarded on 17/2/2021.</li> </ol>	1

**Environment and Social Safeguards**



14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	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	There <b>was evidence</b> that the Local Government had recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework	2
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure		In log book the focal person recorded a complaint on 5/10/22 about intimidation and beating of the community members during the construction of Bitereko HC III, in the minutes dated 10/10/22, the committee investigated the issue and found out that people were being beaten whenever they would go close to the construction site, it was resolved that the issue should be reported to the head UPDF at the site. in his response interchanged his staff and reprimanded others for thier bad habits against the community.	
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0	There <b>was evidence to confirm that Mitooma DLG</b> Health Department had disseminated guidelines on health care/medical waste management to health facilities. A circular or guideline on waste management in health facilities disseminated to health facility in charge was submitted to the District Health Officer (DHO) on August 10, 2022, with reference number HLTH/101/1.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence to confirm that Mitooma DLG</b> had a functional system/central infrastructure with equipment for medical waste management and had a dedicated/operational budget. The assessment team found that Green Label services Ltd supported the local government in recovering medical waste from health facilities. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed between the District Local Government (DLG) and Green Label Services, with representation from Dr. Grace Mugume, the managing director of Green Label Services, and the accounting officer represented the DLG.	2
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			
15	Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery	c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence to confirm that Mitooma DLG</b> has conducted training and created awareness in healthcare waste management. The assessment revealed that the health department conducted training in medical waste management, as evidenced by the report submitted to the District Health Officer (DHO) on January 17, 2023. The training occurred on January 9, 2023, and the attendance list indicated the participation of 29 health workers. The training was facilitated by members of the District Health Team (DHT), Green Label Services Ltd (Guma Lawrence), and the focal point person for Healthcare Waste Management (HCWM) from the Ministry of Health (MoH), Opio Okello.	1
	Maximum 5 points on this performance measure			

16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A costed ESMP for the construction of staff house at Mayanga HC III was prepared on 22/7/22, at cost of Ugx 8,800,000 signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, this ESMP of <b>Proc ref No MITO893/WRKS/21-22/00001</b> was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents in element 2 under item A to d for environmental health issues at cost of 480,000</li> </ol>	
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that all health sector projects were 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	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Certificate of title for Mayanga HC III on plot 31, block 31 at Mayanga A dated 1/9/21, signed and stamped by registrar of titles on 22/11/21</li> </ol>	
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.	There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support supervision and monitoring for the construction of a staff house at Mayanga HC II was carried out on 11/10/22, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, monthly monitoring reports were provided for review dated 11/10/22, 9/12/22, 19/1/23, 16/3/23, 20/2/23 29/4/23 and 12/6/23, the project started on 28/9/22 and ended on 9/6/23.</li> </ol>	
16	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments	d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0	There <b>was evidence</b> 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	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environment and Social Certification forms for the construction of a staff house at Mayanga HC II were prepared on 12/6/23 signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, payments were made on 30/6/23</li> </ol>	

**Water &  
Environment  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>As per the MWE-MIS for the FY 2022/2023, the rural water functionality for Mitooma DLG was <b>81% which falls between 80% and 89%</b> and thereby justifying a score one (1)</p>	1
1	<p>Water &amp; Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water &amp; sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 90 - 100%: score 2</li> <li>o 80-89%: score 1</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the MWE-MIS for the FY 2022/2023, the percentage of WSS facilities with functional WSCs in Mitooma DLG, as seen under the Management Column was <b>93% that falls between 90% to 100%</b>, thereby justifying a score two (2).</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 80%, score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 80%, score 1</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The performance of MDLG in its FY2022/2023 LLG Water and Environment assessment was 60%, making it fall in the range '60% - 80%.</p>	1
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 1</li> <li>o If below 80 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the 4th Quarter/ Annual report titled "Mitooma District Local Government Water and Sanitation Development Grant Annual Report for 2022/2023 (REF: CR/158/3)" submitted by CAO on 24th/07/2023 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 25th/07/2023;<b>the Safe Water Coverage (SWC) for Mitooma DLG was 82.5%</b>. The Sub-Counties with SWC below the district average were: <b>Bitereko S/C</b> with SWC of 82%; <b>Kiyanga S/C</b> with SWC of 61%; <b>Mutara</b></li> </ul>	0

S/C with SWC of 69% and **Kashenshero Town council** with SWC of 73%

- As per the document titled “Mitooma District Water and Sanitation Development Grant Work Plan for FY 2022/2023 (CR/158/1)” submitted by CAO on 18th/07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 27th/07/2022 and in reference to my analysis of the annual progress reports for FY 2022/2023, Mitooma district water department implemented the following budgeted water projects in the targeted sub counties.

i. Project 1: MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00002: Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS Phase II Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C at a cost of UGX 254,980,041; **which is a target of 0 out of 1, equivalent to 0%;**

ii. Project 1: MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00010: Rehabilitation of ten (10) springs and spring tanks in Katenga S/C (4,133,304), **Bitereko** S/C (8,624,926) and Rutookye S/C (7,482,568) at a cost of UGX 20,240,800; which is a target of **4.3 (8,624,926) out of 10 (33,781,598), equivalent to 42.6%;**

- However, there were the following MoUs with the development partners: MoU between Mitooma DLG and Raising the Village International (RTV) from 20th/02/2020 and 27th/02/2024; and MoU between Mitooma DLG and Rukungiri Women Integrated Development Foundation (RWIDF) from 22nd/08/2022 and 21st/08/2027;

- According to RWIDF Report written by Field Officer on 30th/10/2022, ten (10) springs were protected 5 in Mitooma S/C (12,500,000), 2 in Kashenshero S/C (5,000,000), 3 in Mutara TC (7,500,000) and 2 in Mutara S/C (5,000,000) and two (2) rain water harvesting tanks of 30,000 litres capacity 1 in Rurehe S/C (9,500,000) and 1 in Mitooma S/C (9,500,000); which is a target of **2 (5,000,000) out of 12 (44,000,000), equivalent to 11.4%.**

- According to Raising the Village International Report written by Field Officer on 30th/06/2023, 8 shallow wells and 1 spring protection with tank and extension of piped water (7 PSPs) in **Kiyanga** S/C (UGX 27,000,000), 1 shallow well and 2 protected springs with tanks in Mayanga S/C (UGX 9,000,000), 2 shallow wells **Mutara** S/C (UGX 6,000,000), and 11 shallow wells and 3 spring protection with tanks and extension of piped water (4 PSPs) in Rurehe S/C (UGX 42,000,000); which is a

target of **15 (33,000,000) out of 28 (84,000,000), equivalent to 39.3%.**

- Therefore, the number of projects implemented in target S/Cs is **21.3 (UGX 46,624,926) out of 51 (UGX 416,761,639)** budgeted projects in the Previous FY 2022/2023, equivalent to **41.7% approximated to 42%, which is below 80% and thereby justifying a score of zero (0).**

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

As per the document titled "Mitooma District Water and Sanitation Development Grant Work Plan for FY 2022/2023 (CR/158/1)" submitted by CAO on 18th/07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 27th/07/2022 and in reference to my analysis of the annual progress reports for FY 2022/2023, and basing on sample of two (2) WSS contracts that were implemented in Mitooma DLG, the following percentage variation of the engineering estimates were revealed:

i. Project 1: MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00002: Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS Phase II Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C;

- Contractor: M/S GAT Consults Ltd;

- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 265,037,805 (A);

- Contracted Sum of UGX 254,980,041 (B);

- **Percentage variation= [(A-B)/A]\*100 = [(265,037,805 - 254,980,041)/ 265,037,805]\*100 = 3.8%**

ii. Project 1: MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00010: Rehabilitation of ten (10) springs and spring tanks in Katenga S/C, Bitereko S/C and Rutookye S/C;

- Contractor: M/S Kamoja Enterprises Ltd ;

- Engineer's estimated cost of UGX 20,000,000 (A);

- Contracted Sum of UGX 20,240,800 (B);

- **Percentage variation= [(A-B)/A]\*100 = [(20,000,000-20,240,800)/ 20,000,000]\*100 = - 1.2%**

- Hence the variations in the contract price and engineer's estimates of the **two (2) sampled WSS infrastructure investment contracts for FY 2022/2023 are all within +/-20%**, thereby justifying a score of two (2)

N23\_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.

o If 100% projects completed: score 2

o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1

o If projects completed are below 80%: 0

• As per the document titled “Mitooma District Water and Sanitation Development Grant Work Plan for FY 2022/2023 (CR/158/1)” submitted by CAO on 18th/07/2022 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 27th/07/2022 and 4th Quarter/ Annual report titled “Mitooma District Local Government Water and Sanitation Development Grant Annual Report for 2022/2023 (REF: CR/158/3)” submitted by CAO on 24th/07/2023 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 25th/07/2023; **all the planned projects were completed** by the end of the FY 2022/2023. The following were the planned WSS infrastructure projects and level of achievement by the end of the FY 2022/2023:

i. Project 1: MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00002: Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS Phase II Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C at a cost of UGX 254,980,041; **GFS Achieved 100%**;

ii. Project 1: MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00010: Rehabilitation of ten (10) springs and spring tanks in Katenga S/C (4,133,304), Bitereko S/C (8,624,926) and Rutookye S/C (7,482,568) at a cost of UGX 20,240,800; **Rehabilitation Achieved 100%**;

• Therefore, 100% WSS infrastructure projects were completed thereby justifying **a score of two (2)**.

3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Ministry of Water and Environment Management Information System (MWE-MIS) assessment report for the FY 2022/2023, Mitooma DLG had 1163 functional and 195 non-functional rural water sources, that was equivalent to a functionality of <math>[1163/(1163+195)]*100 = 85.6\%</math> approximated to 86%.</li> <li>• Also, from MWE-MIS assessment report for the FY 2021/2022, Mitooma DLG had 772 functional and 210 non-functional rural water sources, that was equivalent to a functionality of <math>[772/(772+210)]*100 = 78.5\%</math> approximated to 79%.</li> <li>• The variation in Mitooma DLG rural water functionality <b>from 79% to 86% represents an increase of 7% in the water supply facilities that are functional.</b></li> <li>• There is an increase and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).</li> </ul>
---	---	--	--

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 &amp; sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 1% score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase : score 0.</p>	<p>1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Ministry of Water and Environment Management Information System (MWE-MIS) District Software Report (rural water Management) for FY/2022/2023, Mitooma DLG had</li> <li>• 680 functional WSCs out of the 733 established WSCs equivalent to Management of <math>[680/733]*100 = 92.77\%</math>.</li> <li>• Also, MWE-MIS District Software Report (rural water Management) for FY 2021/2022, Mitooma DLG had</li> <li>• 695 functional WSCs out of the 754 established WSCs equivalent to Management of <math>[695/754]*100 = 92.18\%</math>.</li> <li>• The variation in Mitooma DLG rural water functionality <b>from 92.18% to 92.77% represents an increase of 0.59% in the water supply facilities with functional water and sanitation committees.</b></li> <li>• <b>There was an increase between 0 to 1%, justifying a score of one (1).</b></li> </ul>
---	---	--	---

### Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects</p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported:</p>	<p>3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the 4th Quarter/ Annual report titled “Mitooma District Local Government Water and Sanitation Development Grant Annual Report for 2022/2023 (REF: CR/158/3)” submitted</li> </ul>
---	--	---	--



and service  
performance

Score: 3

*Maximum 3 points on  
this performance  
measure*

by CAO on 24th/07/2023 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 25th/07/2023; Mitooma DLG water department implemented (constructed/rehabilitated) 11 WSS projects in FY 2022/2023. I sampled and visited six (6) WSS facilities in three (3) S/Counties and I observed/noted the following:

**(i) Phase II: Mushunga-Nkinga Gravity Flow Scheme in Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C**

**a) PSP 1- Kichwamba B (single spout) at Kichwamba B village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C**

- Upon testing the minimum PSP yield, on average a 10-litre jerrycan was filled in  $(35+28)/2=31.5$  seconds approximated to  $[(10/31.5)*3600] = 1143$  litres per hour greater than 600 liters per hour reported in the standard design, technical specifications and terms of reference and thus good yield.
- The PSP was not engraved.
- The PSP was well secured and metered with meter reading at 406.6m<sup>3</sup>
- The surrounding environment was clean without a soak pit.
- The water collection platform was 900mmx830mmx150mm
- The drainage channel was 85mmx130mmx85mm
- The height of the water delivery pipe from the ground was 550mm.
- The facility served about 65 households each comprising 5 members on average
- During the field visit, I found 2 WSC members including C/Person Tukundane Julius and Member-Banturaki Obed and four (4) community members.
- According to the WSC C/Person, the functional WSC was trained once in July 2023 on cleanliness, non-wastage of water (using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel) and the facility was clean.
- There was no payment for water despite members expected to have started paying from 1st/ Dec/2023.

**• Challenge: there was leakage on the line before the meter.**

**b) PSP 2- Nkinga Trading Center (single spout) at Nkinga A village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C**

- Upon testing the minimum PSP yield,

on average a 10-litre jerrycan was filled in  $(32+30)/2=31$  seconds approximated to  $[(10/31)*3600] = 1161$  litres per hour greater than 600 liters per hour reported in the standard design, technical specifications and terms of reference and thus good yield.

- The PSP was not engraved.
- The PSP was well secured and metered. However, there was no keys to access the meter reading
- The surrounding environment was clean with a soak pit.
- The water collection platform was 1000mmx810mmx155mm
- The height of the water delivery pipe from the ground was 670mm.
- The facility served about 25 households each comprising 5 members on average
- During the field visit, I found one (1) WSC members C/Person of GFS Beshemeza Teudor and two (2) community members.
- According to the WSC C/Person, the functional WSC was trained once in July 2023 from Nkiga parish Hall on cleanliness, non-wastage of water (using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel) and the facility was clean.
- The GFS management comprises 10 members including four (4) women.
- There was no payment for water despite members expected to have started paying from 1st/ Dec/2023.
- **Challenge: There was no scheme attendant for the last one month.**

**c) PSP 3- Mustibuka B (single spout) at Nkinga A village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C**

- Upon testing the minimum PSP yield, on average a 10-litre jerrycan was filled in  $(41+38)/2=39.5$  seconds approximated to  $[(10/39.5)*3600] = 911$  litres per hour greater than 600 liters per hour reported in the standard design, technical specifications and terms of reference and thus good yield.
- The PSP was not engraved.
- The PSP was well secured and metered with meter reading at 79.1m<sup>3</sup>
- The surrounding environment was clean without a soak pit.
- The water collection platform was 850mmx800mmx165mm

- The height of the water delivery pipe from the ground was 685mm.
- The facility served about 10 households each comprising 5 members on average
- During the field visit, I found one (1) WSC members-C/Person Banabas Sasirabo and two (2) community members.
- According to the WSC C/Person, the functional WSC was trained once in August 2023 on cleanliness, collection of water user fees, non-wastage of water (using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel) and the facility was clean.
- There was no payment for water as community households were not sure of when to start paying for the water.
- **Overall, the GFS (Phase II) was completed and was functional as reported by the Mitooma DWO.**

**(ii) Rehabilitation of Kasigazi Abdu Protected spring in Nyerambire village, Central ward in Rutookye Town Council**

- The facility had pathway for easy access.
- I found the protected spring with one (1) spout rehabilitated and functioning fairly well
- The catchment was live-fenced and environment was too bushy. There was need to slash along the drainage/ spill way
- At the time of field visit, the water collection tank was flooded and filled with sediments/ silt and therefore I could not measure the minimum water yield.
- There was a drainage channel constructed to divert storm water from flowing into or flooding over the spring. However, this was too bushy and filled with sediments.
- During the field visit, I found WSC C/Person (Mr. Godfrey Balem) and three (3) community members
- According to C/Person, there was a functional WSC and was trained only once in June 2023 on slashing around the spring well; using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel. However, the facility was dirty and bushy.
- The facility serves 40 households each comprising on average 6 people
- There was no collection of water user

fees and thus no balance in treasury as the community members prefer collecting money when there is need to do minor repairs.

- Challenge: the spring seemed to have one (1) or more unprotected eye(s) and thus was flooded (also due to storm water). There was need to re-protect the spring, clean and slash around the drainage channel.

**• Overall, the medium protected spring (constructed with one spout) was functioning fairly well as reported by Mitooma DWO.**

**(iii) Rehabilitation of Protected spring in Kibale I village, Kibale ward in Rutookye Town Council**

- The facility had pathway for easy access with paspalum planted with no planted trees.

- I found the protected spring with a spring tank and one (1) spout rehabilitated and functioning fairly well.

- The source was well re-protected.

- The catchment was live-fenced and environment was clean.

- Upon testing the minimum water yield on average a 10-litre jerrycan was filled in  $(50+52)/2 = 51$  seconds approximated to  $(10/51) = 0.196$  litres per second less than 1.2 litres per second reported in the standard design (technical specifications and terms of reference) and thus low yield.

- The repaired steps had a rise of 225mm and a tread of 620 mm (and 1030mm wide) that was in the range of technical specifications (a rise of 200mm and a tread of 300mm)

- Height of delivery pipe (spout) from the ground was 500mm within the indicated values in the construction drawings

- There was a drainage channel constructed to divert storm water from flowing into or flooding over the spring

- During the field visit, I found WSC C/Person (Mr. Mugisha Geoffrey) and two (2) community members

- According to C/Person, there was a functional WSC and was trained only once in 2012 on slashing around the spring well; using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel

- The facility serves 10 households each comprising on average 6 people

- There was no collection of water user

fees and thus no balance in treasury as the community members prefer collecting money when there is need to do minor repairs. However, the spring tap was faulty but not yet replaced.

- Challenge: The spring tank seemed to be heavily leaking from the underground and thus needed repair. The spring tap was also faulty and thus needed replacement.

- **Overall, the medium protected spring and spring tank (rehabilitated with one spout) was functioning well as reported by Mitooma DWO.**

#### **(iv) Rehabilitation of Omukayera Protected spring in Mahungye village, Karimbiro Parish in Bitereko S/County**

- The facility had pathway for easy access with paspalum planted with no planted trees.

- I found the protected spring with one (1) spout rehabilitated and functioning fairly well.

- The source was well re-protected.

- The retaining wall was repaired using masonry stones/ boulders was 270mm.

- The catchment was live-fenced and environment was clean.

- Upon testing the minimum water yield on average a 10-litre jerrycan was filled in  $(87+86)/2 = 86.5$  seconds approximated to  $(10/86.5) = 0.116$  litres per second less than 1.2 litres per second reported in the standard design (technical specifications and terms of reference) and thus low yield.

- The repaired steps had a rise of 170mm and a tread of 580 mm (and 970mm wide) that was in the range of technical specifications (a rise of 200mm and a tread of 300mm)

- Height of delivery pipe (spout) from the ground was 570mm within the indicated values in the construction drawings

- There was a drainage channel constructed to divert storm water from flowing into or flooding over the spring

- During the field visit, I found WSC C/Person (Mr. Mweyambe Erias) and one (1) community member.

- According to C/Person, there was a functional WSC and was trained only once in Jan 2023 on slashing around the spring well; using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel.

• The facility serves 18 households each comprising on average 6 people

• There was no collection of water user fees and thus no balance in treasury as the community members prefer collecting money when there is need to do minor repairs.

• **Overall, the medium protected spring (rehabilitated with one spout) was functioning well as reported by Mitooma DWO.**

• Therefore, on average **all the six (6) WSS facilities I visited/ observed in three (3) S/Counties were constructed/ rehabilitated were generally functioning well**, and the DWO fairly reported on them in the Annual Performance and Progress Reports of 4th Quarter in the FY 2022/2023 and therefore, **justifying a score of three (3)**

5

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

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2

• As per quarterly WSS reports, Mitooma district 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.

• There was evidence that Mitooma district LG Water Office collects and compiles information on sub-county water supply and sanitation reported in the minutes of the coordination committee meetings held each quarter incorporated in the following Quarterly reports:

i. **1st Quarter Report** for FY 2022/2023 (REF:CR/158/3) submitted by Mitooma DLG CAO on 12th/10/2022 to MWE Permanent Secretary (PS), received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 16th/03/2023.

ii. **2nd Quarter Report** for FY 2022/2023 (REF:CR/158/3) submitted by Mitooma DLG CAO on 20th/01/2023 to MWE Permanent Secretary (PS), received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 16th/03/2023.

iii. **3rd Quarter Report** for FY 2022/2023 (REF:CR/158/3) submitted by Mitooma DLG CAO on 21st/04/2023 to MWE Permanent Secretary (PS), received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 21st/04/2023.

2

**iv. 4th Quarter Report** for FY 2022/2023 (REF:CR/158/3) submitted by Mitooma DLG CAO on 24th/07/2023 to MWE Permanent Secretary (PS), received by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 25th/07/2023.

- The other information details on functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water coverage, and community involvement especially in management through WSCs were also reported in the summary list attached to especially the 4th Quarter report and Form 1 for data collection for new point water sources/facilities.

- Examples of information in 4th Quarter included the following newly constructed water points in FY 2022/2023 as presented in Water Source database update forms:

- i. **Bulinda spring** in Nyabwina I village, Igambiro Parish, Mitooma S/C rehabilitated in 2023 serving 35 households each comprising 6 people.

- ii. **Nyabwima II spring** in Nyabwina II village, Igambiro Parish, Mitooma S/C rehabilitated in 2023 serving 25 households each comprising 6 people.

- iii. **Late Kanabah spring** in Kazira village, Rukararwe Parish, Katenga S/C rehabilitated in 2023 serving 25 households each comprising 7 people.

- iv. **Mahungye spring** in Mahungye village, Karimbire Parish, Bitereko S/C rehabilitated in 2023 serving 25 households each comprising 6 people.

- v. **Kamabare spring** in Kamabare II village, Kamabare Parish, Bitereko S/C rehabilitated in 2023 serving 30 households each comprising 6 people.

- vi. **Kyoburunga spring** in Karimbire village, Karimbire Parish, Bitereko S/C rehabilitated in 2023 serving 30 households each comprising 7 people.

- vii. **Kibare spring** in Kibare I cell, Kibare ward, Rutookye Town Council rehabilitated in 2023 serving 45 households each comprising 6 people.

- viii. **Katsigazi spring** in Nyerambire II cell, Central ward, Rutookye Town Council rehabilitated in 2023 serving 30 households each comprising 6 people.

- **and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).**

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

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0

• There was some evidence that Mitooma DLG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) as evidenced in only 4th Quarter Report, the newly constructed facilities are reported and their details are filled in Form 1 as a data collection form for point water sources for new facilities, detailing location of the new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc... These are compiled together sent to MWE for updating and the DWO downloads this information as Form 4 compilations of the updated MWE database forming the DWO MIS.

• There was **only one (1) data update report** for District Water and Sanitation Development Grant for FY 2022/2023, submitted to MWE:

**i. Submission of the 4th Quarter data (Form-4)** report for FY 2022/2023 by Mitooma DLG CAO on 14th/09/2023 to MWE PS, by the MWE Central Registry and MWE Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Department (RWSSD) on 26th/10/2023

• There was a compilation for form 1s and form 4s at the LG Water Office for only the 4th Quarter and these were used by the DWO for planning purposes (plan for villages/ S/Counties based on their access/ functionality of water sources).

• Therefore, Mitooma DLG Water Office updated the MIS (WSS data) with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) **for only one (1) out of the four (4) quarters for the FY 2022/2023**

• **and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0)**



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

*Maximum 7 points on this performance measure*

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

*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.*

• According to the Mitooma Lower Local Government Assessment Results for 2021/2022 FY; the 25% lowest performing LLGs and PIPs were therefore to be developed and implemented for them included: **Bitereko** S/C at 61%, **Kanyabwanga** S/C at 58%, **Kigyende** S/C at 58%, **Mayanga** S/C at 50% and **Nyakizinga** S/C at 61%.

• There was a document titled "**Performance improvement plan for poorly Performing Sub-counties in relation to water infrastructure/ Water Supply**" written by District Engineer to CAO Mitooma DLG on 18th/07/2022.

• Also, there was document titled "**Performance Improvement Report for poorly Performing Sub-counties in relation to water infrastructure/ Water Supply**" written by DWO to CAO Mitooma DLG on 28th/06/2023.

• The following were the key action plans: **capacity building initiatives-conduct training programs for local water management staff to enhance technical skills; train local staff on efficient water management, maintenance and repairs; develop a regular maintenance schedule for water facilities; regularly assess the performance of implemented measures; educate communities on the importance of clean water and its impact on health** among others.

• Therefore, there was evidence that the DWO **supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the Previous FY 2022/2023, and thereby justifying a score of two (2).**

## Human Resource Management and Development

Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff

*Maximum 4 points on this performance measure*

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

**There was evidence** that the District Water Officer (DWO) had budgeted for critical staff in the District Water Office. HRM presented an extract from the Performance Contract indicating the DWO had provided for UGX 78,933,372/= for wage in FY 2023/2024.

6	<p>Budgeting for Water &amp; Sanitation and Environment &amp; Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment &amp; Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the District Natural Resources Officer budgeted for critical staff in the Environment and Natural Resources department. HRM presented an extract from the Performance Contract indicating the District Natural Resources Officer had provided for UGX 376,001,328/= for wage in FY 2023/2024.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that the DWO had appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY. Most of the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines. Some of the files reviewed included the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Civil Engineer (Water), Tumusiime Geoffrey was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.</li> <li>2. The Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization, Tumwine Elly was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.</li> <li>3. The Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, Tushemereirwe Shallon was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.</li> <li>4. The Natural Resources Officer, Baguma Naboth was appraised by Turyasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on June 30, 2023.</li> <li>5. The Environment Officer, Kagumire Godwin was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 25, 2023.</li> <li>6. The Forestry Officer, Bazirake Amon was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 25, 2023.</li> </ol>	0

Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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

• According to the document titled **“Request for Training/ Induction of Our Staff”** submitted by CAO Mitooma DLG on 9th/02/2023 to the Commissioner,-Civil Service College Uganda, Ministry of Public Service; and document titled **“Capacity Development of Staff”** written by **CAO Mitooma DLG on 23rd/02/2023 top all heads of Departments; and the document titled “Nomination of Works’ Staff for Capacity Building Training”** written by the District Engineer Mitooma DLG on 24th/02/2023, the District Water Office had identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities were conducted by nominating five (5) staff for capacity building Training.

• According to the document titled **“Training Report on Induction in Public Service”** written by Assistant Engineering Officer (Mechanical) to the District Engineer and copied to PHRO, Mitooma DLG on 28th/3/2023; **five (5) staff (Tumwebaze John Baptist, Tumwine Elly, Malinga Nathan, Tumusiime Geoffrey and Mujuni Ronald)** from the Works/Water Department-Mitooma DLG were trained on mindset change, Discipline in Public services, communication, conflict management, building and maintaining effective team;

• Therefore, **there was evidence that the DWO submitted staff capacity needs to the PHRO and this was documented/ consolidated into the District Training database by the PHRO Mitooma DLG.**

• **and therefore, justifying a score of three (3).**

### Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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.

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

- 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

• According to the 4th Quarter/ Annual report titled “Mitooma District Local Government Water and Sanitation Development Grant Annual Report for 2022/2023 (REF: CR/158/3)” submitted by CAO on 24th/07/2023 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 25th/07/2023; **the Safe Water Coverage (SWC) for Mitooma DLG was 82.7%.**

• The Sub-Counties with SWC below the district average were: **Bitereko** S/C with SWC of 82.4%; **Kiyanga** S/C with SWC of 61.7%; **Mutara** S/C with SWC of 69.2%

- If below 60 %: Score 0 and **Kashenshero** Town council with SWC of 80.0%
  - These were all to be the target S/Cs for budget allocations in the FY 2023/24.
  - As per the document titled “Mitooma District Water and Sanitation Development Conditional Grant Annual work plan for FY 2023/2024 (CR/158/1) submitted by CAO on 21st/07/2023 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 21st/07/2023, the following were the budget allocations:
    - Project 1: Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS Phase III Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C at a cost of UGX 272,096,863; **which is a target of 0 out of 1, equivalent to 0%;**
    - Project 2: Rehabilitation of ten (10) springs and spring tanks in Mutara S/C (4), Mayanga S/C (3) and Rurehe S/C (3) at a cost of UGX 25,000,000; **which is a target of 4 (UGX 10,000,000) out of 10 (UGX 25,000,000), equivalent to 40%;**
  - However, there were the following MoUs with the development partners: MoU between Mitooma DLG and Raising the Village International from 20th/02/2020 and 27th/02/2024; and MoU between Mitooma DLG and Rukungiri Women Integrated Development Foundation (RWIDF) from 22nd/08/2022 and 21st/08/2027;
  - According to RWIDF Report written by Field Officer on 30th/08/2023, in 2023/2024 FY, ten (10) springs are to be protected 3 in Katenga S/C (7,500,000), 2 in Kashenshero S/C (5,000,000), 3 in Mutara TC (7,500,000) and 2 in Mutara S/C (5,000,000) and one (1) rain water harvesting tank of 30,000 litres capacity in Rurehe S/C (9,500,000); which is a target of **4 (10,000,000) out of 11 (34,500,000), equivalent to 36.4%.**
  - According to Raising the Village International Report written by Field Officer on 30th/10/2023, 32 shallow wells and 43 spring protection with tanks were being constructed/rehabilitated in Bitereko S/C (UGX 183,000,000), 3 shallow wells and 7 protected springs with tanks in Nyakizinga S/C (UGX 30,000,000), which is a target of **75 (183,000,000) out of 85 (213,000,000), equivalent to 86%.**
  - The Budget for FY 2023/24, therefore reflects a total of **UGX 544,596,863 (A)** allocated to WSS developmental projects out of which **UGX 203,000,000 (B)** is allocated to target S/Cs.

• Therefore % of the budget allocation for FY 2023/2024 that was allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage was  $(B/A)*100 = UGX\ 203,000,000/544,596,863)*100 = 37.3%$  equivalent to 37%.

• **This was below 60% and therefore, justifying a score of zero (0)**

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.

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3

• There was evidence that Mitooma DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the FY 2023/2024 as seen from the following:

• According to the 4th Quarter/ Annual report titled “Mitooma District Local Government Water and Sanitation Development Grant Annual Report for 2022/2023 (REF: CR/158/3)” submitted by CAO on 24th/07/2023 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 25th/07/2023;

• There was a document titled “**Report on District Planning and Advocacy Meeting on Water and Sanitation**” held from District Council Hall written by PCDO/ Community Mobilizer to District Engineer/ Senior DWO Mitooma DLG on 30th/09/2022. The meeting was attended by 53 participants.

• There was a document titled “**Report on County Planning and Advocacy Meetings on Water and Sanitation held in Ruhinda South (6th/01/2023), Ruhinda North (9th/01/2023) and Ruhinda (10th/02/2023) during FY 2022/2023**” written by Senior PCDO-Mobilization to District Engineer Mitooma DLG on 12th/01/2023.

• There were letters to the Senior Assistant Secretaries on the subject of: “**Capital Water projects to be implemented in FY 2023/2024**” written by District Engineer Mitooma DLG on 21st/07/2023,

• and besides a list of WSS projects titled “**Capital Water projects to be implemented in FY 2023/2024**” was displayed on Mitooma DLG notice board and on 3 out of 3 noticeboards of the sampled S/Countries for field visits.

• **and therefore, justifying a score of three (3)**

3

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

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.)

- 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

• There was some evidence that Mitooma District Water Office monitored some WSS facilities at least quarterly.

• There was a document titled **“Monitoring Plan for FY 2022-2023”** written by the Assistant Engineering Officer (Water) Mitooma DLG on 22nd/07/2022, 1000 WSS facilities were planned to be monitored.

• There were the following quarterly monitoring reports for FY 2022/2023 that were provided by Mitooma DWO.

• **Quarterly Monitoring and Supervision Report for the 1st Quarter** FY 2022/2023 written by DWO Mitooma DLG on 1th/10/2023

• **Quarterly Monitoring and Supervision Report for the 2nd Quarter** FY 2022/2023 written by DWO Mitooma DLG on 10th/12/2022.

• **Quarterly Monitoring and Supervision Report for the 3rd Quarter** FY 2022/2023 written by DWO Mitooma DLG on 29th/03/2023.

• **Quarterly Monitoring and Supervision Report for the 4th Quarter** FY 2022/2023 written by DWO Mitooma DLG on 30th/06/2023.

• The List of sources for Rural Water Supply and sanitation facilities for Mitooma district constructed/rehabilitated in FY 2022/2023 included the following:

i. Project 1: MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00002: Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS Phase II Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C at a cost of UGX 254,980,041; **GFS Monitored, 100%**;

ii. Project 2: MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00010: Rehabilitation of ten (10) springs and spring tanks in Katenga S/C **(4,133,304), Bitereko S/C (8,624,926) and Rutookye S/C (7,482,568) at a cost of UGX 20,240,800; Protected springs Monitored, 100%**;

• Overall, from my analysis of all the monitoring reports of WSS facilities for FY 2022/2023, I conclude that the estimated percentage of water facilities monitored at least quarterly was  $(B/A)*100=(1000/1163)*100 = 85.98\%$  equivalent to 86% that was between 80% and 95%

• thereby, justifying a score two (2).

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2

There was evidence that Mitooma DWO planned and conducted all the four (4) quarterly DWSCC meetings and key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed:

(i) **Minutes of the Mitooma DLG 1st Quarter** District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 27th/09/2022 held from the District Council Hall, attended by 26 participants: Especially under agenda item 3-“Remarks by DWO” and 8-“Discussion and Way forward”

(ii) **Minutes of the Mitooma DLG 2nd Quarter** District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 15th/12/2022 held from the District Council Hall, attended by 23 participants: Especially under agenda item 6-“Presentation and discussion of reports” and 8-“ Way forward”

(iii) **Minutes of the Mitooma DLG 3rd Quarter** District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 20th/03/2023 held from the District Council Hall, attended by 23 participants: Especially under agenda item 4-“Reports”, 5-“Discussion” and 7-“Way forward”

(iv) **Minutes of the Mitooma DLG 4th Quarter** District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee Meeting held on 22nd/05/2023 held from the Tent near production Sector, attended by 23 participants: Especially under agenda item 4-“Technical Assessment Report for Liable Water Source Reports”, 6-“Discussion” and 7-“ Way forward”

• Key Issue identified and discussed included but not limited to the following:

(i) ...improvement of sanitation and hygiene campaign to be carried out in Katenga in the parishes of Bitooma and Igambiro.... **(Min.24/2022).**

(ii) ...engage SNV and Japanese embassy to give us a hand in Water and Sanitation activities in the district.... **(Min.25/2022).**

(iii) ...NWSC should put VAT on unit of water not on service fee.... **(Min.25/2022).**

(iv) ...Assessment be done on Rwenshama Kashongorero GFS by NWSC with the S/County leadership to identify where the problem is .... **(Min.34/2022).**

(v) .....Report on the progress of Kyanzare parish as a model parish in sanitation and hygiene improvement be

produced in next quarter's meeting ....  
**(Min.14/2023).**

(vi) .....issue of trees in catchment area of Kibale water source, NWSC was to take an upper hand, write to CAO, for the relevant/ technical officers to carry out assessment for what should be done .... (Min.05/2023).

**• therefore, justifying a score of two (2)**

• There was evidence that Mitooma district water office publicizes budget allocations for the current FY 2023/24. The list of planned projects for FY 2023/2024 titled "Capital water projects to be implemented in FY 2023-2024 was **displayed on Mitooma DLG notice board by the DWO and on 3 out of 3 notice boards of sampled benefiting S/Counties**

**• and therefore, justifying a score of two (2)**

2

9

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

*Maximum 8 points on this performance measure*

c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2

10

Mobilization for WSS is conducted

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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:

- If funds were allocated score 3
- If not score 0

☞ The Total Non-Wage Recurrent budget for the previous FY 2022/2023 was UGX 57,776,342 (A) while the amount spend on Mobilization (Software) was UGX 27,116,342 (B).

☞ Percentage of NWR rural water and sanitation budget allocated to mobilization = **(B/A)\*100 = (27,116,342 /57,776,342)\*100= 47%**

☞ This percentage **is greater than the minimum of 40% as per sector guidelines and therefore, justifying a score of three (3)**

3

10

Mobilization for WSS is conducted

*Maximum 6 points on this performance measure*

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.

☞ According to the four (4) quarterly Mitooma District software reports, the DWO in liaison with the CDO established and trained all WSCs for the new facilities constructed in FY 2022/2023 on their roles and responsibilities on O&M for the facilities, and on hygiene indicated in the Quarterly Software Reports.

☞ According to the document titled **"Report on Formation and Training of Water User Committees"** written by Assistant Engineering-Water Department to DWO Mitooma DLG on 26th/09/ 2023, there was evidence that **ten (10) water User Committees (WSCs)** for newly constructed/ rehabilitated water supply

3



facilities/projects each comprising of **six (6) members** were trained by the staff of DWO Mitooma DLG.

📎 There was another document titled **“Report on Formation Reactivation and Training of Water User Committees for Katenga GFS”** written by Assistant Engineering-Water Department to DWO Mitooma DLG on 25th/08/2023, there was evidence that **four (4) water User Committees (WSCs)** for newly constructed/ rehabilitated water supply facilities/projects **each comprising of six (6) members** were trained by the staff of DWO Mitooma DLG.

📎 There was some photos of Training water user committees in in different S/Counties.

📎 For the six (6) WSS facilities sampled in three (3) S/Counties namely, I observed/noted the following:

**(i) Phase II: Mushunga-Nkinga Gravity Flow Scheme in Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C**

**a) PSP 1- Kichwamba B (single spout) at Kichwamba B village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C**

- During the field visit, I found 2 WSC members including C/Person Tukundane Julius and Member-Banturaki Obed and four (4) community members.
- According to the WSC C/Person, the functional WSC was trained once in July 2023 on cleanliness, non-wastage of water (using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel) and the facility was clean.
- There was no payment for water despite members expected to have started paying from 1st/ Dec/2023.

**b) PSP 2- Nkinga Trading Center (single spout) at Nkinga A village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C**

- During the field visit, I found one (1) WSC members C/Person of GFS Beshemeza Teudor and two (2) community members.
- According to the WSC C/Person, the functional WSC was trained once in July 2023 from Nkiga parish Hall on cleanliness, non-wastage of water (using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel) and the facility was clean.
- The GFS management comprises 10 members including four (4) women.
- There was no payment for water

despite members expected to have started paying from 1st/ Dec/2023.

**c) PSP 3- Mustibuka B (single spout) at Nkinga A village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C**

- During the field visit, I found one (1) WSC members-C/Person Banabas Sasirabo and two (2) community members.
- According to the WSC C/Person, the functional WSC was trained once in August 2023 on cleanliness, collection of water user fees, non-wastage of water (using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel) and the facility was clean.
- There was no payment for water as community households were not sure of when to start paying for the water.

**(ii) Rehabilitation of Kasigazi Abdu Protected spring in Nyerambire village, Central ward in Rutookye Town Council**

- During the field visit, I found WSC C/Person (Mr. Godfrey Balem) and three (3) community members
- According to C/Person, there was a functional WSC and was trained only once in June 2023 on slashing around the spring well; using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel. However, the facility was dirty and bushy.
- The was no collection of water user fees and thus no balance in treasury as the community members prefer collecting money when there is need to do minor repairs.

**(iii) Rehabilitation of Protected spring in Kibale I village, Kibale ward in Rutookye Town Council**

- During the field visit, I found WSC C/Person (Mr. Mugisha Geoffrey) and two (2) community members
- According to C/Person, there was a functional WSC and was trained only once in 2012 on slashing around the spring well; using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel
- The facility serves 10 households each comprising on average 6 people
- The was no collection of water user fees and thus no balance in treasury as the community members prefer collecting money when there is need to do minor repairs. However, the spring tap was faulty but not yet replaced.

**(iv) Rehabilitation of Omukayera**

**Protected spring in Mahungye village, Karimbiro Parish in Bitereko S/County**

- During the field visit, I found WSC C/Person (Mr. Mweyambe Erias) and one (1) community member.
- According to C/Person, there was a functional WSC and was trained only once in Jan 2023 on slashing around the spring well; using water sparingly and cleaning drainage channel.
- The facility serves 18 households each comprising on average 6 people
- There was no collection of water user fees and thus no balance in treasury as the community members prefer collecting money when there is need to do minor repairs.
- **therefore, justifying a score of three (3)**

**Investment Management**

11

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

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

- There was an assets register titled **“Asset Register for Water Facilities”** for WSS facilities for Mitooma district Water Department signed and stamped by the Mitooma DLG District Engineer on 30th/6/2023.

- This was listed by S/N, Subcounty, Parish, Village, Name of Source, Type, Year of Construction, Management and Functionality.

- This was updated with the most recently entered facility constructed in 2022.

- Examples of functional and communally managed WSS facilities constructed in FY 2022/2023 and were updated in the WSS asset register included:

- Mutsibika A PSP**, Mutsibika A village, Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/County

- Mutsibika B PSP**, Mutsibika B village, Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/County

- Nkinga A-Katureebe PSP**, Nkinga A village, Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/County

- Mushabe Pius PSP**, Nkinga A village Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/County

- Karimbari PSP**, Nkinga B, village Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/County.

- Therefore, basing on the summarized (sampled) WSS facilities and their functionality, I established that most of the WSS facilities implemented (constructed/ rehabilitated/ designed) in FY 2022/2023 were updated.

- **There was an up-to-date WSS asset register available at Mitooma DLG Water Department and therefore, justifying a score of four (4).**

11

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans (LGDPIII) and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:

Score 4 or else score 0.

For FY 2023/2024, MDLG Water and Environment Unit has the following projects:

Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS UGX159,930,685

Rehabilitation of 10 springs and spring tanks in Mayanga S/C, Mutara S/C and Rurehe S/C UGX22,928,438

-Derived from the LG Development Plan

-Consistent with sector guidelines & DDEG objectives

-Financially feasible

-Having costed project profiles.

Evidence of desk appraisals for the two (02) MDLG FY2023/2024 Water and Environment projects was provided/seen and reviewed during this assessment.

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities:  
Score 2

• As per the document “Mitooma District Water and Sanitation Development Conditional Grant Annual work plan for FY 2023/2024 (CR/158/1) submitted by CAO on 21st/07/2023 to MWE PS, received by MWE Central Registry and approved by MWE RWSSD on 21st/07/2023, the following were the budget allocations:

i. Project 1: Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS Phase III Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C at a cost of UGX 272,096,863;

ii. Project 2: Rehabilitation of ten (10) springs and spring tanks in Mutara S/C (4), Mayanga S/C (3) and Rurehe S/C (3) at a cost of UGX 25,000,000;

• There was evidence that the beneficiary communities applied for WSS investments for the current FY 2023/2024.

(i) **Request** for Rurehe spring protection from district water office Nyaruhita village, Rurehe South parish in Rurehe sub county signed, stamped on 26th/06/2016.

(ii) **Request** for Rutooma spring protection from district water office by Rutooma A village, Rutooma parish in Rurehe sub county signed, stamped by LC-I C/Person on 18th/06/2016.

(iii) **Request** for Kijimbi C spring protection from district water office by Kijimbi C village, Rutooma parish in Rurehe sub county signed, stamped by LC-I C/Person on 18th/06/2016

(iv) **Request** for Kiririma spring protection from district water office by Mawizi village, Mawizi parish in Mutara sub county signed, stamped by LC-I C/Person on 20th/06/2016

(v) **Request** for Buhashya spring protection from district water office by Buhashya A-II village, Ryengyerero parish in Ryengyerero sub county signed, stamped by LC-I C/Person on 20th/06/2016

• Therefore, **at least five (5) sampled beneficiary communities applied for the budgeted WSS investments for current FY 2023/2024 and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).**

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>For the current FY2023/2024, MDLG Water and Environment department has the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>🏗️ Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS UGX159,930,685</li> <li>🏗️ Rehabilitation of 10 springs and spring tanks in Mayanga S/C, Mutara S/C and Rurehe S/C UGX22,928,438</li> </ul> <p>A Field Appraisal aims to ensure that a project meets the following requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Technical feasibility</li> <li>-Environmental and social acceptability requirements</li> </ul> <p>No evidence with regard to field appraisals for the two (02) MDLG FY2023/2024 Water and Environment projects was provided/seen during assessment.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Screening for environmental and social risks/ impacts for the construction/rehabilitation Rugarama spring tanks was carried out on 7/7/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO.</li> <li>2. Screening for environmental and social risks/ impacts for the rehabilitation of Kanganga spring tanks in Mayanga II village was carried out on 24/7/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO.</li> <li>3. Screening for environmental and social risks/ impacts for the construction/rehabilitation Rusheraganyi spring tanks i Mayanga I village was carried out on 20/7/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO.</li> </ol>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There is Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in Mitooma DLG approved Procurement Plan for the previous FY (2022/23) dated 14/7/2023. The following water infrastructure investment projects among others were incorporated in the Procurement Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Rehabilitation of 10 Springs and Spring Tanks in Katenga, Bitereko and Rutookye T/C-</b> MITO893/WRKS/20222-23/00010; Contract Price is UGX 20,240,800/=.</li> <li>2. <b>Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga Scheme Phase II-</b> MITO893/WRKS/20222-23/00002; Contract Price is UGX 254,989,121/=.</li> </ol> <p>.</p>	2
----	--	--	--	---

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There is Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY (2022/23) was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement.</p> <p>The sampled projects are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Rehabilitation of 10 Springs and Spring Tanks in Katenga, Bitereko and Rutookye T/C-</b> MITO893/WRKS/20222-23/00010; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 029/CC/2022/23 in a meeting held on 28/11/2022.</li> <li>2. <b>Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga Scheme Phase II-</b> MITO893/WRKS/20222-23/00002; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 028/CC/2022/23 in a meeting held on 28/11/2022.</li> </ol>	2
----	--	--	---	---



12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was NO evidence of proper establishment of the PITs for the Water Sector projects within the last FY (2022/2023) as per guidelines.</p>	0
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p>The sampled projects are listed below with their details:</p>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Rehabilitation of 10 Springs and Spring Tanks in Katenga, Bitereko and Rutookye T/C-</b> A copy of appointment through memo dated 5/1/2023 has the Project Manager appointed by the CAO. However there were no appointments for the: Clerk of Works, Contract Manager, Labour Officer, Environment Officer and DCDO for Water and Sanitation projects of FY 2022/2023.</li> <li>2. <b>Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga Scheme Phase II-</b> A copy of joint appointment through memo dated 5/1/2023 has the following PIT members appointed by the CAO; Environment Officer, DCDO, Labour Officer and Contract Manager. However there was no appointment for the: Clerk of Works for Water and Sanitation projects of FY 2022/2023.</li> </ol>	
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>There was some evidence that the six (6) water facilities I sampled and visited in three (3) S/Counties and presented below were constructed as per the standard Technical Designs provided by the DWO in the BOQs and Technical drawings:</p>	2
	<p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>		<p><b>(i) Phase II: Mushunga-Nkinga Gravity Flow Scheme in Nkinga parish in Mitooma S/C</b></p> <p><b>a) PSP 1- Kichwamba B (single spout) at Kichwamba B village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The water collection platform was 900mmx830mmx150mm</li> <li>• The drainage channel was 85mmx130mmx85mm</li> <li>• The height of the water delivery pipe from the ground was 550mm.</li> </ul> <p><b>b) PSP 2- Nkinga Trading Center (single spout) at Nkinga A village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The water collection platform was 1000mmx810mmx155mm</li> <li>• The height of the water delivery pipe from the ground was 670mm.</li> </ul>	

**c) PSP 3- Mustibuka B (single spout)  
at Nkinga A village, Nkinga Parish,  
Mitooma S/C**

- The water collection platform was 850mmx800mmx165mm
- The height of the water delivery pipe from the ground was 685mm.
- The facility served about 10 households each comprising 5 members on average.

**(ii) Rehabilitation of Kasigazi Abdu  
Protected spring in Nyerambire  
village, Central ward in Rutookye  
Town Council**

- There was a drainage channel constructed to divert storm water from flowing into or flooding over the spring. However, this was too bushy and filled with sediments.

**(iii) Rehabilitation of Protected  
spring in Kibale I village, Kibale  
ward in Rutookye Town Council**

- The repaired steps had a rise of 225mm and a tread of 620 mm (and 1030mm wide) that was in the range of technical specifications (a rise of 200mm and a tread of 300mm)
- Height of delivery pipe (spout) from the ground was 500mm within the indicated values in the construction drawings
- There was a drainage channel constructed to divert storm water from flowing into or flooding over the spring.

**(iv) Rehabilitation of Omukayera  
Protected spring in Mahungye  
village, Karimbiro Parish in Bitereko  
S/County**

- The source was well re-protected.
- The retaining wall was repaired using masonry stones/ boulders was 270mm.
- The repaired steps had a rise of 170mm and a tread of 580 mm (and 970mm wide) that was in the range of technical specifications (a rise of 200mm and a tread of 300mm)
- Height of delivery pipe (spout) from the ground was 570mm within the indicated values in the construction drawings

**• Overall, all the six (6) water and sanitation facilities sampled were constructed/ rehabilitated as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO, and therefore, justifying a score of two (2).**

Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements

*Maximum 14 points on this performance measure*

e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2

There is NO evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects. Monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects was carried out by the relevant technical officers (i.e. Contract Manager, Project Manager, Contract Supervisor, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CDO) as seen from the joint inspection reports dated: 25/4/2023, 18/8/2023, 30/9/2022, 13/5/2022 and minutes of meeting dated: 6/4/2023.

The projects sampled included;

1. **Rehabilitation of 10 Springs and Spring Tanks in Katenga, Bitereko and Rutookye T/C-** Monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects was carried out by the relevant technical officers (i.e. Contract Manager, Project Manager, Contract Supervisor, Environment Officer, Labour Officer and CDO) as seen from the joint inspection reports dated: 25/4/2023, 18/8/2023, 30/9/2022, 13/5/2022 and minutes of meeting dated: 6/4/2023.
2. **Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga Scheme Phase II-** The following dated minutes of meeting were noted: 14/3/2023, 22/4/2022. However, there were no joint inspection reports noted during assessment.

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements	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	Two (02) payments of MDLG FY2022/2023 Water and Environment infrastructure projects were sampled to test for certification and the timeliness of payment for works executed.	0
	<i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0	Payment to Kamoja Enterprises Ltd for rehabilitation of springs and spring tanks in Katenga, Bitereko and Rutokye T/C (UGX18,251,026) – Requisition dated 01/06/2023, certified by Water Officer, CDO, Environment Officer and CAO on 24/05/2023 and payment effected on 15/06/2023 (14 days).  Payment to GAT Consults Ltd for Construction of Nkiga-Mushunga GFS phase 2 (UGX217,821,215) – Requisition dated 08/06/2023, certified by Water Officer, CDO, Environment Officer and CAO on 08/06/2023 and payment effected on 27/06/2023 (19 days).  Though in all payments certification before payment was duly effected, in one (01) of the two (02) sampled projects payments were effected beyond the 14 days’ time limit.	
12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements	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:	There was evidence that Mitooma DLG has a complete procurement file for all water infrastructure investments with all records; including: the evaluation report approved by the Contracts Committee; Works Contract; and Minutes of Contracts Committee decisions. The Projects files among others included;	2
	<i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	Score 2, If not score 0	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Rehabilitation of 10 Springs and Spring Tanks in Katenga, Bitereko and Rutookye T/C-</b> MITO893/WRKS/20222-23/00010; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 029/CC/2022/23 in a meeting held on 28/11/2022. The contract was awarded on 19/12/2022. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report on 28/11/2022.</li> <li>2. <b>Construction of Mushunga-Nkinga Scheme Phase II-</b> MITO893/WRKS/20222-23/00002; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 028/CC/2022/23 in a meeting held on 28/11/2022. The contract was awarded on 19/12/2022. The Contracts Committee approved the evaluation report on 28/11/2022.</li> </ol>	

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence</b> that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework</p>	0
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>		
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the DWO and the Environment Officer were disseminated guidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs</p>	3
		<p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>1. In the minutes dated 12/12/22, the DWO and the Environment Officer disseminated the uidelines on water source &amp; catchment protection and natural resource management to 4 LLG of Rutookye S/c, Bitereko S/c, Kashenshero S/c and Mitooma T/c, singed by secretary Miss. Atuzarirwe Allen and chairperson Turyasasirws Edith.</p>	
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented</p>	3
			<p>In report of Ref NAT.213/1, dated 25/8/22, the CAO recieved water source protection plans &amp; natural resource management plan for all the water projects implemented in the previous FY.</p>	

Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on this performance measure*

b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:

Score 3, If not score 0

• There was evidence that WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent as seen from the following listed requests and the accompanying land consent statements:

(i) **Consent agreement** for construction Mushunga-Nkinga GFS (45ftx45ft for electing the water tanks) between the land owner (Kayunga Joses) and community of Nkinga A village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/County in the presence of eight (8) witnesses signed and stamped by LC-II C/P Nkinga Parish on 16th/11/2021.

(ii) **Land Sale agreement** (UGX 2,000,000) for Mushunga-Nkinga GFS between Kayunga Joses (Buyer) and the land owner (Nakalanzi Beatrice) of Nkiga A village, Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C in the presence of ten (10) witnesses signed and stamped by LC-I and LC-II C/Persons on 13th/11/2021

• **There was evidence that all WSS facilities budgeted for FY 2022/2023 were implemented on land where Mitooma DLG had proof of consent , and therefore, justifying a score of three (3).**

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&amp;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:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>A sample of seven (07) MDLG FY2022/2023 investment projects was tested to check for E&amp;S certification of projects before payment:</p> <p>Construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS – E&amp;S certificate dated 09/06/2023.</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Katerera P/S – E&amp;S certificate dated 16/06/2023.</p> <p>Construction of Kitojo Seed S.S in Kashenshero S/C – E&amp;S certificate dated 16/06/2023.</p> <p>Construction of classroom block at Kyeibare P/S – E&amp;S certificate dated 16/06/2023.</p> <p>Construction of staff house at Mayanga HCIII – E&amp;S certificate dated 12/06/2023.</p> <p>Upgrade of Mayanga HCIII to HCIV – E&amp;S certificate dated 28/05/2023.</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 10 water springs in the DLG – E&amp;S certificate dated 05/06/2023.</p> <p>For all the samples tested, E&amp;S certification was effected in accordance with the requirements.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring for the rehabilitation of the springs and spring tanks i.e. of Kazira and Mahungye was carried out on 12/5/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO, <b>However monitoring reports were not provided for review</b>, the project started on 4/10/22 and ended on 19/5/23.</li> </ul>	0

**Micro-scale  
Irrigation  
Performance  
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Local Government Service Delivery Results</b>				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The District Production Officer, Mr. Monday Lwanga availed a document titled “Data on irrigated Agriculture for 2022/2023 and 2021/2022” FY”, disaggregated between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of Microscale irrigation grant. Among beneficiaries is Gakyaro Adrian in katenga S/C (1.5acres) while one of the non-beneficiaries is Nyabubaare Irrigation scheme in Rwoburonga S/C (20 acres) funded by the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p> <p>therefore, Mitooma DLG keeps up to date data on irrigated land for the las 2 FYs, and is disaggregated between beneficiaries and non beneficiaries of microscale irrigation grant.</p>	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By more than 5% score 2</li> <li>• Between 1% and 4% score 1</li> <li>• If no increase score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the data on irrigated agricultural for the last three FYs, the following were noted <b>2020/2021=0, 2021/2022=0, 2022/2023=31.416</b> acres. This implies an increase of acreage under irrigation of <b>[(31.416-0)/0]*100=∞</b></p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 70%, score 4</li> <li>• 60% - 70%, score 2</li> <li>• Below 60%, score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The performance of MDLG in its FY2022/2023 LLG Micro scale irrigation (Production Services) assessment was 94% making it fall in the range ‘80% and above’.</p>	4



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>	<p>According to the budget performance report of Mitooma DLG, the total allocation for Microscale Irrigation program was <b>UGX255,000,000</b>, of which <b>UGX163,000,000</b> was spent on Awareness creation and <b>UGX92,000,000</b> was returned to the treasury. Also, it should be noted that the entire allocation was meant for complementary activities including setting up demos, no development component.</p>	<b>0</b>
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>For MDLG, the program started in FY2022/2023 and not is in its second year. During the previous FY the procurement process delayed and by the end of the year the grant had not been utilised and was swept back (100%). Therefore no payments were made, even for demo equipment. In the same way, the delay of initiating the process meant that there were no approved farmers, even at the time of this assessment.</p> <p>The LG did not comply with the performance measure</p>	<b>0</b>

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DPO availed the following for review;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contract agreement for supply and installation of microscale irrigation equipment to two farmers in Kashenshero &amp; kiyanga Sub counties, <b>MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00014/LOT1</b> dated 9th May,2023 between Mitooma DLG and Adritex Uganda Ltd, at <b>UGX 45,650,660</b>, Engineers estimate was <b>UGX 38,315,126, variation= [(45,650,660-38,315,126)/45,650,660]*100=16.1%</b>.</li> <li>2. Contract agreement for supply and installation of microscale irrigation equipment to two farmers in Kashenshero &amp; kiyanga Sub counties, <b>MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00014/LOT2</b> dated 9th May,2023 between Mitooma DLG and Associated Design and Build Engineers Ltd, at <b>UGX 44,894,280</b>, against the <b>engineer's estimate of UGX 44,716,500 giving a variation of [(44,894,280-44,716,500)/44,716,500]*100=0.4%</b></li> </ol> <p>Therefore the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates.</p>	1
---	---	---	--	---

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>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• Between 80 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• Below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DPO availed the following for review;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contract agreement for supply and installation of microscale irrigation equipment to two farmers in Kashenshero &amp; kiyanga Sub counties, <b>MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00014/LOT1 dated 9th May,2023</b> between Mitooma DLG and Adritex Uganda Ltd, at UGX 45,650,660.</li> <li>2. Contract agreement for supply and installation of microscale irrigation equipment to two farmers in Kashenshero &amp; kiyanga Sub counties, <b>MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00014/LOT2 dated 9th May,2023</b> between Mitooma DLG and Associated Design and Build Engineers Ltd, at UGX 44,894,280.</li> <li>3. Certificate of completion for ADBE dated 23rd October, 2023 and Certificate of completion for Adritex dated 18th October, 2023</li> </ol> <p>From these, it was observed that the contracts that were signed in the previous FY were actually completed in the current FY.</p>	0
---	---	--	--	---

<p>4</p> <p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2</li> <li>• If 75 – 99% score 1</li> <li>• If below 75% score 0</li> </ul>	<p><b>There was no evidence</b> that the LG had recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure.</p> <p>Mitooma District Local Government had 10 Sub Counties and 02 Town Councils</p> <p>The approved structure provided for five extension workers in each sub county (Veterinary Officer, Agricultural Officer, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer, Assistant Agricultural Officer, and Assistant Veterinary Officer), and three in each town council (Agricultural Officer, Assistant Agricultural Officer, and Assistant Veterinary Officer). The staff list for extension workers showed that the District had recruited only 26 staff out of the expected 56 computing to a percentage of 46.4%.</p> <p>Some of the staff substantively appointed included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Turyamuhebwa Mathias, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated October 13, 2015 ref.: Ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 212/6/5/2015 (3) and posted to Mitooma Sub County. Turyamuhebwa Mathias was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 15, 2023.</li> <li>2. Atwine Caroline, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated October 13, 2015 ref.: Ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 212/6/5/2015 (2) and posted to Katenga Sub County. Atwine Caroline was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.</li> <li>3. Mugizi Peter, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated October 13, 2015 ref.: Ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 212/6/5/2015 (6) and posted to Mitooma Town Council. Mugizi Peter was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans Principal Assistant Secretary on July 03, 2023.</li> <li>4. Ngabirano Augustino, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated October 13, 2015 ref.: Ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 212/6/5/2015 (4) and posted to Kashenshero Sub County. Ngabirano Augustino was appraised</li> </ol>
---	---	--

- by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
5. Kamurasi Jackson, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 13, 2023 ref.: Ref.: CR/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 635/04/2023 and posted to Kiyanga Sub County. Kamurasi Jackson was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
  6. Keminyeto Naome, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 16, 2017 ref.: Ref.; CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 210/2017 and posted to Kanyabwanga Sub County. Keminyeto Naome was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 04, 2023.
  7. Muhebwa Bruce, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated October 29, 2015 ref.: Ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 238/10/2015 and posted to Rurehe Sub County. Muhebwa Bruce was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 20, 2023.
  8. Atwine Kenneth Rwakanuuma, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated October 13, 2015 ref.: Ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 212/6/5/2015 (1) and posted to Kashenshero Town Council. Atwine Kenneth Rwakanuuma was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on June 30, 2023.
  9. Ngabirano Keneth, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated October 13, 2015 ref.: Ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 212/6/5/2015 (5) and posted to Mutara Sub County. Ngabirano Keneth was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 29, 2023.
  10. Muganga Paul, Agricultural Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated October 29, 2015 ref.: Ref.:

CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 238/10/2015 and posted to Mayanga Sub County. Muganga Paul was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 04, 2023.

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The three demonstration installations(in Kayanga, Kashenshero and Kayanga S/Cs) were sampled, visited and checked for conformity with the standards. The Micro-Scale irrigation program guideline Version April 2020 stipulates the key components of an irrigation system as Water source, pumping equipment, water storage and water application components.</p> <p>The three demonstration sites were found to conform to the guidelines.</p>	<b>2</b>
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0</li> </ul>	<p>No installation was made in the previous FY, all the three demos were completed in this FY.</p>	<b>0</b>

**Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement**

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

**There was evidence** that information on position of extension workers filled was accurate.

In Mitooma District, Katenga Sub County, Rurehe Sub County, and Mitooma Town Council were sampled for assessment.

In Katenga Sub County the information on the position of extension workers filled was accurate and in conformity with deployment information from HRM.

The following extension workers were on the staff list of Katenga Sub County, consistent with information from HRM:

1. Atwine Caroline, Agricultural Officer
2. Ashaba Nathan, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer

In Rurehe Sub County the information on the position of extension workers filled was accurate.

The following extension workers were on the staff list of Rurehe Sub County:

1. Muhebwa Bruce, Agricultural Officer
2. Mwebesa Robert, Assistant Animal husbandry Officer

In Mitooma Town Council the information on the position of extension workers filled was accurate.

The following extension workers were on the staff list of Mitooma Town Council:

1. Mugizi Peter, Agricultural Officer
2. Atwijukire Judith, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer

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

Three irrigation demos installed this FY were the only ones available at the time of assessment. They were sampled and visited, and tested and were all found to be up and running with no defects. Their locations are as follows;

1. Kayanga S/C, hosted by Tukwasibwe Deogratiious (0772438822).
2. Katenga S/C, hosted by Tumusime Fred (0782454938)
3. Kashensero S/C hosted by Gakyaro Adrian (0774231401)

Therefore, information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is actually accurate

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

The following evidences were availed for review;

1. Fourth quarter report dated 17/08/2023, by Atwine Caroline the Focal person for Micro scale irrigation program, according which 18 awareness raising meetings for farmers were conducted (644 female and 555 male), 50 EOIs registered, 192 preparations for farm visits were made, 51 farm visits conducted, Monitoring and supervision of works on irrigation demonstration sites by both technical and political leaders was done.
2. Third quarter report dated 13/04/2023; Awareness raising at district level (139 males and 87 females). Participants were drawn from among technical staff, political leaders, irrigation equipment suppliers and financial institutions. Awareness raising at LLG levels (1020 participated, 879 males and 141 female), Expressions of Interest registered were 197.
3. Second Quarter report: Awareness raising events for local leaders at district level (23 males and 14 females), LLG level 12 awareness events were conducted in 12 LLGs attended by 534 participants, 67 EOIs registered.
4. No quarter one report because activities had not yet commenced.

Therefore, there was evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest

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

The Focal person for Microscale irrigation program signed in to her MIS account and it was noted that up to date LLG information was maintained, sampled EOIS were found to be in the MIS for example Ahimbisibwe Benard registered on 13/12/2023 and Ndyanabo James registered on 17/10/2023 among others. Overall, at the time of assessment EOIs stood at 375 against a target of 296 EOIs.

therefore, there was evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS.

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS;  From the quarterly reports, the contents were noted to be derived from the MIS for example on MIS, the cumulative EOIs by end of third quarter was 314 which was the same on MIS. Farm visits and awareness records were also noted to be consistent between MIS and Quarterly reports.	1
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has:  i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	The DPO did not avail an approved performance improvement plan	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans  Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	The DPO did not avail the PIP implementation report	0

### Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  Maximum score 6	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	According to the performance contract, the DPO budgeted <b>UGX837,423,000</b> for <b>35</b> extension staff. However, the approved structure requires the district to have <b>97</b> extensions staff whose wage budget would be <b>UGX2,947,480,000</b> . Therefore, the DLG did not budget for extension staff in accordance to the staffing norm.	0
---	--	---	--	---



7 Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines  
ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0  
The DPO availed a staff list having only 35 extension staff deployed at district and LLG levels instead of the 97 as per the approved staffing structure. **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  
b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0  
**There was evidence** that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed  
Review of the staff list, attendance registers and monitoring reports at Katenga Sub County showed that the following LLG extension workers were actually physically working at Katenga Sub County: **2**  
Maximum score 6

1. Atwine Caroline, Agricultural Officer
2. Ashaba Nathan, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer

These were physically working at Rurehe Sub County:

1. Muhebwa Bruce, Agricultural Officer
2. Mwebesa Robert, Assistant Animal husbandry Officer

These were physically at Mitooma Town Council:

1. Mugizi Peter, Agricultural Officer
2. Atwijukire Judith, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer

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

**There was evidence** that extension workers deployment had been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board.

The staff lists including extension workers where there were any posted and their telephone contacts were prominently displayed at the Notice Boards of all the three sampled LLGs of Katenga Sub County, Rurehe Sub County, and Mitooma Town Council.

Names of some of the LLG extension workers displayed included:

1. Atwine Caroline, Agricultural Officer
2. Ashaba Nathan, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer

were found at Katenga Sub County;

1. Muhebwa Bruce, Agricultural Officer
2. Mwebesa Robert, Assistant Animal husbandry Officer

were at Rurehe Sub County; and

1. Mugizi Peter, Agricultural Officer
2. Atwijukire Judith, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer

were at Mitooma Town Council.

2

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

**There was no evidence** that the District Production Coordinator had conducted annual performance appraisal of all extension workers according to guidelines as all the appraisals were conducted outside the stipulated timelines. Some files reviewed indicated the following:

1. Turyamuhebwa Mathias, Agricultural Officer posted to Mitooma Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 15, 2023.
2. Atwine Caroline, Agricultural Officer posted to Katenga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
3. Mugizi Peter, Agricultural Officer posted to Mitooma Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 03, 2023.
4. Ngabirano Augustino, Agricultural Officer posted to Kashenshero Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.

0

5. Kamurasi Jackson, Agricultural Officer posted to Kiyanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
6. Keminyeto Naome, Agricultural Officer posted to Kanyabwanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 04, 2023.
7. Muhebwa Bruce, Agricultural Officer posted to Rurehe Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 20, 2023.
8. Atwine Kenneth Rwakanuuma, Agricultural Officer posted to Kashenshero Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on June 30, 2023.
9. Ngabirano Keneth, Agricultural Officer posted to Mutara Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 29, 2023.
10. Muganga Paul, Agricultural Officer posted to Mayanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 04, 2023.
11. Tugeineyo Annet, Agricultural Officer posted to Kabira Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
12. Tashobya Dickson, Agricultural Officer posted to Bitereko Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
13. Ashaba Nathon, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Kabira Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 28, 2023.
14. Namara Ronald, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Kanyabwanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 31, 2023.
15. Kahwireyo Makinoni , Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Kashenshero Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 31, 2023.
16. Atuijukire Judith, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Mitoma Town Council was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans,

Principal Assistant Secretary on July 31, 2023.

17. Muhereza Ignituous, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Mayanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 31, 2023.
18. Atuhaire Modrine, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Kashenshero Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 15, 2023.
19. Musinguzi Edison, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Kabira Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 28, 2023.
20. Tumuhimbise Nicholas, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Mitara Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 15, 2023.
21. Niwasiima Gilbert, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Bitereko Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 01, 2023.
22. Amany Bruce, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Mitooma Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
23. Tumwebaze Bernard, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Mayanga Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.
24. Mwebesa Robert, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer posted to Rurehe Sub County was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on September 15, 2023.

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has;  Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	<b>There was evidence</b> that the District Production Coordinator had taken corrective action based on the appraisals.	<b>1</b>
	Maximum score 4		Some of the recommendations seen in the appraisal folders under 'Performance Gap'; 'Agreed Action' and 'Time Frame' for example show that Ngabirano Augustino, Agricultural Officer in Kashenshero Sub County had gaps of 'Limited knowledge on tea management in Kashenshero Sub County' and the agreed action was to attach the officer to Tashobya Dickens, Agricultural Officer in Bitereko Sub County for capacity building and that the Senior Agricultural Officer should follow up to ensure attendance to at least two trainings sessions.	
			The other case seen was on poor performance of Muhebwa Bruce, Agricultural Officer in Katenga Sub County. Agreed action was to transfer him to another Sub County or Town Council under strict supervision.	
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	b) Evidence that:  i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	DPO did not avail training reports	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 4			
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	Neither training report no training database was availed	<b>0</b>
	Maximum score 4			

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

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

MDLG Micro-scale irrigation program has been running for some time and for the current FY2023/2024, allocation has been made for complimentary services (awareness rising of leaders and farmers, demonstration establishment and farm visits - making 25%) and capital development (75%), making 100%.

In the budget of FY2023/2024, the following allocations have been made:

Capital Development is UGX261,146,952 (75%)

Complementary services UGX87,048,983 (25%)

TOTAL BUDGET UGX348,195,934 (100%)

The allocations were made in accordance with Micro-scale irrigation grant allocation guidelines.

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

MDLG Micro-scale irrigation program has been running and for the current year FY2023/2024, allocations have been made for complimentary services in line with MAIF Guidelines.

Complementary services should include a maximum 25% on enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (Awareness leaders and procurement) and 75% on enhancing farmer capacity (Awareness farmers, Farm visits, Irrigation demos and Farmer field schools). For MDLG, the financial breakdown was as follows:

Awareness - LG Leaders UGX13,057,347 (15%)

Procurement 8,704,898 (10%)

Awareness - Farmers UGX29,379,032 (33.7%)

Farm Visits UGX13,057,347 (15%)

Irrigation Demos 3,264,336 (3.7%)

Farmer Field Schools UGX19,586,022(22.7%)

TOTAL Complementary Services UGX87,048,983 (100%).

For FY2023/2024, allocations have been made for Complementary Services in accordance with the guidelines.

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

Mitooma DLG FY2023/2024 Micro scale irrigation budget of UGX348,195,934 is government grant gotten through a supplementary budget and is 100% GoU funded. It doesn't yet have a co-funding element embedded.

There was no evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG FY2023/2024 Budget and allocations made as per laid down Micro-scale irrigation guidelines, though effort is being made to go this direction.

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As at the time of this assessment, for FY2023/2024, Mitooma DLG Micro scale irrigation budget was still 100% GoU funded without an element of co-funding. UGX348,195,934 and is 100% GoU funded.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The following documents were availed for review;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Awareness raising on microscale irrigation program &amp; quarter one review and planning meeting for extension staff held on 23/8/2022. Under minute number Min.53/Ext/2022, Caroline the focal person for micro-scale irrigation program highlighted that the modality of the program is cofunding where the farmer pays 25% for the equipment.</li> <li>2. Report on sensitization of LLG leaders in Bitekero S/C and Rutookye T/C on microscale irrigation program dated 6/6/2023 where cofunding was disseminated</li> <li>3. Report on sensitization of political leadership and technical staff at district level on MSI dated 16/01/2023, cofunding was presented on.</li> </ol> <p>Therefore, the LG has disseminated information on use of cofunding.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2</li> <li>• 70-89% monitored score 1</li> <li>Less than 70% score 0</li> </ul>	<p>No monitoring reports for the previous FY reports because no installations were completed in the previous FY.</p>	0



10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training &amp; support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not yet conducted because some demos are not yet commissioned</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DLG availed the following reports for hands-on support for LLG extension staff;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Online training on modules 1-6 of irrigatrack</li> <li>2. Report on capacity building of extension workers/irrigatrack users on irrigatrack app use under microscale irrigation program, dated 16th January 2023. According to the attached attendance list, the training was attended by among others Turyamuhebwa Mathias, Agric officer (0781033394), Mugizi peter Agricultural officer (0775354073) Tashobya Dickson Agricultural officer (0785005933).</li> </ol> <p>The above-named extension staff were interviewed and confirmed that they had received the said trainings.</p>	2
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>d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, the DLG had established 3 demonstration sites and conducted farmer field day. Department monthly meeting for March 2023, dated 14/03/2023, under Min.5/2023 the DPO informed members that farmer field schools (FFS) are necessary, and each S/C needs to have a farmer group and it was resolved that the Demos act as FFSs and more formed as more farmers enroll for irrigation.</p>	2

11

Mobilization of farmers:  
The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.

Maximum score 4

a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0

The DPO availed the following reports showing that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize and sensitize farmers;

1. Report on farmer exchange visit to Rukungiri dated 10th June 2023, prepared by Atwine Caroline, the focal person, Attendance list has attendees including Kareija Benon the LCV chairperson
2. Mass media sensitization under microscale irrigation dated 16th March, 2023 prepared by Atwine Caroline, Radio talk show conducted by C/Man LCV, DPO and Focal person on voice of Ruhinda in Mitooma on 15th April 2023, 8:00-9:00PM

11	<p>Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DPO availed the following reports;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Report on awareness of LLGs in kiyanga S/c dated 20th march 2023, prepared by Mathias Turyamuhebwa (AO-Kiyanga). Attendance list attached dated 6/2/2023 showing among others Mr. Asiimwe John, the Parish Chief of Kiyanga parish.</li> <li>2. Sensitization of greater Kanyabwanga S/C lower council leadership dated 15/5/2023, prepared keneth Atwiine Rwakanuma (AO Kanyabwanga), attendance list dated 11/5/2023 among others attended by Rev. Canon Kukuuba John</li> <li>3. Report on microscale irrigation sensitization meeting dated 5th April, 2023 prepared by Augustino Ngabirano (AO Kabira S/C) attended by among others Ayebazibwe Moneth, the secretary production Kabira S/C.</li> <li>4. Report on awareness raising of LL councils in katenga S/C dated 14th March,2023 prepared by Turyamureba Pathias with attendance list attached</li> <li>5. Sensitization report for Lower local council leadership, dated 27th march, 2023 by Amnaya Bruce (AAHO-Mitooma) attendance list attached, Kyarusima Peace, town agent</li> <li>6. Sensitization for local leaders, dated 27th March 2023 by Mr. Muganga Paul, the AO Mutara S/c attended by among others Mutatina Ronald, the LCII Chairperson Rubirizi parish</li> </ol> <p>Therefore, there was evidence that the DLG had conducted a training for Staff and political leaders at District and LLG.</p>
----	--	--	---

### Investment Management

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>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</p>	<p>Inventory was not availed</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>0</b></p>
----	---	--	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Focal person for Microscale irrigation program signed in to her MIS account and it was noted that up to date LLG information was maintained, sampled EOIS were found to be in the MIS for example Ahimbisibwe Benard registered on 13/12/2023 and Ndyanabo James registered on 17/10/2023 among others. Overall, EOIs at the time of assessment stood at 375 and last date of EOI entry was 13-11-2023.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DPO availed the following evidences;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Report on farm visits conducted under MSI for 2022/2023 FY dated 30th June, 2023 by Atwine Caroline, showing indicating 143 farm visits conducted</li> <li>2. Report on farm visit under MSI program, dated 25th July 2023 showing that 144 farm visits had been conducted.</li> </ol>	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>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> 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.</p> <p>A document obtained from the District Production Officer (DPO) titled "List of Farmers Approved by the TPC - October 2023: Batch 1" signed by the DPO dated November 10, 2023 publicized beneficiary farmers including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Byasoba Alfred</li> <li>2. Asiimwe Didas</li> <li>3. Karungi Mary</li> <li>4. Biryaho Silver</li> <li>5. Musabarara Bagarukayo Sterancia Joy</li> <li>6. Bagirwa Vasta</li> <li>7. Abasa Stephen</li> </ol>	2

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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.	There is Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in Mitooma DLG approved procurement plan for the current FY (2023/24) as shown in the details below;	1
	Maximum score 18		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Item No. 13- Establishment of an Upland Demo Pond at the District Headquarters;</b> with a Budgeted cost of UGX 9,393,994/=.</li> <li>2. <b>Item No. 14- Supply and Installation of Irrigation Equipment at Selected 12 Farms;</b> with a Budgeted cost of UGX 255,515,121/=.</li> </ol>	
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There is evidence that Mitooma DLG requested for quotations from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF).	2
	Maximum score 18		<p>As per memo dated 25/5/2021 and email (attached to stated memo) from Andrew Kasibante (Engineer-MAAIF) for Commissioner, DAIMWAP, a list of pre-qualified suppliers was provided by MAAIF. As per memo dated 7/2/2022, MAAIF informed various districts to proceed with the establishment of Irrigation Demonstration sites in the FY (2022-23) under the Micro Scale irrigation program. Mitooma District was listed under the Phase 2 District Local Governments. As per the list of pre-qualified firms, Mitooma District was listed under Groups A, B and C Cluster 1-Rwebitaba. The pre-qualified suppliers are listed below under Group A which includes Rukungiri, Bushenyi, Ntungamo Districts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Davis and Shirliff</li> <li>2. Associated Design and Build Engineers Ltd</li> <li>3. Sprinktech</li> <li>4. Adritex Uganda Limited</li> <li>5. Kaftech Investments Ltd</li> <li>6. Ferest Investments Ltd</li> <li>7. Solar now Ltd</li> <li>8. W&amp;S Consult International Ltd</li> </ol> <p>As per memos dated 7/3/2023, all the above-mentioned pre-qualified suppliers were individually invited to bid for the Design, Supply and installation of Micro-Scale irrigation systems.</p>	

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that Mitooma DLG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Under Min. No. 066/CC/2022/23</b> of the Contracts Committee meeting held on 28/2/2023, the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria was concluded. for the Design, Supply and Installation of irrigation equipment in Katenga and Mayanga Sub Counties.</li> <li>2. <b>Under Min. No. 066/CC/2022/23</b> of the Contracts Committee meeting held on 28/2/2023, the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria was concluded for the Design, Supply and Installation of irrigation equipment at Kashenshero and Kiyanga Sub Counties.</li> </ol>	2
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>d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There is evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY (2022/23) was approved by the Contracts Committee as listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Under Min. No. 075/CC/2022/23</b> of the Contracts Committee meeting held on 12/4/2023, the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria was concluded for the micro scale irrigation equipment in Katenga and Mayanga Sub Counties.</li> <li>2. <b>Under Min. No. 074/CC/2022/23</b> of the Contracts Committee meeting held on 12/4/2023, the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria was concluded for the micro scale irrigation equipment in Kashenshero and Kiyanga Sub Counties.</li> </ol>	1

Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines

Maximum score 18

e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0

There is evidence that Mitooma DLG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier before commencement of installation.

**A.** As per LG PP Form 10 dated 23/3/2023, 3 bidders submitted their quotations for the Design, Supply and Installation of Irrigation Equipment at Katenga and Mayanga Sub Counties and were evaluated as listed below:

1. Sprinktech Ltd- with bid amount of UGX 49,622,712/=
2. Associated Design and Build Engineers- with bid amount of UGX 46,132,387/=
3. Adritex (U) Ltd- with bid amount of 46,314,580/=

After the preliminary examination, assessment of eligibility and financial comparison, the evaluation committee recommended Associated Design and Build Engineers (lowest priced technically responsive bid) be awarded the contract for the design, supply and installation of irrigation Equipment at Katenga and Mayanga Sub Counties.

**B.** As per bid evaluation report for the meeting held on 31/3/2023 for the design, supply and installation of Micro Scale irrigation system in Kashenshero and Kiyanga Sub Counties, 2 bidders submitted their quotations and were evaluated as listed below:

1. Sprinktech Ltd- with bid amount of UGX 47,020,271/=
2. Kaftech Investments Ltd- with bid amount of UGX 64,091,352/=
3. Adritex (U) Ltd- with bid amount of UGX 41,008,220/=
4. Ferest Investments Ltd- with bid amount of UGX 59,848,662/=

After the preliminary examination, assessment of eligibility and financial comparison, the evaluation committee recommended Adritex (U) Ltd (lowest priced technically responsive bid) be awarded the contract for the design, supply and installation of Micro Scale irrigation system in Kashenshero and Kiyanga Sub Counties.

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

Three complete irrigation demonstration sites were visited and checked for conformity to to the design output sheet and the findings were as follows;

1. In Kayanga, the design had a petrol powered pump with 5000Litre tanks and sprinklers system for coffee and banana (1.5acres) and this was found on site
2. At kashenshero, the design had an engine powered pump, with 5000litre tank and Sprinkler and drip systems for Irrigating pasture, banana's, coffee and vegetables(1.5acres) and the site was found to conform to this.
3. In Katenga S/C, the design had solar powered surface pump (62m head), sprinkler, drip and drag hose technology for irrigating bananas, vegetables and coffee, which the site conformed to.

therefore, all the three sites checked were found to conform to the designs.



- 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
- The DPO availed the following evidences;
1. Monitoring and supervision report for the four demo sites for MSI dated 26th June, 2023 by Atuzalirwe Allen DCDO; monitoring was conducted on 1/June, 2/June, 5/June, 7th June/12June. 13th, 14th and 16th June at different stages of the installation
  2. Report on installation of demo sites in Kiyanga, Katenga and kashenshero S/Cs by Baluku Robert, dated July 2023 whereby he noted that materials had been delivered at the sites and work was on going at all the four sites.
  3. Routine supervision of the ongoing equipment installation for microscale irrigation dated 20th July,2023 by Tumisime Geoffrey, DWO. He noted that materials were already on site but not yet installed, trenches were already excavated, and specifically on 13th of July, the system had minor leakages on the pipe at Gakyaro Adrian in Katunga S/C.
  4. Supervision of Microscale irrigation activities dated 7th august 2023, by Mr. Monday S Lwanga, the DPo whereby he noted that only trenching had been done in katenga as at 14/6/2023, 90% of the materials had been delivered as of 31st July 2023.

Therefore, the LG conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers.

- 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
- According to the site books, on 16th November, 2023, the technical staff of Mitooma DLG together with the political leadres oversaw commissioning and hand over of the demo sites in Katenge, Kayanga and Kashenshero S/Cs. Here, one of the demonstration sites was not commissioned because it was malfunctioning.

Therefore, the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during testing the functionality of the installed equipment.

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0	According to the site books, on 16th November, 2023, the technical staff of Mitooma DLG together with the political leadres oversaw commissioning and hand over of the demo sites in Katenge, Kayanga and Kashenshero S/Cs.	1
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer’s signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	For MDLG Micro-scale irrigation, no payments for equipment were made in FY2022/2023 and none had been made by the time of this assessment.  The LG did not comply with the performance measure.	0
Maximum score 18				
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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	There was evidence of complete procurement files in place for the all projects/contracts; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals and/or minutes. These included the following:	2
Maximum score 18			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Design, Supply and Installation of Micro-Scale Irrigation System in Katenga and Mayanga Sub Counties-</b> MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00014 Lot 2; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 075/CC/2022/23 in a meeting held on 12/4/2023 after evaluation. The evaluation report was approved by Contracts Committee.</li> <li>2. <b>Design, Supply and Installation of Micro-Scale Irrigation System in Kashenshero and Kiyanga Sub Counties-</b> MITO893/WRKS/22-23/00014 Lot 1; approved by the Contracts Committee under Min. No. 074/CC/2022/23 in a meeting held on 12/4/2023 after evaluation. The evaluation report was approved by Contracts Committee.</li> </ol>	

**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	There <b>was no evidence</b> that the Local Government had displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas	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	There <b>was evidence</b> that Micro-scale irrigation grievances were recorded in line with LG grievance redress framework  In a letter dated 11/5/23, the chairperson Mr. Karwani Lawrence complained about the reallocation of microscale which was originally allocated to Mayanga seed school to individual Mrs. Mwongyera Rose, this was recorded in log book on 11/5/23 by the focal person	1
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that Micro-scale irrigation grievances were investigated in line with LG grievance redress framework  In a invitation letter dated 12/5/2023, the CAO Mr. Twinamatsiko Evans called for a meeting to further investigate the issue, and according to minutes the meeting was held on 16/5/23, under minute 18, the complaint was investigated further and it was confirmed that there was reallocation of of microscale plant which was meant for the school to individual.	1
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework  Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that Micro-scale irrigation grievances were responded in line with LG grievance redress framework  In minutes under minute 19, the committee resolved that the school management should apply for the micro scale equipment under co-funding.	1

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was no evidence</b> that Micro-scale irrigation grievances reported in line with LG grievance redress framework</p>	<b>0</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

**Environment and Social Requirements**

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DPO availed MOUs between Mitooma DLG and the following host farmers;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tumusime Fred (0782454938), dated 4th April,2023</li> <li>2. Gakyaro Adrian (0774231401), dated 27th March, 2023</li> <li>3. Tukwasibwe Deogratiuous (0772438822), dated 4th April, 2023</li> <li>4. Mwongyera Fred (0760979511), dated 27th march 20023</li> </ol> <p>Additionally, the DPO availed agreements to proceed for Twinamatsiko Justus (Mitooma/2023-03-09/Male/43939) dated 19th June, 2023, kabireho jephard (Mitooma/2023-3-16/Male/45304) dated 20th 6 2023 and Kyasimire Maurine (Mitooma 2023-3-25/Female/46794) dated 28/6/2023.</p> <p>Therefore, there was evidence that Micro- scale irrigation guidelines (including E &amp; S requirements) have been issued to the beneficiary small-holder farmers.</p>	<b>2</b>
----	---	---	---	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the supply, design and installation of irrigation equipment for Kashenshero demo site was carried out on 4/7/23, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study therefore a ESMP was prepared on 16/2/23 at tune of Ugx 200,000, in the project file of <b>Proc Ref No MITO893/WRKS/21-22/00014 LOT 1</b> a costed ESMP was incorporated under environmental and social management at tune of Ugx 200,000</li> <li>2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the supply, design and installation of irrigation equipment for Katenga demo site was carried out on 3/7/23, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study therefore a ESMP was prepared on 16/2/23 at tune of Ugx 200,000, in the project file of Proc Ref No MITO893/WRKS/21-22/00014 LOT 2 a costed ESMP was incorporated under environmental and social management at tune of Ugx 200,000</li> </ol>	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality &amp; quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals &amp; management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> for Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality &amp; quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals &amp; management of resultant chemical waste containers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitoring supply, design and installation of irrigation equipment for Kashenshero demo site was carried out on 17/7/23, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, monthly reports were provided for review dated 17/7/23, 20/7/23 the project started on 11/3/23 and ended 23/10/23.</li> <li>2. Monitoring supply, design and installation of irrigation equipment for Katenga demo site was carried out on 20/7/23, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO, the project started on 11/3/23 and ended 16/11/23.</li> </ol>	1

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	<b>Not applicable</b> since the payments have not been effected	<b>1</b>
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	<b>Not applicable</b> since the payments have not been effected	<b>1</b>

**Crosscutting Minimum  
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Chief Finance Officer was substantively filled by Tumuhame Juliet Olive appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 27, 2019 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 514/06/2019. Tumuhame Juliet Olive was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on June 30, 2023.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of District Planner was substantively filled by Agaba Onesmus appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated September 04, 2023 ref.: DSC/651/09/2023 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 651/09/2023. Agaba Onesmus was not appraised.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of District Engineer was substantively filled by Mwebaze John Baptist appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated September 04, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 652/09/2023. Mwebaze John Baptist was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on August 07, 2023.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of District Natural Resources Officer was substantively filled by Baguma Naboth appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 18, 2016 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. DSC/MIT/248/2016(1). Baguma Naboth was not appraised.</p>	3

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>e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of District Production Officer was substantively filled by Monday Swaibuh Lwanga appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated January 02, 2019 ref.: CR/156/5/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 428/2018. Monday Swaibuh Lwanga was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on July 11, 2023.</p>	3
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>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of District Community Development Officer was substantively filled by Atuzalirwe Allen appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated November 02, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. DSC/652/10/2023. Atuzalirwe Allen was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 22, 2023.</p>	3
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>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of District Commercial Officer was substantively filled by Ahimbisibwe Gervase Kabaterine appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated November 02, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. DSC/652/10/2023. Ahimbisibwe Gervase Kabaterine was not appraised.</p>	3
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>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Kyomukama Florence appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 06, 2011 ref.: CR/156/4 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 10/2011. Kyomukama Florence was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.</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>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Procurement Officer was substantively filled by Tushemereirwe Mackline appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 13, 2023 ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. DSC/628/04/2023. Tushemereirwe Mackline was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023 for confirmation.</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>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Administration) was substantively filled by Nahurira Anne appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated September 04, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. DSC/657/10/2023. Nahurira Anne was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on June 23, 2023.</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>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Environment Officer was substantively filled by Kagumire Godwin appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated September 04, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. DSC/653/09/2023. Kagumire Godwin was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 25, 2023.</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><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Land Management Officer was substantively filled by Muhwezi Anthony appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated January 02, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 431/2018. Muhwezi Anthony was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 26, 2023.</p>	2

1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Accountant was substantively filled by Tumwesigye Seriano appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated January 08, 2021 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 568/01/2021. Tumwesigye Seriano was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 15, 2023.	2	
District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the position of Principal Internal Auditor was substantively filled by Akankwasa Israel appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated November 02, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 655/10/2023. Akankwasa Israel was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 08, 2023.	2
District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the	n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) was substantively filled by Natukunda Olivia appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated September 04, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 658/09/2023. Natukunda Olivia was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on July 01, 2023.	2
District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	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).	<b>There was evidence</b> that the LG had substantively recruited a Senior Assistant Secretary in every Sub County and a Principal Township Officer in every Town Council.	5
Maximum score is 15	Mitooma District LG had 10 Sub Counties and 2 Town Councils and a review of personnel files revealed that the LG had substantively recruited and posted staff to these LLGs as follows:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Natukwatsa Henry, Principal Township Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 13, 2023 ref.: CR/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 632/04/2023 and posted to Kashenshero Town Council. Natukwatsa Henry was appraised by Turyasasurwa Edith, Ag. Chief</li> </ol>			

- Administrative Officer on July 30, 2023.
2. Bucureezi Priva, Principal Township Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 03, 2023 ref.: CR/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 650/04/2023 and posted to Mitooma Town Council. Bucureezi Priva was appraised by Turyasasurwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on July 15, 2023.
  3. Musiime Dianah , Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 10, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 502/2019 (1) and posted to Katenga Sub County. Musiime Dianah was appraised by Turyasasurwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on June 30, 2023.
  4. Ssali Yusuf, Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 10, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 502/2019 and posted to Mitooma Sub County. Ssali Yusuf was appraised by Turyasasurwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on June 30, 2023.
  5. Bitenihirwe Jonath, Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 06, 2011 ref.: CR/156/4 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 12/2011 (3) and posted to Kanyabwanga Sub County. Bitenihirwe Jonath was not appraised.
  6. Bamwine Jovia, Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 06, 2018 ref.: CR/156/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 410/2018 and posted to Bitereko Sub County. Bamwine Jovia was appraised by Turyasasurwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on July 27, 2023.
  7. Ashabaahebwa Rachael, Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 24, 2022 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 617/06/2022 and posted to Kiyanga Sub County. Ashabaahebwa Rachael was not appraised.

8. Asiimwe John, Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 24, 2022 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 617/06/2022 (2) and posted to Kabira Sub County. Asiimwe John was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 24, 2023.
9. Musinguzi Everist, Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 24, 2022 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 617/06/2022 (5) and posted to Mayanga Sub County. Musinguzi Everist was not appraised.
10. Tayebwa Patrick , Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 06, 2011 ref.: CR/156/4 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 12/2011 (6) and posted to Rurehe Sub County. Kasinga Elva was appraised by Turyasasurwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on July 14, 2023.
11. Rugambwa Vincent, Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated November 26, 2021 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 595/11/2021 and posted to Mutara Sub County. Rugambwa Vincent was not appraised.
12. Rwabihegye Robert, Senior Assistant Secretary appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 17, 2018 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 377/1/2018 and posted to Kashenshero Sub County. Rwabihegye Robert was appraised by Turyasasurwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on August 02, 2023.

2

New Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

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

**There was evidence** that the LG had substantively recruited a Community Development Officer in every Sub County and a Senior Community Development Officer in every Town Council.

Mitooma District LG had 10 Sub Counties and 2 Town Councils and a review of personnel files revealed that the LG had substantively recruited and posted staff to these LLGs as follows:

5

1. Mugabe Nelson, Senior Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 10, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 496/2019 (1) and posted to Mitooma Town Council. Mugabe Nelson was not appraised.
2. Taremwa Edidah, Senior Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 10, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 496/2019 and posted to Kashenshero Town Council. Taremwa Edidah was not appraised.
3. Nyangoma Patience, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 07, 2012 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 49/2012 (16) and posted to Katenga Sub County. Nyangoma Patience was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 15, 2023.
4. Atusasibwa Susan, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 10, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 497/2019 and posted to Kashenshero Sub County. Atusasibwa Susan was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 10, 2023.
5. Twinamasiko Justus, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated December 20, 2010 ref.: CR/156/5/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 11/2010 and posted to Kabira Sub County. Twinamasiko Justus was not appraised.
6. Nasasira Oliver, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 30, 2018 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 402/3/2018 and posted to Kanyabwanga Sub County. Nasasira Oliver was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 23, 2023.
7. Kasinga Elva, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in

a letter dated May 17, 2018 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 375/2018 and posted to Mutara Sub County. Kasinga Elva was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 23, 2023.

8. Kiconco Sarah, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 30, 2018 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 403/2018 and posted to Bitereko Sub County. Kiconco Sarah was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 23, 2023.
9. Turyachira Yonnah, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 27, 2019 ref.: CR/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 513/06/2019 (1) and posted to Rurehe Sub County. Turyachira Yonnah was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 23, 2023.
10. Turyasingura Wilber, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 27, 2019 ref.: CR/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 513/06/2019 (2) and posted to Mayanga Sub County. Turyasingura Wilber was not appraised.
11. Kyarisima Judith, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 17, 2018 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 376/2018 and posted to Kiyanga Sub County. Kyarisima Judith was not appraised.
12. Kusasira Jovlet, Community Development Officer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 10, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 497/2019 (1) and posted to Mitooma Sub County. Kusasira Jovlet was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 23, 2023.

in place for all essential positions in every LLG

Maximum score is 15

/an Accounts Assistant in all LLGs, score 5 or else 0.

Accounts Assistant in every Sub County and Town Council.

Mitooma District LG had 10 Sub Counties and 2 Town Councils and a review of personnel files revealed that the LG had substantively recruited and posted staff to these LLGs as follows:

1. Byaruhanga David Kajangu, Treasurer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated January 02, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 433/2018 and posted to Mitooma Town Council. Byaruhanga David Kajangu was not appraised.
2. Tumuhimbise Joab, Treasurer appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated December 20, 2010 ref.: CR/156/6/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 10/2010 and posted to Kashenshero Town Council. Tumuhimbise Joab was not appraised.
3. Aruho Stephen, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 17, 2018 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 381/2018 and posted to Katenga Sub County. Aruho Stephen was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 15, 2023.
4. Arinaitwe Glorious, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 18, 2023 ref.: CR/159/4 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 643/04/2023 and posted to Kashenshero Sub County. Arinaitwe Glorious was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 28, 2023.
5. Atukwase Ronald, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 18, 2023 ref.: CR/159/4 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 643/04/2023 (9) and posted to Mutara Sub County. Atukwase Ronald was not appraised.
6. Muhumuza Smith, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 30, 2018 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 408/2/2018 and posted

- to Kanyabwanga Sub County. Muhumuza Smith was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 28, 2023.
7. Kamusinge Glorious, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 30, 2018 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 408/1/2018 and posted to Rurehe Sub County. Kamusinge Glorious was not appraised.
  8. Nowomutano Victor, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated February 18, 2021 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 588/02/2021 and posted to Kabira Sub County. Nowomutano Victor was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 28, 2023.
  9. Mugarura Adison, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 10, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 489/2019 and posted to Mitooma Sub County. Mugarura Adison was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 28, 2023.
  10. Ahereza Lydia, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated January 23, 2015 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 189/2015 (3) and posted to Bitereko Sub County. Ahereza Lydia was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 28, 2023.
  11. Asimwe Amon, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated January 23, 2015 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 190/2015 and posted to Mayanga Sub County. Asimwe Amon was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 28, 2023.
  12. Mugabe Henry, Senior Accounts Assistant appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated February 12, 2021 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under



Minute No. 576/02/2021 (2) and posted to Kiyanga Sub County. Mugabe Henry was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 28, 2023.

### 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:	For MDLG Natural Resources what was budgeted for FY2022/2023 was UGX274,118,925. What was spent according to the report of the year ended 30 June 2023 was UGX274,118,925. The ratio of the expenditure to the budgeted funds was 100%.	2
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department,  score 2 or else 0		
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:	For MDLG Community Based Services what was budgeted for FY2022/2023 was UGX241,019,993. What was spent according to the report of the year ended 30 June 2023 was UGX241,019,910. The ratio of the expenditure to the budgeted funds was 100%.	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.  score 2 or else 0.		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,  score 4 or else 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all projects implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY  1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of administration block phase 4 was carried out on 4/7/22, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO. 2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 120 perimeter wall at the district headquarters was carried out on 22/7/22, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO.	4
	Maximum score is 12			

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),  score 4 or 0	The projects funded by DDEG (i.e. screening for the construction of administration block phase 4 was carried out on 4/7/22, screening for the construction of 120 perimeter wall at the district headquarters was carried out on 22/7/22) implemented by the district in the previous FY, were screened by EO and DCDO, however after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study (ESIA) according to NEA 2019 under schedule 4 and 5, therefore costed ESMP was prepared.	4
---	--	---	--	---

4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.  Maximum score is 12	c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;  score 4 or 0	There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG had a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of 120 perimeter wall at the district headquarters was carried out on 4/7/22, after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study therefore a costed ESMP was prepared on 7/7/22 at cost of ugx 330,000, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO.</li> <li>2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of administration block phase 4 was carried out on 22/7/22, after screening the project didn't qualify for detailed study therefore a costed ESMP was prepared on 22/7/22 at cost of ugx 49,000,000, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO.</li> </ol>	4
---	--	--	--	---

**Financial management and reporting**

5	Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.  Maximum score is 10	If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;  If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5  If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0	Mitooma DLG had an unqualified audit opinion for its FY2022/2023 final accounts.	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>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>As per the submissions at the IAG office and the records at Mitooma DLG, a report on the implementation status of IAG recommendations for FY2021/2022 was submitted to the office of the Internal Auditor General on 29/12/2022. The report had actions taken on 4 recommendations.</p>	10
<p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The submission to the IAG was made before the previous FY February end deadline.</p>		
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p>	<p>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG, Mitooma DLG Performance Contract for FY 2023/2024, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) was submitted on 02/08/2023.</p>	4
<p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>The submission was made before the mandatory August 31st deadline.</b></p>		
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>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>According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG, Mitooma DLG Annual Performance Report for FY 2022/2023, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) was submitted on 14/08/2023.</p>	4
<p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The submission was made before the mandatory August 31 deadline.</p>		

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.

According to the MoFPED inventory of submissions and records at the DLG, Mitooma DLG Quarterly Performance Reports for FY 2022/2023, signed by the Accounting Officer (CAO) were submitted as follows:

Quarter 1 report on 15/12/2022

Quarter 2 report on 15/02/2023

Quarter 3 report on 10/05/2023

Quarter 4 report on 14/08/2023

All the quarterly performance reports for FY2022/2023 were submitted before the mandatory August 31 deadline.

**Education Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------

**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 evidence** that the position of District Education Officer was substantively filled by Barungi Peace appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 06, 2018 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 414/2018. Barungi Peace was not appraised.

**30**

*The Maximum Score of  
70*

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.

*The Maximum Score of 70*

b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.

**There was evidence** to show that the LG had substantively filled all Inspector of Schools positions.

The approved structure of Mitooma District LG provided for a Senior Inspector of Schools and 4 Inspector of Schools' positions. These positions were substantively filled as follows:

1. There was evidence that the position of Senior Inspector of Schools was substantively filled by Tushabe Jane appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 30, 2018 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 386/2018. Tushabe Jane was not appraised.
2. There was evidence that the position of Inspector of Schools was substantively filled by Kyomugisha Shallon appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated January 02, 2019 ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 432/2018. Kyomugisha Shallon was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 07, 2023.
3. There was evidence that the position of Inspector of Schools was substantively filled by Namudu Aisha appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated March 18, 2022 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 600/03/2022 (2). Namudu Aisha was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on March 28, 2023.
4. There was evidence that the position of Inspector of Schools was substantively filled by Atwiine Angella appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated March 18, 2022 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 600/03/2022 (1). Atwiine Angella was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 07, 2023.
5. There was evidence that the position of Inspector of Schools was substantively filled by Baryayebwa Rughina Joshua appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated March 18, 2022 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 600/03/2022. Baryayebwa Rughina Joshua was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 07, 2023.

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>The 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 <b>was evidence</b> that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Education projects for the previous FY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening construction of a 2 classroom block at Kyeibare P/s was carried out on 4/7/2022, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO</li> <li>2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening construction of a 2 classroom block at Katerera P/s was carried out on 19/7/2022, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO</li> <li>3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening construction of Kitojo seed secondary school P/s was carried out on 6/7/2022, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO</li> </ol>	<b>15</b>
---	---	---	--	-----------

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>The Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>Education projects</b> i.e. (construction of a 2 classroom block at Kyeibare P/s was carried out on 4/7/2022, construction of a 2 classroom block at Katerera P/s was carried out on 19/7/2022, construction of Kitojo seed secondary school P/s was carried out on 6/7/2022), that were implemented by the district in the previous FY, were screened by SEO and DCDO, however after screening all projects didn't qualify for detailed study (ESIA) according to NEA 2019 under schedule 4 and 5, therefore costed ESMP was prepared.</p>	<b>15</b>
---	---	---	---	-----------

**Health Minimum  
Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Summary of requirements</b>	<b>Definition of compliance</b>	<b>Compliance justification</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <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.	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of District Health Officer was substantively filled by Dr. Byamugisha Sadic appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated December 11, 2020 ref.: CR/156/5/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 560/12/2020. Dr. Byamugisha Sadic was appraised by Turyarasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on July 17, 2023.	<b>10</b>
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	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing was substantively filled by Nakeya Stella appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated September 04, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 654/09/2023. Nakeya Stella was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.	<b>10</b>
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.	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health was substantively filled by Gumisisriza Robert appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 27, 2019 ref.: CR/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 511/06/2019. Gumisisriza Robert was not appraised.	<b>10</b>
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.	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Environmental Health Officer was substantively filled by Mbeine Robert appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated September 30, 2020 ref.: CR/160/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 543/09/2020. Mbeine Robert was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 02, 2023.	<b>10</b>



1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Health Educator was substantively filled by Murangi K. Richard appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 27, 2019 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 510/06/2019. Murangi K. Richard was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 18, 2023.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Biostatistician was substantively filled by Mwiru Arthur appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated May 22, 2017 ref.: CR/156/4/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 211/2017. Mwiru Arthur was not appraised.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of District Cold Chain Technician was substantively filled by Beshumbusha Fred appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated June 25, 2015 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 206/2015. Beshumbusha Fred was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 05, 2023.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

- 1 New\_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions.

j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0

*Applicable to MCs only.*

*Maximum score is 70*

## Environment and Social Requirements

- 2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)
- Maximum score is 30
- If the LG carried out:
- a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.
- There **was evidence** that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all Health projects for the current FY
1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the upgrade of Kigyende HC III was carried out on 6/7/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO.
  2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the construction of Rutookye HC III was carried out on 17/7/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO.
  3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the upgrade of Mitooma HC IV to district hospital was carried out on 4/7/23, signed and stamped by both the EO and DCDO.
- 15**
- 2 Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)
- Maximum score is 30
- b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.
- Health projects i.e.** ( upgrade of Kigyende HC III was carried out on 6/7/23, construction of Rutookye HC III was carried out on 17/7/23, upgrade of Mitooma HC IV to district hospital was carried out on 4/7/23), that were implemented by the district in the current FY, were screened by SEO and DCDO, however after screening all projects didn't qualify for detailed study (ESIA) according to NEA 2019 under schedule 4 and 5, therefore costed ESMP was prepared.
- 15**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
-----	-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------

**Human Resource Management and Development**

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Senior Agricultural Engineer was filled by Baluku Robert on secondment from the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries.</p> <p>The assessment team was availed letters, one from the Chief Administrative Officer, Sharifah Nakintu to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries dated November 03, 2022 ref.: CR/210/5 titled "Request for an Agricultural Engineer" and a response from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries ref.: FAD 46/99/02 dated November 10, 2022 titled "Secondment of a Senior Agricultural Engineer for Micro Scale Irrigation Programme", recommending the services of Mr. baluku Robert, Senior Agricultural Engineer from Rubirizi District Local Government. Another letter presented was a request letter to Rubirizi District Local Government from Chief Administrative Officer Mitooma District LG dated November 21, 2022 titled "Requesting for Services of Senior Agricultural Engineer" and letter from Chief Administrative Officer Rubirizi District LG ref.: CR/402/1 titled "Services of the Senior Agricultural Engineer Under the Micro-Scale Irrigation Programme" allowing Mr. Baluku Robert, Senior Agricultural Engineer to provide services to Mitooma District LG.</p>	70
---	---	---	--	----

**Environment and Social Requirements**

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening</p> <p><i>score 30 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>There <b>was evidence</b> that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all micro-scale irrigation projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the supply, design and installation of irrigation equipment for Kashenshero demo site was carried out on 4/7/23, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO.</li> <li>2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the supply, design and installation of irrigation equipment for Katenga demo site was carried out on 3/7/23, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO.</li> </ol>	30
---	---	--	--	----

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>Human Resource Management and Development</b>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.  <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Civil Engineer (Water) was substantively filled by Tumusiime Geoffrey appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated March 18, 2022 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 598/03/2022. Tumusiime Geoffrey was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.	<b>15</b>
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.	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Assistant Water Officer for Mobilization was substantively filled by Tumwine Elly appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated March 18, 2022 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 597/03/2022. Tumwine Elly was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.	<b>10</b>
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.	<b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer was substantively filled by Tushemereirwe Shallon appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 06, 2011 ref.: CR/156/4 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 22/2011. Tushemereirwe Shallon was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on August 24, 2023.	<b>10</b>

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Natural Resources Officer was substantively filled by Baguma Naboth appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated April 18, 2016 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. DSC/MIT/248/2016(1). Baguma Naboth was appraised by Turyasasirwa Edith, Ag. Chief Administrative Officer on June 30, 2023.</p>	<b>15</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Environment Officer was substantively filled by Kagumire Godwin appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated September 04, 2023 ref.: CR/160/2 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. DSC/653/09/2023. Kagumire Godwin was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 25, 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p><b>There was evidence</b> that the position of Forestry Officer was substantively filled by Bazirake Amon appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer in a letter dated March 18, 2022 ref.: CR/156/4/1 as directed by the District Service Commission under Minute No. 596/03/2022. Bazirake Amon was appraised by Twinamasiko Evans, Principal Assistant Secretary on July 25, 2023.</p>	<b>10</b>

**Environment and Social Requirements**

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

If the LG:

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

There **was evidence** that the LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY

1. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS was carried on 22/8/22, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO.
2. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for rehabilitation of Kaziko-Mahungye spring tank was carried on 15/7/22, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO.
3. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for rehabilitation of Kazira spring tank was carried on 19/7/22, signed and stamped by both EO and DCDO.

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.

**The water projects** i.e. (construction of Nkinga-Mushunga GFS was carried on 22/8/22, rehabilitation of Kaziko-Mahungye spring tank was carried on 15/7/22, rehabilitation of Kazira spring tank was carried on 19/7/22) implemented by the district in the previous FY, were screened by SEO and DCDO. however after screening all projects didn't qualify for detailed study (ESIA) according to NEA 2019 under schedule 4 and 5, therefore costed ESMP was prepared.

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.

• According to Mitooma DWO, at the end of FY 2022/2023, there was **three (3) operational piped water supply systems including: Mushunga-Nkinga GFS (Spring) in Nkinga Parish, Mitooma S/C with average yield of 1.75 m3/hr constructed in April 2023 and Kibazi GFS (River/Stream) in Nyakizinga S/C and Katenga GFS (Spring) in Katenga S/C.**

• However, Mitooma DLG Water department had not acquired water abstraction permits for all piped water supply systems.

• Therefore, Mitooma DLG specifically the Water Department **did not get water abstraction permit issued by DWRM thereby justifying a score zero (0)**